

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 30 JULY 1925**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 30 JULY, 1925.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to the requirements of Standing Order No. 13, I hereby nominate the following members to form the panel of Temporary Chairmen during the present session:—

Frank Arthur Cooper, member for the electoral district of Bremer;

David Alexander Gledson, member for the electoral district of Ipswich;

Frederick Lancelot Nott, member for the electoral district of Stanley;

Harry Frederick Walker, member for the electoral district of Cooroora; and

David Weir, member for the electoral district of Maryborough.

QUESTIONS.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER METER RENT.

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

“In view of the unreasonable charges and conditions imposed and attaching to the use of electric light and power meters, will he exercise his authority and have conditions altered, so that the charges or cost of meters be made more equitable, and thus remove the cause of much dissatisfaction amongst householders and people using electricity?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. M. J. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) replied—

“If consumers are not satisfied with the charges made by electric authorities for meters they have the right, if so desired, to provide their own. They must at all times, at their own expense, keep them in proper order for correctly registering the value of supply.”

PROPOSED TRAMWAY EXTENSION TO GRANGE ESTATE, NEWMARKET.

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

“Will he lay upon the table of the House all papers, together with all notings thereon, dealing with the proposed tramway extension to the Grange Estate, Newmarket?”

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

“The papers can be perused at the Home Office.”

INQUIRIES BY METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE BOARD IN RE RENTAL VALUE OF PROPERTIES.

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

“1. Was it at his instigation or with his approval that the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board secured information in regard to the rental value of properties?

“2. To bring about an alteration of the present system of computation, would the Act require amendment?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. M. J. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) replied—

"1. The Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board is empowered under section 97 (2) of the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Acts, 1909-1923," to collect information regarding the rental value of properties.

"2. No. The Board, under Part VIII., sections 88 and 90, of the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Acts, 1909-1923, shall define by by-laws the basis upon which water and sewerage rates shall be assessed."

REVENUE FROM TIMBER ROYALTIES OR STUMPAGE, 1920-1925.

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

"1. What is the total revenue received by the Government from royalties or stumpage on timber removed from lands under the control of the Lands Department up to and including five (5) years ended 30th June, 1925?"

"2. What amount, if any, has been expended on reforestation during the five (5) years ended 30th June, 1925?"

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

"1. From 1st July, 1920, to 30th June, 1925, inclusive, the revenue on account of forestry was £955,723.

"2. During this period the sum of £202,430 has been spent in afforestation, reforestation, and kindred work."

FINANCIAL RELIEF FOR SOLDIER SETTLERS.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. Costello (*Carnarvon*), asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"In view of the fact that the Government has in many cases wiped off arrears of interest owing by soldier settlers, will he grant equivalent relief to those who have kept their payments up to date, and have not therefore received any benefit, either by deducting their payments of interest from their outstanding liabilities or by crediting such payments to future years?"

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

"It is assumed that soldier settlers who met their liabilities were able to meet them, and in those circumstances relief is not needed."

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. Costello (*Carnarvon*), asked the Premier—

"1. Has he received the agreement relative to the writing off by the Commonwealth Government of £475,000 of the State's indebtedness on account of soldier settlers?"

"2. Has the agreement yet been signed?"

"3. If and when such relief is granted by the Commonwealth to the State—(a) Does the agreement provide that proportionate relief shall be given to the soldier settlers by writing off a portion of their indebtedness?; (b) if not, does the Government intend to give such relief to these settlers?"

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eucham*) replied—

"1. The draft agreement has been received, and is now under consideration.

"2. See answer to No. 1.

"3. (a) No, the agreement does not provide for relief to individual soldier settlers; (b) as mentioned in the Governor's Speech, substantial relief has already been granted by the Queensland Government to individual soldier settlers."

QUEENSLAND PARTICIPATION IN IMPERIAL MIGRATION SCHEME.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. Costello (*Carnarvon*), asked the Premier—

"1. Has he yet received the agreement relating to the Imperial migration scheme, and, if so, has such agreement yet been signed on behalf of the Queensland Government?"

"2. What amount will be made available to Queensland under this scheme, and at what rates of interest?"

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eucham*) replied—

"1. The draft agreement has been received, and is now under consideration.

"2. The amount proposed to be advanced to each State Government would depend upon the number of migrants absorbed by individual States under the provisions of the proposed agreement. The rates of interest payable by the State Governments are—(a) For the first five years, 1 per cent. per annum; (b) for the succeeding five years, one-third the rate payable by the Commonwealth Government; and (c) thereafter at the full rate payable by the Commonwealth Government?"

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*) asked the Premier—

"1. Has the Government arrived at a decision with reference to the Migration Agreement with the Commonwealth Government?"

"2. If so, will he make such decision known to the House at the earliest possible moment?"

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eucham*) replied—

"1. No.

"2. Yes."

SLEEPER BLOCKS FROM PRIMARY PRODUCERS AND A.W.U. TICKETS.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Is it a fact that before officers of the Railway Department will accept sleeper blocks from primary producers and others they first require production of an Australian Workers' Union ticket?"

"2. Will he instruct his officers that where a person supplying sleepers is a primary producer, and furnishes proof that he is a member of a Local Producers' Association, an Australian Workers' Union ticket shall not in future be required?"

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

“1 and 2. Yes, pieceworkers are required to have an Australian Workers' Union ticket. This is in accordance with the spirit of clause 37 of the Railway Construction Workers' Award.”

#### REASONS FOR LATE ARRIVAL OF RAILWAY TRAINS.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. Swayne (*Mirani*), asked the Secretary for Railways—

“What is the reason for the late arrival of trains at stations that has now become so prevalent outside the metropolitan area?”

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

“Delays to trains are common throughout the world in railway working even when traffic is normal; the traffic on the Queensland railways at the present time is abnormal, and the department is taking every possible means to reduce late trains to a minimum by pushing ahead with a vigorous rolling stock programme, reorganising time-tables, providing additional siding accommodation and crossing places. A special officer is engaged supervising traffic arrangements throughout the State.”

#### MR. MARK HARRISON AND DIRECTORSHIP OF COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. Deacon (*Cunningham*), asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

“1. Is it correct that the Government offered to appoint Mr. Mark Harrison as Director of the Council of Agriculture?”

“2. If so, was such offer made on advice of the Agricultural Council or without?”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) replied—

“1. I understand the matter of the appointment of a Director of the Council of Agriculture was discussed informally with Mr. Harrison, who intimated he was not an aspirant; subsequently the position was advertised, and Mr. Macgregor was the successful applicant.

“2. See answer to No. 1.”

#### INQUIRY INTO RAILWAY DERAILMENTS.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*), without notice, asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. Has his attention been called to a railway derailment at Caboolture?”

“2. Seeing that the inquiry into the Traveston disaster is still proceeding, will he extend the scope of that inquiry to enable the Board to deal with the abnormal number of railway derailments that have occurred recently?”

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

“I would point out to the hon. gentleman that there is not an abnormal number of derailments, but an abnormal amount of publicity given to derailments. If a railway hot box occurs to-day, there is a double column heading in the daily Press with respect to it. Many of these minor derailments are coming in all

States of Australia and on all railway systems throughout the world. If the hon. member would take the trouble to inquire into the position in New South Wales, Victoria, or other places, he would find that the percentage is much greater than it is said to be in Queensland.

Mr. KERR: Inefficient railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:

“If the hon. member will look into the railway working prior to the coming into power of the present Administration he will find that the percentage of derailments, hot boxes, and other such minor matters was greater than that which has been of late.”

Mr. CORSER: What does the Australian Railway Union say about the matter?

Mr. KERR: Inefficient rolling stock.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: But—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that on those occasions there was no Labour Government in power—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And there was no reason why the Press—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

#### INCOME TAX REGULATIONS

##### RATIFICATION BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to approve and ratify certain regulations purporting to have been made under and in pursuance of the Income Tax Act of 1924.”

As I explained yesterday, the object of this amending Bill is to ratify certain regulations which were made on the 8th instant. There is no doubt about their necessity, following on the deregistration or the refusal to register certain persons and firms licensed as agents under the Act who had been found guilty of making false returns. Following on the refusal to register these persons, it was found that they were sending out circulars undertaking to do the work for nothing, and in order that the Board should have control over the people who carry out such work it has been found necessary to introduce this Bill. When the scheme was recently before Parliament it met with the general approval of hon. members on both sides. I have no doubt, therefore, that hon. members on both sides will see the necessity of this small Bill.

Mr. MORGAN: Is this due to faulty drafting of the Bill?

The TREASURER: No. It was not known at the time that these people would undertake to do the work for nothing. But, although they may profess to do the work for nothing, they will get recompense in other ways, and this Bill is necessary in order that people who are considered not qualified and who have been deregistered should not be reregistered or allowed to practise in this way.

Question put and passed.

*Hon. W. N. Gillies.]*

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

The TREASURER presented the Bill, and moved—

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

Question put and passed.

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

#### TOWNSVILLE BRIDGES BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to authorise the Council of the City of Townsville permanently to maintain Victoria Bridge, over Ross Creek, and to construct and maintain a new bridge over Ross Creek within the said city without making provision for the opening of a portion of such bridges for the passage of vessels, and also to construct and maintain a way over or adjacent to the said Ross Creek; and for other consequential purposes.”

The object of this Bill is obvious. It is to give the Townsville City Council authority to build a new bridge over a navigable stream—the Ross River—and also to close the old bridge. The old bridge provides for an opening to allow small craft to go up the river, but the stream is really not used now for navigation, and it is necessary, in view of any common law or other rights, to pass legislation to give the council protection and authority to erect a new bridge further up. The Bill itself and the attached plan will indicate exactly what is required.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) presented the Bill, and moved—

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

Question put and passed.

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

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*) (who on rising was received with Government cheers) said: I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on the able manner in which they dealt with the subject matters referred to in the Governor's Speech. As they covered practically the whole ground of the Speech, I shall content myself with dealing with the propaganda issued by the Opposition during the recess, both on the platform and in the Press during the Greater Brisbane elections campaign and during the New South Wales election. The surprising

[*Hon. W. N. Gillies.*

thing is that the attacks of the Opposition on this Government are usually levelled outside this Chamber. I listened to the leader of the Opposition yesterday delivering his speech on the Address in Reply, and I naturally expected him to repeat some of the charges which he and members of his party are making outside the House so that they could be replied to, and, as you will see before I sit down, replied to very effectively here.

The only matter that the leader of the Opposition touched on yesterday was in connection with manufacturing industries in Queensland. He quoted figures to try and show that the manufacturing industries in Queensland were going to the dogs. But he did not go far enough. He did what hon. members opposite always do; he quoted a few figures that suited his case. Anyone from the other States or from overseas desirous of opening business in Queensland, after reading the figures quoted by the leader of the Opposition, would be very chary about coming here. I want to quote a few other figures. I am quoting from the “ABC of Queensland Statistics” for 1925, page 137. In 1914, when Queensland was mismanaged by the same gang that are over there to-day, the value of the output in Queensland—

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in calling members of the Opposition a “gang”? (Government laughter.)

The SPEAKER: The language is not elegant, but the hon. member will know that a greater latitude is allowed to an hon. member when referring to a party than when referring to an individual.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He thinks he is in a railway construction camp.

Mr. PEASE: I might say that there are more honourable men engaged in the railway construction than there are in the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not impute improper motives.

Mr. PEASE: Before I sit down I will tell the Opposition what their own Press think. They say harder things of them than I have said. In 1923 the value of the output of manufactures in Queensland compared with 1914 showed an increase under the management of a sane Government of £13,500,000. The value per head of manufactures in 1914 was £226, and under this Government it increased to £373 in 1923. The value of the output in 1914 was £589, and in 1923 it had increased to £865. The hon. member for Nundah is a financial man and he has something to do with banking and insurance companies. If he would only read the balance-sheets of the banks of Queensland he would find that from 1914 to 1924 the amount of money and the value of securities held by the banks in Queensland in ten years under Labour administration have increased by £30,500,000—that is to say, that owing to the sane legislation of this Government the assets of the banks in Queensland show that increase in the period mentioned.

Mr. KELSO: Give us the figures for the Southern States.

Mr. PEASE: You can give what you like afterwards.

Mr. KELSO: You only give what suits you.

Mr. PEASE: The wealth production of the State of Queensland in 1923 in comparison with 1914 had increased by over £19,000,000. The Opposition do not like this sort of thing. I am here as a Queenslander to stand up for Queensland and to induce the people of the other States and overseas to come to Queensland. I am convinced that there is no State in Australia to-day—and I speak as a business man—which offers greater facilities to business men than the State of Queensland. The value of the wealth production of Queensland has increased nearly £20,000,000 under Labour rule. The ships which entered the port of Brisbane in 1914 numbered 497, and in 1924 the number of vessels which came to Brisbane to take away the products which this Government have fostered had increased to 955, or practically double. Owing to our sane legislation, which enables the producer to produce successfully, it requires double the number of ships to come here and take away the products of the State, and that is what our Government are responsible for.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What about the other States?

Mr. PEASE: The hon. member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Nundah went over to New South Wales to speak, and, according to the "Courier," two men and a dog were their audience. (Government laughter.) And even the dog went to sleep! (Renewed laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PEASE: I shall now quote from a speech which the leader of the Opposition made at Ipswich. As I said, he makes all these speeches outside the House and not inside it, and because I come along here and try to deal with the matter, naturally the Opposition do not like it. First of all, he said that this Government was a "minority" Government. I thought that that idea was exploded long ago. What actually happened? At the last elections in Queensland

this Government put up a record [11 a.m.] which I do not think any Government in the world has ever exceeded. They went to the country, and every member on this side of the House was returned, and, in addition, six seats were won from the Opposition. Moreover, we have won every by-election—Warrego, Buranda, and Toowoomba. If we were such a bad Government, and the people did not want us, surely to goodness at these by-elections—when the Opposition can concentrate the whole of their forces upon them—the people would give them their answer. The people did on every occasion. It does not matter what money they spend or how they concentrate their efforts, they are unsuccessful. I took part in the recent campaign in New South Wales, and I illustrated to the farming community there what our Government had done—satisfactorily to the electors, because the brother of the Premier was returned. In effect, we went over there and convinced the farmers that our policy was sound. And what did the farmers of Toowoomba say at the last by-election?

Mr. MAXWELL: They are not farmers.

Mr. PEASE: They live on farming; they are in a farming community, and naturally

they had to do what the farmers want. (Opposition interjection.) And, whilst I am on this point, I should like to say that during the New South Wales election this "minority Government" cry was used a good deal, and a statement which was put into "Hansard" by the then leader of the Opposition was quoted. That statement was incorrect, and I am surprised to find that the leader of the Opposition should lend himself to putting an incorrect statement into "Hansard." He asked the permission of the House to put it in—he did not read it—so that it got there without examination by members on this side, and it was incorrect.

Mr. CORSER: What leader was it?

Mr. PEASE: Never mind. Probably a better man than somebody else. (Laughter.) That statement is incorrect in that the Opposition claimed the Rosewood electorate for the Country party. That fact just illustrates the sort of tactics hon. members opposite are prepared to adopt. They put into "Hansard" an incorrect statement, inasmuch as in it they claim Rosewood, whereas everybody knows that the member for Rosewood sits over here.

Mr. CORSER: What is the date of that?

Mr. PEASE: The date is 21st August, 1923. Now I will give what really happened to a "minority" Government, who are really ruining the Commonwealth by bad administration. I refer to the present Federal Government, and I quote from "The National Review," their own paper, which said that—

"The figures showed that at the last Senate election the Labour majority was 90,616, and that six Ministers and thirty-seven members lost their seats."

Another charge which was made by the present leader of the Opposition was that we were frightened to go to the country. Our Government are not frightened to go to the country. The only Governments who are frightened are Governments composed of members like hon. members opposite, because at present the Federal Government are hanging on for all they are worth. They will not go to the country until their full time expires, and, when they do go, they are going to get a very bad shock. I did not happen to be in the Chamber when the electoral Estimates were being discussed last session or I would have quoted then what I propose to read now. If hon. members will look at the "Daily Mail" of the 26th June, 1923, they will see this comment—

"The sooner the Opposition realises that it is beaten on its merits the better for it."

And it goes on to say—

"Mr. Taylor's basis of calculations included electorates in which there were no party fights, and he made an arbitrary allocation of votes."

The Townsville "Bulletin" of 24th May, 1923, said—

"Queensland electors have again cast their votes in favour of the Labour party and, as majority law rules in this State, their voice has to be accepted. It is a cleanly cut victory, and the Labour party will go back numerically strengthened. There can be no mistaking the edict of the people. They have decided for Labour rule."

*Mr. Pease* }

The Sydney "Daily Telegraph" says—

"An Opposition with a policy as colourless and unenterprising as its personnel was weak, sought to impress the electors with a warning that the Labour Government had embarked on a political jaunt of 'Red Bolshevism.'"

The hon. member for Toowoong rendered very good service to a Labour candidate in New South Wales during the last elections there. He went over there and preached the Bolshevik business so much that he disgusted even his own supporters, who refused to go and listen to him, and so Labour won the seat.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is wrong.

Mr. PEASE: It is absolutely right. The hon. member spoke of nothing else but Bolshevism, and his own papers got disgusted. Mr. Denham, ex-Premier of Queensland, speaking in America, said—

"The Labour Party has been in power in Queensland for a long time and general conduct of affairs has been quite satisfactory. Though not presuming to say how Government control or State ownership might work in the United States, I can say—after an extended visit to Canada—that we seem to be more up-to-date than they are in Canada."

Some hon. members opposite made reference to the redistribution of seats. When the redistribution took place, Mr. Pihelly, who was the Acting Premier of the day, made this statement to the Press—

"This morning I took the opportunity of spending half an hour with Mr. Ferry (Chairman of the Commission) and the absurdity of the Press criticism is shown by the fact that out of 23 anti-Labour members who called on the Commissioners, 25 fully approved of the alterations, two had no objections, and only one had a complaint at all. Mr. Ferry also informed me that out of the 26 Labour members who called, four had very definite objections. These figures speak for themselves.

"It is true that there will be new electorates and that old ones will disappear. That is unavoidable. The same thing happened in 1911. And to anyone who is acquainted with the metropolitan area it must be laughable to hear of complaints from anti-Labour members, more particularly when you look at the new Wynnum and Sandgate electorates."

I am quite convinced that after the next elections the Government will come back with such a big following that it will be necessary for us to find the Opposition.

One of the main attacks made by the Opposition and its Press propagandists outside of this Chamber is that we are taxing the people out of Queensland. What is the fact? According to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures for 1924, the excess of arrivals over departures is shown by these figures—

Queensland	...	...	18,223
Victoria	...	...	12,078
New South Wales	...	...	5,257
South Australia	...	...	7,036
Western Australia	...	...	5,271
Northern Territory	...	...	29
Federal Territory	...	...	350

[Mr. Pease.

In Tasmania, instead of there being an excess of arrivals, the number decreased by 4,495. In the Federal electorate of Herbert—which will shortly be represented in the Federal House by our ex-Premier—the number of persons enrolled had increased by 3,649 in 1924, as compared with 1922. Hon. members know that it takes 5 years for an immigrant, unless he be British-born, to get on the roll. The figure 3,649 represents not children, but adults alone whose names have been added to the electoral roll for Herbert. Then the Opposition say that we are taxing the people out of Queensland. They say that we are encouraging unemployment. They assert that there is more unemployment in Queensland than in any other State. The Unemployed Workers Insurance Act provides benefits for all persons registered under that Act as unemployed. Never since that Act came into operation has the percentage of unemployed to employed persons under the provisions of the Act exceeded 3 per cent. The highest percentage of all registered unemployed since the passing of that Act is 5.6, whereas in Victoria for the last ten years it has been 9 per cent. Those figures must certainly show what we are doing in Queensland. We are able to show a record increase in population, and our figures for unemployment are less than they are in Victoria.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Those figures are not true. They are in relation to unionists.

Mr. PEASE: They are not in relation to unionists. I am giving the total registered number of unemployed in Queensland, which is 5.6 per cent.

The great charge is made that we are a terrible taxing authority—that anybody who comes to Queensland is taxed out of existence. For the whole State of Queensland in 1923-24 25,706 persons are assessed, in addition to 860 companies. That is out of a total population of 830,000 people. The exemptions granted by the present Government in 1923-24 exempted 14,395 taxpayers as compared with 1922-23. That is to say, the legislation brought in by this Government last session totally exempted 14,395 taxpayers from paying any tax at all. To show how fair we have been to the primary producer—whom the hon. members opposite claim they are standing for—I wish to point out that, in connection with the land tax, exemptions were granted by this Government last session which benefited 11,202 settlers and farmers, and totally exempted 8,877 farmers, the amount reduced totalling £22,630. Over 20,000 primary producers have benefited by the taxing legislation of this Government. I am going to show the Opposition and the people of Queensland who are really responsible for any over-taxation which is levied in Queensland. I am quoting from the "ABC of Queensland Statistics" for 1925, page 111. These show that for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1924, the total amount of State taxation was £3,617,201. This amount works out per head of population at £4 9s. 2d. For the same period the amount of Federal taxation levied in Queensland totalled £4,581,101, or £5 12s. 11d. per head.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Why do you not give the figures for the other States?

Mr. PEASE: That is to say, the sort of Government represented by gentlemen of

the other side taxed the people of Queensland £1 3s. 9d. per head more than the State Government, who have to perform all the functions of the State.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Federal Government have to carry the burden of war taxation.

Mr. PEASE: This is not war taxation. It shows that hon. members opposite do not know their "book," and that these are the sort of figures they do not want to know. Those figures are in the "ABC of Queensland Statistics" for anyone to look at. If the hon. member for Wynnum does not know them, I shall be glad at the conclusion of my speech to show him the book. If the people of Queensland are overtaxed, it is the anti-Labour Federal Government who are responsible for it, for the simple reason that they take per head of population from this State £1 3s. 9d. more than the State Government. Those figures have nothing whatever to do with the war. It is solely the taxation which they have levied. Against those figures the State expends £16 10s. per head, whereas the Commonwealth expend per head of population £10 12s. 4d. This State has to carry the burden of interest on loans for development work and all the services of the State. Yet the Commonwealth collect the most money, and, as I say, hon. members opposite go out into the country and tell the people that we are such a terrible taxation authority solely to camouflage the true facts. It shows that the Federal Government are levying from the people of Queensland more than they should do. A returned soldier came to me when I recently visited the Herbert electorate and asked me to go into the question of his income tax. It appears that this soldier went over to France some years ago, when a gentleman called Mr. Hughes visited the front, lined up the Australian soldiers and promised them all sorts of things. This man assured me that one of the things Mr. Hughes promised the soldiers was that all Australian soldiers would be exempted from taxation for five years after their return to Australia. This soldier told me that when he was returning on the troopship his commanding officer, when dismissing the men, told them that Australia was so well pleased with what they had done for it that they would be exempt from all taxation for five years after their return. This man was astounded when he received his taxation papers to find that he was levied for three years' taxation, for the years 1921, 1922, and 1923. I sent his papers along to the Commissioner of Taxes in Brisbane and asked him to deal with the matter. I informed the Commissioner what the returned soldier had been told about taxation exemption, and that the man wanted to know all about it. The Commissioner stated that there was no exemption. I shall show how this man was taxed over those three years—

Year.	State.		Federal.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1921	...	4 7 8	...	6 14 5
1922	...	5 14 5	...	6 10 0
1923	...	5 8 5	...	6 1 2
Total	...	15 10 6	...	19 5 7

I quote those figures merely to show that not only companies but individuals are taxed more excessively by the Federal Government than by the Queensland State Government.

Our State taxation policy is to give to the ordinary worker as much relief as is possible, and my figures show that that object is achieved.

Hon. members opposite and their propagandists outside say that Labour administration in Queensland is hampering the progress of industry in the State. To disprove that I shall show how Queensland has progressed by taking recent financial reports. First I shall deal with that of the Queensland Trustees, a big corporation in Brisbane, functioning also throughout the State. It had its annual meeting recently, and the "Courier" of 29th July quotes the chairman's report, wherein he is stated to have said—

"The business for the year showed an increase of £270,680. Primary production in Queensland is greatly on the upgrade, and a great future is in store for Queensland."

I desire to tell the leader of the Opposition that he should get his information from the chairman of the Queensland Trustees and the hon. member should inform the public from his seat in this House what that gentleman and others have said about the primary production of Queensland being greatly on the upgrade. And so it is. Any man who travels in Queensland where agricultural production is going on must see the great benefits that have been derived from the agricultural policy of this Government. I might mention that the chairman of the Queensland Trustees is no friend of this Government.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Oh, these people say nice things about you.

Mr. PEASE: The chairman of the Stock Exchange, a Mr. Corser, is reported by the "Courier" as saying—

"The year must be considered a very satisfactory one for the State of Queensland in particular."

I am glad to see the hon. member for Burnett comes here to hear words of wisdom from his brother. Mr. James Allan, who is chairman of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, stated—

"Queensland has approximately one-seventh of the population of the Commonwealth, yet its retail business per parcel post is considerably more than double that of all the other States."

Mr. MORGAN: What about stock?

Mr. PEASE: The hon. member who interjected has something to do with stock. Will the hon. member tell me, if we are such a terrible Government, and if this State is no good for the stock people, why Vestey's Limited, came here recently and purchased Lakes Creek Meatworks, and why Angliss and Co. bought the Redbank Meatworks? It was because of the good work of this Government on behalf of the stockowner. I am glad that, despite the gloomy propaganda, as the late Premier used to call it, of the Opposition, we have hon. members on this side of the House who are able to refute such propaganda, and that such firms as Vestey's and Angliss have appreciated the possibilities of our State and have come here to do business. I am also very glad to know that Henry Ford did not listen to their gloomy propaganda. We have Henry Ford coming to Queensland, and I am quite satisfied that he will do as well here as he does in any of the other States.

Mr. Pease]

I want to say that if members of the Opposition will travel, through North Queensland particularly, they will find in nearly every town from Townsville north that some bank is erecting new buildings. Does that show that Queensland is going to ruin? Why are they erecting all these fine buildings? It does not matter where you go—to Townsville, Cairns, Innisfail, Ingham—in all these places you will find one or two banks putting up fine buildings. What does that show? It shows that these people know that they are on a good thing. They know that they have got a good Government and that they have the worst Opposition in Australia. (Laughter.) The Jewellers' Conference came to Brisbane the other day. The Jewellers' Conference is not the sort of concern a poor man is interested in. As a rule, the only time a man can give a ring to a girl is when things are pretty good; when things are not good he gives her a ring on the 'phone. (Laughter.) The Jewellers' Conference came to Brisbane the other day, and I just want to show what these people said. Mr. Walsh, of New South Wales, said—

“Brisbane, after a lapse of five years, was a revelation. The city had gone ahead wonderfully.”

Mr. Cattanaach, of Victoria, said—

“Brisbane had gone ahead more than any other city of Australia.”

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Did you see what Harry Lauder said the other day? (Laughter.)

Mr. PEASE: I am not a Scotchman. Mr. Darcy, of Tasmania, was good enough to say—

“Brisbane showed great evidence of wonderful growth.”

Before I touch on one most important matter, I want to say that under this Government the value of exports from North Queensland for 1924 amounted to no less a sum than £14,493,969, and I hope the members of the Opposition will let those figures sink in. North Queensland, under the beneficent rule of this Government—their railway development policy and the opening up of new centres everywhere—helped the producer to such an extent that last year the value of goods exported from North Queensland totalled nearly £15,000,000.

In view of the fact that an election is looming, it is only right that the people of Queensland should know who control the Opposition, and I am going to try and tell them in the words of the friends of the Opposition, so that they cannot say that I or anyone else is trying to mislead the people. I want the people of Queensland definitely to understand who are behind the Opposition. I intend to quote from the “Courier,” and not from the “Worker” or the “Advocate.”

Mr. KERR: They are your supporters.

Mr. PEASE: With regard to the offer of funds the “Courier” said—

“The National Union would advance funds for members of Parliament, any election candidates, and electoral committees on condition—

1. That the National Union was recognised as the sole collecting authority.

2. All funds to be allocated by the party leaders and the National Union.”

[Mr. Pease.

Now with regard to the acceptance—

“The Parliamentary Country party and nine members of the Parliamentary United party accepted these proposals.

A statement was issued by Mr. King and Mr. Moore, as follows:—

“As the National Union is now constituted we consider it to have all the requisite elements which should inspire confidence in the minds of the subscribers and the organisations, and consequently we feel no qualms in recognising it as the sole collecting authority.”

I want the people of Queensland to know who comprise the National Union. First of all, I will quote the Melbourne “Age,” which says—

“The National Union is a secret little body of rich men who act in defiance of the spirit, if not the letter of the law, and endeavour by the expenditure of scores of thousands of pounds to buy into power accommodating politicians.”

No wonder the honest men of the Opposition would not have anything to do with it. The “Townsville Bulletin” of 25th February, says—

“The National Union is a self-appointed body working in secret. Any political candidate who submits wholly to the Union will be financially blessed, his election expenses will be paid, and other benefits will overtake his relations and friends.”

Anybody who knows Mr. David Green, the man who edits that paper, knows that he is one of the real solid old Tories, and he makes no bones about it, and that is what he has to say about the National Union. The Brisbane “Courier” of 13th May states—

“The vested interests of Melbourne stand behind the National Union, and the Queensland Opposition are selling the soul of Queensland to the money interests of Melbourne.”

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Shame!

Mr. PEASE: Then, along comes the Brisbane “Sun” of 17th May. Everybody knows who the editor of the Brisbane “Sun” is—there was a bribery case once in Queensland. This is what the editor of the Brisbane “Sun” has to say about the National Union—

“The National Union said to the Opposition, ‘Not one brass farthing until you take your orders from us,’ and the Opposition surrendered and sold themselves to the clutching hand of hungry exploitation.”

The hon. member for Windsor was so disgusted with those tactics that he absolutely refused to have anything to do with them. This is what he said—

“At the Greater Brisbane elections Mr. King, as leader of the party, handed out funds for certain candidates on behalf of the National Union. This alliance will take control of politics from the hands of the electors and place it in the grasp of the National Union.”

Mr. Shipley, chairman of the Southern Division of the United party, said—

“The Opposition is now at the mercy of the outside and self-interested control of the National Union.”

On the 18th May, the "Courier" in a leading article dealt with the statement which Mr. Corser, the Opposition whip, had made at Maryborough—

"Mr. Corser, Opposition whip, has been interviewed by the Maryborough 'Chronicle,' and stated—

"The "Courier" would create the impression that the National Union was comprised of a few self-interested individuals. That might or might not have been the case in the past, but the Country party has now secured eight of its supporters representation on the National Union."

Mr. CORSER: Not now.

Mr. PEASE: Fancy! What are eight of their supporters going to do with the secret little body of rich men?

Mr. CORSER: You have misquoted that statement.

Mr. PEASE: I am quoting the "Courier's" statement—

"If Mr. Corser is correctly reported, then our contention that the new party is backed by the National Union is completely justified, and again reiterate 'The vested interests of Melbourne stand behind the National Union.'"

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in misquoting a statement attributed to me?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He is quoting the "Courier."

Mr. CORSER: He is misquoting the "Courier," and something more. It is a pretty nasty thing to have to say.

The SPEAKER: I am not aware whether the hon. member is misquoting or not. So long as the hon. member for Herbert is in order in the quotations he is making, the hon. member for Burnett will have the right to reply.

Mr. PEASE: I am quoting from the "Courier's" leading article, which says—

"The vested interests of Melbourne stand behind the National Union."

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member said a little while ago that it was my interjection.

Mr. PEASE: No, a quotation from the Maryborough "Chronicle."

Mr. CORSER: You did not quote it correctly.

Mr. PEASE: The "Courier" says again (16th May)—

"Mr. King's last statement is more definite in regard to the control by the National Union than the previous announcement signed by himself and Mr. Moore."

Senator Thompson quite frankly stated publicly in the "Courier" of 15th May—

"The Country party is non-existent in Queensland. The existing organisation which controls the anti-Labour forces—State and Federal—consists of Federal and State parliamentarians, Q.W.E.L., and the National Union."

Mr. CORSER: You know my statements had nothing to do with that—

Mr. PEASE: History repeats itself. The Brisbane "Courier" of 13th September, 1873, stated—

"A squatters' league has been formed, having its head office in George street,

Brisbane. The object of the league was described to us to be the return of men pledged to support the squatting interests. It was felt that, unless the larger centres can be bamboozled or bribed into returning supporters of the present Government the Liberal cause must triumph."

I want to point out, also, that Mr. Shipley, as reported in the "Courier" of 28th July, said—

"The Opposition now tell us that the National Union is not behind them. If that is the case, where are they getting their funds? It is evident they have pawned themselves to the National Union."

[11.30 a.m.]

This Government are not afraid to go to the people, and I am quite satisfied that, when we do go, the people are not going to sell the soul of Queensland for the money interest in Melbourne.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*): It is a great pity that so much of the time of the House has been taken up in the discussion of matters which do not affect Queensland very much. (Government laughter.) It may be all very well for a few political aspirants to indulge in such talk, but so far as Queensland is concerned it is of no value at all. We all know perfectly well that we have been defeated on two or three occasions, but it is only fair to say that, although members of this party are on the Opposition side of the House, since we were first beaten there has been a redistribution of seats, and, although we represent a smaller number of seats, still we represent 14,000 votes more than hon. members opposite. That is the conclusion to be drawn from the last election, and in the election before that the position was even worse, because, although we were in a minority inside the Chamber, we represented 20,000 votes more than members who occupied the Government benches. That is a nice state of affairs in a democracy such as Queensland. Then again, when we are talking of elections, we must remember that the Greater Brisbane scheme came into operation not long ago, and the elections under it took place quite recently, with the result that in the whole of the metropolitan area the Labour representation was wiped out with the exception of six seats. In other words, fourteen aldermen out of a total of twenty were elected in opposition to the Labour policy.

The hon. member who has just resumed his seat has spoken a great deal about unemployment, and before I sit down I am going to give figures to show that it is greater now than previously, owing to the dolos given out by the present Government. In considering this question you have to remember that the unemployment contributions deducted from wages make the average wage considerably lower than it otherwise would be. Taxation was also mentioned by the hon. member, but he only mentioned the Commonwealth in his comparison with State finances. How he can compare the administration of Queensland with that of the Commonwealth I fail to understand. Why not take Victoria or New South Wales and make a comparison with a State whose duties are similar—and, what is more, whose expenditures are on similar objects or of the same kind? I propose to

Mr. Walker.]

give some comparisons to show that we are a heavily taxed State, although one would not mind that so much if we knew that the money was being wisely spent. I shall also prove that there is a waste of money which could be spent more profitably in providing work for the unemployed. On more than one occasion the prosperity of Brisbane and of the big cities has been referred to as the prosperity of Queensland. That is a great mistake. The prosperity of any country is best to be gauged by the prosperity of the rural districts, and, if the expenditure of the Government were of a remunerative or reproductive character, we would see all our agricultural and other primary industries prospering. I shall give more definite information on this point as I go along, because I want to reply to the hon. member for Herbert. Certainly all these big buildings which one sees in Brisbane indicate prosperity in Brisbane, but they do not indicate much more, because they are almost exclusively offices—finely equipped, no doubt, but occupied by people who are making their living as commission agents or income tax agents, and in similar lines of industry. We do not, on the other hand, see any secondary industries or large distributing centres such as we see in other portions of Australia to-day. Take Victoria. The manufacturing industries there are right out ahead of us, even taking into consideration our population.

The hon. gentleman referred to the National Union, and quoted certain statements from a newspaper. That is the opinion of the "Brisbane Courier," and those who manage the paper have the right to put that opinion in the paper because they own it. But that does not say that it is true. I have been a member of this House for 18 years, and I have never received anything from any fund, and I believe that can be said of other hon. members on this side. But in any case, what is the difference between getting funds from Victoria or anywhere else, and getting them from unionists who are conscripted for the money? The worker has no say as to whether he shall subscribe to those funds. He simply has to put in his money, and that is the end of it. No ice is cut by making any reference to the question of party funds, and it is a pity that it has cropped up in the debate at all, for it brings about a controversy which is not in the best interests of Queensland.

I was particularly pleased with His Excellency's Speech—not with what was in it, but with the nice language which the Governor used in his kindly reference to his experiences in this State. His Excellency has taken a wonderful amount of interest in the activities of this State and has taken great interest in industries that are not popular with politicians. He has taken great interest in forestry, and has devoted a good deal of time to visiting the various centres, and it was left to His Excellency to help make forestry a success in Queensland. That work could not have been accomplished so well by others, because here was no political kudos attached to it. I know perfectly well that when the Governor leaves Queensland he will carry with him the good wishes of every person here, and I am of the opinion that it would be the present Government to arrange with His Excellency to act in an honorary capacity in attending to the question of the

[Mr. Walker.

marketing of our products on the other side of the world. That is a matter that has not been given any attention by this Government.

Both the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply are well known to me, and the language used by them in their speeches proves conclusively that, if they are not hampered or contaminated by the methods adopted from time to time in the inner rooms of the Government, they will be very excellent members and an asset to the State. Unfortunately, when there is a difference of opinion, something drastic must happen. When the late Premier, Mr. Theodore, came back after negotiating the big conversion loan in the old country he had to quit for reasons best known to the majority of his party. It is a deplorable state of affairs to think that a man of experience who has done excellent work in Queensland should have to lay down the political pick and shovel and transfer his energies somewhere else simply because of a quarrel on the opposite side of the House.

We also know that there are certain serious omissions from His Excellency's Speech. We find that the great boom from a political point of view will be the Childhood Endowment Bill. We know that Bill is put forward—probably with the best intentions by some—so that the Government may be successful at the next election.

MR. WRIGHT: What is wrong with the scheme?

MR. WALKER: There might be a good deal in the question of childhood endowment, but the important thing is: How is it going to be worked, who is going to pay the endowment; is it going to be paid direct to the mothers, and is the money going to be raised by a direct tax on one section of the community? Until I see the Bill I cannot reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Bulimba. Seeing that in Queensland the people have been given benefits in the way of shorter hours and increased wages, it is really a good thing that the mothers will be in a position to receive some financial assistance, paid direct to them, to be spent in the comfort of their children, and not on the racecourses, where many of the big salaries are spent at the present time.

I expected to see in His Excellency's Speech some reference in regard to co-operation on the part of Federal and State Governments with respect to the overseas marketing of our products. I find nothing there except some slight reference with regard to greater research work to be carried out during the coming year, which matter has been promised for the last 4 or 5 years, but has not yet been carried out.

Then we come to the question of main roads. We find that main roads in Queensland have not altogether been the success they were expected to be on account of the expenditure in making them. We have only to take the position in Victoria, where they have a vast amount of settlement—a settlement much closer than we have in Queensland, and a settlement which can stand an enormous taxation in comparison with Queensland. The people have been wriggling away from their obligations to such an extent that the Government of that State have been compelled to maintain and control the four great highways of the State because

the people could not stand the expenditure on them. We find to-day that heavy expenses have been caused by the creation of benefited areas for main roads. When we take into consideration the fact that some of these main roads are costing £6,000 to £12,000 per mile to construct, it is little wonder that they are imposing a heavy burden on the primary producer.

We also find that very little is being done with regard to economy. The same old word "economy" is used in the Governor's Speech, but nothing has been done in any shape or form to economise. We find the same lavish expenditure by the Administration and by the various men who go away from time to time. I wish to deal briefly with finance to show what I really mean and why economy should be practised. In 1914-15 the expenditure was £7,199,399, and in 1923-24 it was £13,415,332. In 1914-15 the expenditure per head was £10 12s. 6d., whilst in 1923-24 it was £16 11s. 1d., or an increase of £5 8s. 3d. What special privileges are we getting with regard to the administration of the various departments at the present time for this increase in taxation, and where is this expenditure going? It is going in many forms which I will refer to later on to show that we are not getting a fair deal, and I will show that the word "economy" is not being used in the sense it should. In 1914-15 the total taxation revenue was £954,457, or equal to £1 8s. 2d. per head, while in 1923-24 it was £3,617,201, or equal to £4 9s. 2d. per head. Then we are expected to compete with the Southern States in manufactures, or, in other words, secondary industries! It is impossible under the circumstances to do so. We have only to look at the boot industry to-day in that respect. Queensland, I suppose, is supplying 90 per cent. of the hides used in the boot industry, still the greater proportion of the boots used in Queensland is imported from Victoria at the expense of Queensland industries.

If we look at the deficits we find that the net deficits during the nine years of office of the present Government amount to £1,124,341 as compared with accumulated surpluses of £576,076 during the previous nine years, when an anti-Labour Government was in power. Those figures prove the wise administration of the hon. member for Wynnum. In Queensland to-day money is borrowed repeatedly, and a large amount of loan money is going to make up the deficits from time to time. At one time hon. members opposite said that the Government had no right to borrow except for reproductive work, but now we find them even using loan money to make up the deficits.

Mr. PEASE: The greater number of requests for the expenditure of loan money is received from members of the Opposition.

Mr. WALKER: Of course, hon. members on this side have a right to ask for the expenditure of loan money for reproductive work. That is the policy which we enunciate. It was a policy introduced by the former Government and continued by the present régime, who, as I say, are also using it for the wiping off of deficits. The expenditure per head of population is now £16 16s. 9d., against £10 12s. 9d. in 1914-15. That shows an increase in the total indebtedness of the State of over 60 per cent.

I now come to the State Enterprises, of which we have heard so much. We are always opposed to them, although I personally believe in State insurance, for the success of which I give the Government all the credit they deserve. In everything else the Government have been entirely wrong. I really expected that the Minister in charge of State Enterprises would have made some reference in the Governor's Speech to the effect that something was going to be done to discontinue this fad—this expensive method of doing business—and to clean up the whole of our State enterprises.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: You should be the last to condemn collective enterprises.

Mr. WALKER: I am a great believer in the co-operative principle, which we have carried out so successfully, but further than that I will not go. It is remarkable that these enterprises should be continued in face of the bad balances they repeatedly produce. There should be some rectification, and not a perpetuation, of the trouble whereby some £800,000 was lost during the past twelve months. Those losses come out of the Loan Fund, and are not met out of revenue. That is where the evil takes place. We are passing on an evil which will never be overcome, and are placing on the backs of our successors in Queensland an enormous burden. We are not going to show for that expenditure efficient railways, magnificent harbour works, and valuable State buildings, but a debt of £800,000, in addition to other great indebtednesses which have been incurred.

For the period 1923-24 the State Trade Department showed a loss of £85,691, while the State's accumulated loss was a big one. That accumulated loss was increased to £723,796, while the increased indebtedness to the Treasury was £69,339. The total indebtedness of the department was raised to £2,284,091.

That would have built many miles of railways if it had been used judiciously, but we find all the railways which have been built recently have been constructed in the North. That may have been a good policy, but, when we could show good investments in the matter of building railways in other parts of the State, those schemes were jettisoned. We also have the following losses on our State cattle enterprises—

	£
Loss on cattle stations ...	101,971
Revenue from sales of cattle	101,034
Working expenses of cattle stations ...	212,234

For the same year the State Cannery showed a loss of £9,513, and for the last two years £25,363. At 30th June, 1924, the accumulated loss on the State Cannery was £63,477, and the cannery owed the Treasury £160,469.

Dealing with the fish question—which is a very important one—we had these losses—

	£
Loss on State trawler ...	65,000
Loss on State Fish Enterprise	3,922
Accumulated losses to 30th June, 1924 ...	39,718

Then we come to the question of State mines, which have lost £534,149, making a grand total loss on our State enterprises of £1,681,759. Not counting the accumulated loss of £11,475,550 on our railways over nine

Mr. Walker.]

year, we have lost an enormous amount of money in State enterprises. There may be some excuse with regard to some of the expenditure on our railways, on account of having to send trains long distances into the country; but, when we see our metropolitan train area run at a loss, it proves that something is wrong. Where we have a big concentration of people and everything calculated to give a profit, we certainly should not have these continued losses in the metropolitan area. The losses for the year on State railways amount to £4,364 11s. a day. It is time for the Minister in charge of State Enterprises to open his eyes, and for the Government to see if they cannot rectify these big losses which are taking place yearly.

A good deal may be said about the State meat shops showing a profit. I am quoting all these figures from the Auditor-General's report in order to show that there is no mistake. In 1922-23 the State meat shops showed a profit of £11,024. Then we find, on turning to the Auditor-General's report, that cattle were sold to these shops for £3 13s. 3d. per head from the State stations, while the same class of cattle was sold to the outside butcher at £7 11s. 9d. per head. You can clearly understand that, if you are going to make a profit under conditions like that, you are going to involve the taxpayers in Queensland in an enormous expenditure. In other words, you will have to wipe out some more money through a sinking fund or write it down in the course of a year or two. The total amount written down last year was £808,828. That money has gone for ever, because it is loan money. Some people may be under the impression that it is not lost because it came out of the general taxpayer; but it has gone for ever, and we have nothing to show for it. Country members repeatedly are asking the Government to build railways where we can show something in return. Build us a railway into the Mary Valley, and we will settle 500 soldiers there to-morrow on land which is at present only growing a few sticks.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: That line is showing a loss at the present time.

Mr. WALKER: Every railway at the present time is showing a loss. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that if the Mary Valley Railway were credited with the increase in the value of the timber which was created by that railway, it would be one of the best railways that the department has to-day. We are running trains there very successfully and indirectly giving the Treasurer a lot of money.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There are some railway sections in Queensland that are paying.

Mr. WALKER: The North Coast Railway is about the only one that is paying to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The railway line running to Cairns is paying.

Mr. WALKER: It is paying, no doubt, because the sugar season is on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It has been paying for quite a number of years.

Mr. WALKER: With all these State enterprises we are getting an army of public servants about us. The wages paid to that army of public servants last year amounted to £7,442,440—almost as great an amount as the wages paid to employees in

the whole of our secondary industries in Queensland, who received last year a sum of £7,447,959. That shows how the higher taxation in Queensland is keeping back secondary industries.

I heard one hon. member speak of unemployment in Queensland. What is the position to-day? Unemployed relief rose from £7,092 in 1914 to £177,019 in 1922. During the last two years, in addition to the amount received in relief direct from the Treasurer, we have to take into account the amount paid from the Unemployment Insurance Fund. In the nine years prior to 1914 the amount paid in outdoor relief amounted to £59,708, and for the nine years ended 1924 the amount paid in outdoor relief was £554,813. This all proves conclusively that unemployment is more rampant than ever, and there is no mention in the Governor's Speech as to how they are to be absorbed. A man cannot go down the street without being stopped by an old schoolmate or a working mate and being asked, "Can you get us a job?" You can only give them temporary relief, as there is no work offering for them. If the Government wiped out everything else in the Governor's Speech and provided some method of finding employment to-day on good conditions, they would do far better than by carrying out the policy foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What would you do?

Mr. WALKER: The chances are that, after the next elections, we will give you a chance of seeing what we will do. In the face of this unemployment we find that unwarranted enormous expenditure is continuing to take place. We know that Ministers are not overpaid if they receive only their ordinary salaries, but we find that their expenditure in some cases more than exceeds their salaries. They are getting a double "whack." Why should that be? With all this unemployment they could surely sacrifice a certain amount of their travelling and other unforeseen expenses. Let me quote with regard to travelling expenses. Mr. Brennan last year got £872, the Secretary for Mines £870, and, in addition to that, he had a trip to the old country, which cost a considerable sum. Where is the hon. gentleman's report in regard to the Imperial Conference last year? Then the Home Secretary spent £719; Hon. J. Huxham £531; the Attorney-General £466; the Secretary for Public Lands £422; and the present Secretary for Agriculture £414. That is an enormous amount.

Mr. PEASE: One Federal Minister spent more than that.

Mr. WALKER: That shows that he ought to be dealt with as we want to deal with our Ministers here. No Minister should receive such an enormous amount of money in travelling expenses when there is so much unemployment. Then the Agent-General spent £1,128 in motor-car expenses in the old country—an average of £3 per day. The expenses of Mr. Hunter in going over to the old country were £2,413 in addition to the salary and travelling allowances he received while over there. Then there are other expenses regarding Mr. Fihelly's appointment—a banquet at Parliament House, £33 15s.; motor cars and refreshments, £91 3s. 2d.; travelling expenses and allowances, £1,131; and additional allowances,

[Mr. Walker.

£478; or a total of £1,726. Then we have Mr. Theodore's unsuccessful trip, which cost £4,443. I do not like paying money for a trip that was a failure, as the money goes for nothing; but the work he did last year in connection with the negotiations for the loans was well done for Queensland. I think he is one of the few men in Queensland who could do that work. He got into hot water with his party, and it was practically on account of that visit that he was cast out of the party. He worked solidly for a fortnight, and held the whole of those men in London at bay while negotiating. No man on earth could have made better terms than the Premier of Queensland did. I congratulate him. I was there, and mixed with the people to a certain extent. He did excellent work, and the passing out of a man because he made the best deal possible was an unwarranted attack on a Premier who was doing the best he could for Queensland.

Let us deal with land selection. The area of land selected by 5,310 selectors during the nine years of the régime of the Liberal party was 6,597,460 acres. In the nine years ending 1923 during the present Government's régime there were 2,478 selectors, who selected 2,471,000 acres, or about a-third of the selection for the same length of time under our Government. After all the experience we have had in the past we are not settling people on the land as we should do. That is the drawback in Queensland to-day—that we are not settling more people on the land and producing more than we are doing. I was interested to see that the sympathies of the hon. member for Toowoomba are with the man on the land. He spoke about the 5s. 6d. per bushel which the wheatgrowers were getting, but he never said anything about the 6d. a loaf which the people are paying for bread to-day, although the Government's cry before they got into power was about the dear bread the people had under our Government.

When I was in the old country I was struck with the absence of marketing facilities, which I will deal with later on. I wish to point out the heavy taxation and high cost of production in Queensland. Under Labour rule 30,000 acres of land have gone out of use in the State. In 1923 Queensland had one-seventh of the population of Australia, and only one-twentieth of the acreage of land under cultivation.

Now, take the production of cotton. We have enormous losses through the sale in that industry, for the simple [12 noon] reason that we have to take into consideration the competition of other countries. We find that it has to be fed to the extent of £120,388, which is borne by the State and Commonwealth Governments. Surely to goodness when we have to deal with a commodity like that we have to admit that we are not successful, and we have to make another effort.

Then again, we have the beef producing industry, for which we have had to give in Federal bounties a sum of £119,515 during the last few years—showing that we are running that industry also at a loss. Then we have over-production in butter—also at a loss. Then we have the banana question to deal with. In the banana industry we are almost over-producing, so that obviously we must get other markets outside Australia.

If it were not for the wool which we are sending away our export trade balance would look particularly bad. We have to remember in dealing with export trade, when we produce anything over and above what will fill the requirements of Australia, we are almost always carrying on at a loss. Members of the other side say that we are to go in for heavy research work to see if we cannot get better methods of dealing with these problems. We shall have to come forward, we are told, with some more economical methods of production in these industries if we are to compete with other countries in the great markets of the world, remembering that those countries in some cases are paying only from 2s. to 10s. a day for their labour, whereas we pay at least 50 per cent. higher. That alone proves conclusively the difficulty of the problem we have to deal with. There are many things which we could produce for export, and Senator Wilson has done marvellous work in finding markets for some of our commodities, but in Queensland we are bound to have a big loss in production unless we can get markets for the articles I refer to in which we can compete successfully. Take the great banana-growing industry. There is nothing to prevent us from competing with the Fiji banana even in New Zealand, if we had steamers running across there such as they have to run bananas from the Canary Islands to England, where you can buy them more cheaply than in Victoria and certainly better got up.

But we find that very little sympathy is given to Queensland producers in these lines. The only thing we get from hon. members opposite is a great deal of talk regarding the number of votes the Opposition received at an election, or a lot of talk about where the Nationalists get their funds. When we compare the wages paid in our industries here with those paid in other countries with which we have to compete, we can come to no other conclusion than that we are doing remarkably well.

A great deal has been said recently with regard to the influx of Italians from the Old World, and we have organisers going about talking about the "Dago" coming to Queensland. The reason why he is here to-day is that Northern Queensland is more attractive than his own country, and that fact has been extensively advertised by his own countrymen who came here previously. In letters they have pointed out the upheavals of an unwarranted character which have occurred in the sugar industry, with the result that these men have come forward, and they are going to kill the troubles by thrifty methods and good workmanship. We know that strikes have taken place; we know that farmers' cane has been burnt. Nevertheless, although so much has been said about the matter, the figures show that in the first four months of this year 27,781 Britishers came to Australia and only 2,920 Italians.

Those figures show conclusively that we have a lot of British people coming out, and we have nothing to fear from the few Italians, more particularly as they are very fine workers.

In Queensland in 1923, there were 1,912 factories employing 44,948 hands, whereas in South Australia there were 1,698 factories employing 27,275 hands. In South Australia in five years there was an increase

*Mr. Walker.* }

of 385 factories employing 9,360 hands, and in Queensland 134 factories employing 3,958 hands. South Australia has 300,000 fewer people than Queensland's 840,000, and South Australia is a poorer State.

Those figures show that we are not moving along in the way that we would like to do.

Something has been said with regard to the Council of Agriculture. Recently we have had a very big court case in connection with fruit marketing. It is a deplorable thing to see the cost of that litigation having to be borne by the producers of the State. When the late Premier was in England he addressed the Empire Parliamentary Association at the House of Commons, and he distinctly stated that the Queensland Government had inaugurated a vast agricultural scheme based on co-operative methods. What do we find to-day? We find that the vindictiveness of some who are in power extends to such a degree that they are prepared to experiment at a cost of thousands of pounds, which must ultimately be borne by the producers of Queensland, particularly those concerned with fruit. It is a shocking state of affairs to find men who have had no commercial training endeavouring to compete with commercial men who have studied the whole question of the marketing of products. When we commenced the butter industry in Queensland on co-operative lines we started on sound business-like lines: the Government did not enter into competition with private concerns. Those who believed in co-operation could send their product to co-operative factories, and those who did not adopt the system could send it elsewhere, with the result that we had healthy competition. It is very hard to say which system is the best, but personally I am a co-operative man because I believe in the principle. In Queensland, in the fruit industry, we have men who have invested their accumulated savings in legitimate businesses, and they are being completely wiped out by one stroke of the pen, and in the meantime the farmer has to pay for the resultant litigation. If the Council of Agriculture wants to do the correct thing, it will take a vote of every banana-grower in Queensland to ascertain whether his products shall go to a particular room. We do not want the Council interfering with the farmer. He has just as much sense as the man in the town as to how his products should be marketed, although he may not have the same business training. He is a level-headed hard-working man, and he is not going to throw his money away. Leave the producers alone and keep the agitators completely out. Quite recently we had organisers going round Queensland stressing the benefits of a butter pool to such an extent that it really amounted to beating down those who did not believe in it. These men were really hired men who were paid for by the farmers through the various local producers' associations. Whether the farmer wins or loses in these matters, he has to pay.

The butter and other industries of Queensland should be organised on a commodity basis, and those engaged in the industry should be allowed to vote for pools, if they are effective. Some men are dabbling in half a dozen small occupations, and they have a vote for each section. The industries

[*Mr. Walker.*

should be organised on a commodity basis so that the man producing the greatest amount will have the greatest voting power.

Let me give some idea of the total cost of the Council of Agriculture. The total cost of that body to-day is £75,000. My figures are taken from the report of the Auditor-General. The cost of its administration for the year ended 30th June, 1924, was £11,763 0s. 2d. The fees paid to members of the Council totalled £1,267 2s. 6d. The amount of travelling expenses amounted to £1,003 4s. 4d., and members' rail fares £1,069 10s. 3d., making a total of £3,339 17s. 1d. The total cost of the District Councils was £3,305 16s. 4d., of which members' fees and travelling expenses amounted to £3,045 18s. 3d.; agents' and field representatives' salaries and expenses, £7,781 19s. 3d.; honorarium to the secretary, £994 19s. 1d.; and elections and postage, £582 19s. 9d.

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

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): As Chairman of Committees, I have to take every opportunity to make a speech, and I propose, of course, taking advantage of the present opportunity to address the House.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*): Mr. Speaker, it may be an unusual request to make, but I would ask for an extension of time in order to complete a few of my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. member for Gregory has the floor.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I do not know how I can give way to the hon. member for Cooroora. If I could, I would be quite willing to do so, but having commenced to make my speech I take it he is out of court.

The SPEAKER: The request was not moved by another hon. member.

Mr. POLLOCK: One portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Cooroora which astounded me was that in which he made reference to the alleged passing out of the hon. member for Chillagoe from the Premiership by the Labour party. Every hon. member knows that that is incorrect.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member can tell you that himself.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Cooroora is not telling the truth when he says that the hon. member for Chillagoe will say that himself. The Secretary for Public Lands reminds me that the hon. member for Chillagoe had decided to enter Federal politics before the financial arrangements in London were completed. Speaking for myself, and I believe speaking for the whole of the Labour party, the hon. member for Chillagoe could be Premier to-day if he chose. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to put into words my feelings with regard to the hon. member for Chillagoe.

Mr. CORSER: You give us his feelings.

Mr. POLLOCK: I had known the hon. member for Chillagoe for a great many years before I came to Parliament and since that time, and I know of no man who has captured my imagination as he has. I could safely say that no man in the last six or seven years of Queensland's history has so captured the affection and respect of the public

of Queensland as has the hon. member for Chillagoe.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: Some of the unions love him.

Mr. POLLOCK: I hope that the departure of the hon. member for Chillagoe from politics in Queensland is going to mean his elevation into the Commonwealth Labour Ministry after the coming Federal election.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: Didn't the hon. member for Bowen beat him?

Mr. POLLOCK: Nothing that the disorganised body opposite can say would have any effect on the reputation the hon. member for Chillagoe has earned as a wise and sane administrator. Every man who knows the hon. member for Chillagoe knows sufficient about him to form his own opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why did you help to kick him out?

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member's interjection provides its own answer. Nothing that the disorganised rabble opposite can say about him can have any effect. I was astounded that the hon. member for Cooroora should have taken so much trouble to show that there were large numbers of unemployed in Queensland and yet support a Government—because the Country Progressive party does support the Bruce Government—which has provided for the immigration into Queensland of quite a large number of unskilled labourers. The question of immigration is one of the most important questions in Queensland to-day, because with it is inseparably bound up the question of unemployment. Everybody knows that for the last twelve or eighteen months there has been a veritable deluge of aliens into Queensland. No effort had been made by the Federal Government, which has complete control over all immigration, to check that flow.

Mr. BRAND: Yes, there has.

Mr. POLLOCK: Not until the Queensland Labour Government entered its very vigorous protest against these aliens being allowed to land here indiscriminately and in such large numbers.

Mr. BRAND: When did they do that?

Mr. POLLOCK: On at least three occasions.

Mr. BRAND: When was the first occasion?

Mr. POLLOCK: When it was found that these immigrants were arriving here in unnecessarily large numbers.

Mr. BRAND: It was not until April last.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member knows you cannot deal with a problem of that kind until it arises. I ask the hon. member, "How could the Queensland Government know what immigrants were coming to Queensland until they had some indication either by their arrival here or from some accredited source that they were to arrive?"

Mr. BRAND: Your Government have supported Italian immigration.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Chillagoe does.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Chillagoe can speak for himself. I propose to express my own views on the question, and I hope hon. members opposite will

listen to those views. Perhaps those views will do hon. members opposite good. Alien arrivals into Queensland have been abnormal. Mr. Ferry was appointed a Royal Commission by this Government for the purpose of inquiring into the number of arrivals and into the whole question of alien immigration into North Queensland generally. On page 6 of his report he says—

"The Commonwealth Publicity Department advises that the number of Italian and Greek immigrants to Australia during the thirty years prior to 1901 averaged 150 per annum, and that at 30th November last this rate had increased to 6,854 per annum. There has since been a still greater annual increase. The figures show that during the three and a-half years ended March, 1925, the immigration to Australia of Italians and Greeks has been greater than at any period during the last forty years."

He goes on to say that the average number of arrivals per month during the eight months indicated was about 933, or at the rate of 11,256 per annum.

Of these quite a large number have come to Queensland, principally to North Queensland to the sugar districts. It is very difficult to secure an accurate estimate of the number who have gone to North Queensland, because the Railway Department has kept trace only of those who went there in train loads. Parties of a dozen could go along and no notice would be taken of them. The figures supplied by the Railway Department do show that in January, February, March, and April of this year 1,654 alien immigrants left Brisbane for North Queensland. During January, February, and March of this year, although the surplus of arrivals over departures into Australia was only 668, during the same period over 1,300 aliens left Brisbane for North Queensland. That shows that, no matter when they come to Australia, they gradually get into North Queensland, and naturally the question arises as to how these people are going to be absorbed. It is a question that one cannot treat with levity. The Queensland Government made representations to the Commonwealth Government, and all that they received in reply from Senator Pearce was a flippant allusion to the fact that Queensland had said it wanted population, and he was seeing that we got it. I have different views to those of Senator Pearce; perhaps I have different views to those of some members of my own party and some members of the present Cabinet, but I propose to state those views here this morning. I think that we do want population, but I have no doubt whatever that we do not need unskilled labour in Queensland. Ninety-five per cent., at the very least, of these new arrivals are unskilled labourers, and all that we are getting by this type of immigration is the importation of thousands of men to this State to take the place of Queenslanders who have worked and built up decent conditions here. If people were to say that we wanted population and immigration of the right kind, it would be a different matter; but to say that we need immigration and to leave it at that is unfair. Statements of that kind need qualifying. We need, it is true, men who have the necessary money behind them to take up farms and to prove successful on those farms. We need a large number of

*Mr. Pollock.*]

skilled artisans of various kinds—men who cannot be trained in Queensland in some instances. Both the farmers and these skilled artisans in their turn create employment for others. Probably one skilled artisan of the right type may provide employment for half a dozen, and indirectly a dozen other men, and consequently that kind of immigration can be absorbed. But to land here in Queensland thousands of unskilled labourers, whose sole qualification is that they have £40 on landing here, is absurd. A man who lands in Queensland with £40, and who is unemployed, is practically on the bread line. I consider that any man who has not £100, and is unemployed, is very nearly broke. That does not apply only to Queensland, but to every other State. The Department of Public Lands recognises, and very wisely recognises, that the best type of prospective farmer is the man who has £300 or £400, or at any rate sufficient to enable him to go on the land and carry out some improvements, and to weather a siege without being forced to apply to the Government for relief or get assistance from the Agricultural Bank. He is undoubtedly the best type of settler, yet these men come here with £40 only in their pockets. Now, they are not taking up land. In most cases the better class of Italian immigrants who are arriving are not taking up land. Most of them have bought land from somebody else. They have started nothing new; they have not taken up land of their own and developed it; they have bought—according to Mr. Ferry's figures—mostly improved farms. What does that mean? Merely that they have taken the place of some Australian who was farming; that they have given employment probably to their own countrymen, and in turn it means that Queenslanders who have improved the conditions in the sugar industry have been pushed out into other industries where there is no room for them.

The question of unemployment is inseparably bound up with the question of immigration of unskilled labourers. The Opposition party, in its declaration of a new name for itself the other day, also said that it supported the Bruce Government. It is very queer to talk, as the hon. member for Cooroora did this morning, about our large unemployment problem and complain that we are not satisfactorily dealing with it, whilst at the same time he supports a Government that has added to that problem by importing men for whom we cannot find employment. There was an unemployment problem here before these men came.

Mr. MAXWELL: Did the State Government not agree to a certain number of these men coming?

Mr. POLLOCK: The State Government was never consulted with regard to alien immigration and had no say whatever about it, and that is the objection I make. The hon. member—who says that he is a business man and who is always talking about the law of supply and demand, pointing out that it is as immutable as the laws of the Medes and Persians—should remember that he and his own party have admitted that we have a surplus of unemployed unskilled labourers. Their remedy for that state of affairs is to import more to add to that surplus. Would the hon. member for Wynnum, if the hon. member for Wynnum were a grower of potatoes and there was a glut of potatoes in

the market, send his in under those circumstances? When there is more wool on the market than there is a demand for, would the woolgrowers send more wool on the market? No. They would withhold supplies as they did the other day, and that is the only sensible thing to do where there is an unemployed problem such as we have here to-day. We want to get immigrants who in their turn will create employment for others, but everybody knows that unskilled labourer cannot in any way help to solve the unemployed problem. I have no objection personally to the Italian. I believe that the Northern Italian farmer, from what I have read and heard of him from men who know his type very well, is a very good type of citizen to have, and we can place him in some districts, and in limited numbers, if he has capital or is of a certain type of skilled labour. This problem is not a racial problem at all; it is an economic question. The Northern Italian is no more unwelcome than a Britisher would be; but the problem we have to face is that we cannot place labourers, whether they be British, Italian, American, or Chinese; and the sooner we come to a realisation of the position the better it will be for all concerned. But there has been a less desirable class of immigrant coming into Queensland than the Italian, and that is the Maltese. Everybody knows that for years in this State an effort has been made to improve conditions for the working classes generally, and that improvement is one of which every Queenslanders can be proud; but the importation of this type of individual—the Maltese—no discrimination is being shown when they are brought here—has resulted in what I consider to be a very great danger to the conditions that have been made by the Queensland worker. Mr. Ferry, in his report on the question of the influx of aliens into the State, says—

"I inspected a Maltese lodging-house in Innisfail, and found about twenty men living in one room. Every room was crowded with bunks with just enough space between to enable the occupants to move about. The practice is to charge from 1s. to 2s. per night for a bed and the men obtain their food elsewhere. A number of places are occupied in a similar way by Greeks."

It is obvious to me that the conditions which have been built up in Queensland are endangered by the importation of that sort of person. There is no shadow of doubt that, if it had been persisted in, [12.30 p.m.] and if the Queensland Government had not sounded the first note of warning, the result would have been serious. Not only are these people brought here in large numbers, but, furthermore, no provision appears to have been made for proper supervision of their importation. Mr. Ferry says—

"The report issued by the Maltese Government contains the following under the heading 'Appendix E. Conditions of Entry into various Countries':—

*Australia.*

(11) Domiciled Persons;

(c) Age is no ban to their re-entry into Australia;

(d) They are admitted unconditionally even when suffering from some form of disease.

So that migrants that Canada will not

[Mr. Pollock.

admit at all are accepted by Australia and on re-entry whether aged or diseased, and the fact is advertised by the Maltese Government."

That is a state of affairs which should not exist. In the absence of supervision right from the very start one can only come to the conclusion that the importation of such large numbers of men without supervision has been a deliberate blow aimed by the Bruce Government at the conditions of Queensland workers. It is a hard thing to have to say of any Government that it would stoop so low as to do a thing of that kind, but I can see nothing but that in the whole scheme.

There is another phase of this question which is perhaps worth considering. I refer to the question of what the present Commonwealth Government propose to do in the future in regard to the matter. The Premier has taken the matter up, but the only satisfaction he was able to obtain from Mr. Bruce was a statement that, firstly, more supervision is to be exercised over the immigration of these persons, and, secondly, that those who are being imported will have to be vouched for by somebody who is a land-owner in this country. Apropos of this question Mr. Ferry says—

"The Commonwealth Government advises that there is an understanding with the Italian Government that passports to Australia shall not be granted to any Italian immigrant unless he is nominated by a resident of Australia who is prepared to look after him on arrival here or unless he will have on arrival at least £40 capital.

"Signor Renato Melano, Italian Consular Agent at Townsville, states that Italian immigrants to be able to obtain a passport for Australia must be nominated by a resident of the Commonwealth, who undertakes, and is bound by a statutory declaration, to find them work, to provide for their needs, to pay for medical attention when sick, and generally to see that the persons he has called will not be any burden whatever to any charitable or benevolent institution.

"However, the evidence shows that this undertaking, called an 'Atto di Chiamata,' or 'Act of Call,' is quite useless in its present form. The declaration may be made, and has been made, by persons in Australia who are not themselves in employment and have little prospects of obtaining work. It is forwarded to the nominee in Italy, who must present it to the Italian authorities in order to obtain his passport. The document then remains in Italy.

"If the only object of this 'Act of Call' was to ensure that the nominee would not become a charge upon the State, the statement that it is useless and incapable of enforcement might be answered by the reply that, as a matter of fact, no recent Italian immigrant has been a charge upon the State, so there never has been any need to enforce these undertakings. However, the declaration reads—

I wish to come as soon as possible to join me in Australia, and I declare that I am perfectly able to supply for his means," etc.

Mr. Ferry goes on to say—

"An immigrant arriving in response to a genuine 'Act of Call' would, in most cases, be coming to disinterested friends or relatives, but it is obvious that owing to lack of inquiry and responsibility in regard to the undertaking the form may be used for purely selfish interests. A person anxious to obtain his passport is willing to pay for this form, and apparently others are willing to trade in it. An Italian farmer stated in evidence that a number of applications had been filled in and sold in Italy for £1 each. Further, much of the sworn evidence of Italians shows that many of the new arrivals here are admitted to the Commonwealth without this 'Act of Call.'"

On this question a successful Italian farmer at Ingham in his evidence states—

"I think there is something wrong with the present system. Young men come here, and after they have been here two or three months, although they do not understand the conditions, they send home for friends although they themselves have no work to do. That should be stopped, and only men who understand exactly the conditions and can foresee whether there will be employment or not for the new arrivals, and who are prepared to foot the bill if there is no employment, should be allowed to nominate others."

Mr. Ferry has put my views on this question in concrete form. He is perhaps much more qualified than I am to form an opinion as to the method of immigration and the number of arrivals. I am sure that every hon. member realises the danger that will follow if this thing is allowed to go on. Everything that I have had to say this morning has been more in the nature of a warning that there must be a limit to this type of immigration. The hon. member for Mirani has put out what he considered to be a solution of this problem. Apparently his idea was to induce the Queensland Government to utilise the provisions of an Act passed in 1913 providing for the imposition of a dictation test upon all aliens. The dictation test might have been, in his opinion, a very good way of getting out of a very nasty difficulty, or he might have adopted it as a method of throwing the onus upon the Government; but, while the method of applying a dictation test to Italians and compelling employers to employ only those who can pass that test might be all very fine in its way, and while it might be the average politician's method to deal with the question in that way, it does not solve the problem. Under the 1913 Act it is provided that no alien can be employed in the sugar industry unless he is able to pass a dictation test imposed by the Minister. No man is allowed to hold a farm in a sugar district of Queensland unless he can pass the dictation test imposed by the Minister.

Hon. E. G. THEODORE: Unless he has been previously exempted.

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes, and all Italians and other Europeans were exempted by the Government that the hon. member for Mirani supported in 1913. It is a question whether the Courts would uphold the imposition of a dictation test on Italians. I believe that it would be a very grave

*Mr. Pollock.]*

evasion of treaty rights, and would be declared ultra vires by the higher courts. I am not anxious that the Government should deal with the matter by way of imposing a dictation test. After all, it is a paltry, miserable way of meeting the difficulty. These people are not responsible for coming to Queensland; no doubt they came in good faith. I blame the people who permitted them to come here.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member for Gregory should place the matter before the Australian Workers' Union.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am raising the question now. It is a matter that this Parliament sooner or later will have to deal with, and it is no use hiding behind it.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member should go to the Trades Hall and deliver a lecture there.

Mr. POLLOCK: The people who are responsible for importing these people are the Bruce Government and nobody else.

Mr. VOWLES: Is the hon. gentleman prepared to support an amendment of the existing law providing for a dictation test?

Mr. POLLOCK: It is not a question of whether I am prepared to do that or not. The hon. member for Mirani has circulated this proposal through every Northern newspaper. He says that the Government have power to do that, and if they want to deal with them, why should they not do so? That does not solve the problem. By those means you would only force these men into another industry. If 2,000 Australians entered Italy, they would expect to get a living; but linguistic difficulties would probably force them into the position of accepting a lower rate of wages than was existing in the country when they arrived there. The result would be chaos, as the conditions of persons engaged in industry would be lowered. That is what is occurring here at the present time. Under this Act the Minister could force any person to pass a dictation test in Greek.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They can put a test to them in Gaelic.

Mr. POLLOCK: We can even force them to submit to a dictation in Scotch. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Harry Lauder would be the only one to get through that test. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. POLLOCK: I have very little more to say on that point. Everyone realises the necessity of having a sane scheme of supervision of these immigrants, and the sooner the Bruce-Page Government consult this Government as to the number of immigrants they desire, as to their class and what capital they should possess when they come here, the better it will be for this State. While I agree that the Commonwealth Government are the right body to have control of immigration, I am just as satisfied that, unless immigration is properly controlled, it is far better to have none at all.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK: Unless some new industry is created in Queensland, then no new work is being created. The importation of men who are only capable of following employment at present held by somebody else is not to my mind any solution of the unemployment problem. It is merely giving the jobs that Australians should hold to aliens. I am surprised that the hon. member for

[Mr. Pollock.

Cooroora should charge this Government with the responsibility of the unemployment of our own people, when he and his party are responsible for the importation of these immigrants to add to it.

Mr. KING: The Hon. J. M. Hunter was responsible for them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am sorry that interjection was not made before my time was exhausted.

Mr. TAYLOR (Windsor): I was rather surprised to hear certain remarks made by the hon. member for Gregory. He stated that the Bruce-Page Government had entered into a plot to bring immigrants from the shores of the Mediterranean—from Italy in particular—in order to lower the standard of living that prevailed throughout Australia, and bring down the wages which were at present being paid to Australian workmen.

Mr. HYNES: That is the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is a most serious charge for an hon. member to make. No more serious charge could be made against any Government, whether it be the Bruce-Page Government or a Labour Government.

Mr. KING: It is electioneering.

Mr. TAYLOR: Unless the hon. member is prepared to back up his statements by actual facts and knowledge, he has no right to make them.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: He has given us no evidence in any shape or form to prove such a statement.

Mr. POLLOCK: What other construction can you place upon the fact?

Mr. TAYLOR: I certainly cannot conceive of a body of honourable men in the Federal Parliament—I do not care what party they represent—being guilty of such a thing. The hon. member knows perfectly well that if there were such a body of men in charge of Federal affairs in Australia to-day, they would get very short shrift from the people of Australia. The Australian people and the National Government of Australia do not stand for conditions anything like those which the hon. member outlined in his remarks.

Mr. POLLOCK: But they are responsible for them, none the less.

Mr. TAYLOR: It must not be forgotten that we now are part of the Commonwealth of Nations of the world. It is a very easy matter for an hon. member to rise and say that this and that should be done. It is not always easy to carry it into effect. By certain actions that we might take in this Parliament we might precipitate international relationships into consequences which might be more serious for Australia than, probably, the influx of a few thousand aliens.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Canada is doing it.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, and probably the hon. gentleman knows that the British Government are endeavouring to meet the position and to send a certain number of Britishers to this State.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Previous Governments supported by the hon. member proposed to eliminate aliens by a dictation test.

Mr. TAYLOR: I have no time for a dictation test. I do not care whether a man can read or write if he is a straight man and

has a few pounds. Such a man should be allowed in whether he can write Greek, French, or anything else.

Mr. VOWLES: You like the money.

Mr. TAYLOR: I certainly think such a man would prove a desirable citizen in Australia. The hon. member for Gregory also spoke about unskilled labour coming in, and said that there was no room for unskilled labour. Where have we the room for skilled labour? Where are the industries to absorb the skilled man that the hon. member would prefer to see coming in? We do not possess sufficient secondary industries to absorb any number of either skilled or unskilled men.

Mr. POLLOCK: We have large public works which have been held up for a long time because we could not get plasterers.

Mr. TAYLOR: Possibly one reason why we cannot get plasterers and bricklayers is that the restrictions that have been placed on young fellows learning those trades have caused a lesser number of men to follow those trades, and consequently have made a lesser number available.

Mr. MORGAN: Skilled labour is not allowed to come in.

Mr. TAYLOR: That may be an explanation why it is a very difficult thing to get a skilled plasterer or bricklayer at the present time.

Mr. COLLINS: They get higher wages in New York.

Mr. TAYLOR: But they pay considerably more for their living in New York; and the probabilities are that they are not a very great deal better off there than are the workers in Australia at the present time.

Hon. E. G. THEODORE: Workers could not be better situated anywhere in the world than they are in Queensland to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR: Again, I was rather surprised at some of the things which the hon. member for Herbert said when addressing this House. The hon. member made a comparison between the taxation imposed by the Queensland State Government and that imposed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison what the hon. member said was absolutely valueless. Quite different services are performed by the Federal as compared with the State Government, and it is simply useless to bring forward such a comparison; it cuts no ice whatever. If the hon. member had wished to be fair in making comparisons, he would have taken the taxation of the other States and compared it with that of Queensland. We perform absolutely similar services to those performed by the other States of the Commonwealth. The hon. member preferred not to do that, and introduced a comparison with Federal taxation instead.

The hon. member went further, and stated—a remarkable statement for any hon. member to make—that the Great War had nothing to do with that taxation. I would like to know how the Federal Government pay the interest on loans which it had to incur in connection with that war? From what source do they derive their revenue to pay that interest?

Hon. E. G. THEODORE: The Customs and Excise duties have been increased by from 40 per cent. to 50 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Customs and Excise duties are not sufficient, as the hon. member

for Chillagoe well knows. He knows that quite well. He does not want me to tell him that. With the per capita payments which the Commonwealth has to make to the various States it requires the whole of that money in order to carry on those services satisfactorily.

Mr. W. COOPER: How did they reduce taxation if they had not a surplus?

Mr. TAYLOR: They had a surplus, and they were able to do it. You have got a surplus, and you cannot do it.

To get back to the Governor's Speech. I am sure we all listened to the Governor's Speech with very great interest indeed, and the universal opinion, not only in this House but throughout Queensland, is that we are losing a very excellent man and a very fine Governor—one of the best the State has ever had, and one who has not failed in any degree whatever to move from one end of the State to the other in order to make himself thoroughly acquainted with its primary products, its secondary industries, and everything which is for the benefit of Queensland. The time of his departure is drawing very near, and I feel sure that, when he gets back to the old land, the knowledge and the experience which he has gained during the period he has been administering the affairs of Queensland will be most useful to him, and, what is more, will be most useful to Queensland. He will be able to state in unequivocal terms what he knows of this magnificent State—because it is a magnificent State—we are all agreed on that. He will be able to tell the people with whom he comes in contact that the money which is being loaned to Queensland and to Australia is quite safe—(Hear, hear!)—that the assets of the State are more than sufficient to pay the whole of the national debt a good many times over. He will be able to tell them that, although we have had a Labour Government in power for ten years, this State, in spite of that Government, must progress. When the change in Government takes place—and that change is going to take place in a few months—the people of the old land will have renewed confidence in this great State of ours.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: What party will be over here then?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The "rump" party.

Mr. TAYLOR: I recommend the hon. gentleman to keep away from the "rump," because that is where the kick is.

During the course of the debate the subject of whether we should have overseas Governors or not has been brought forward. There is no question but that in Queensland we have men of ability to equal any man who has administered the affairs of Queensland or the Commonwealth. We know that we have men of equal ability, and men who could administer the affairs of the State equally as well; but, if ever there was a period in the history of Australia and in the history of the Empire when everything we can possibly do should be done to maintain existing connections with the Empire, I claim that time is now. Great Britain has never been faced probably during any time in her history with bigger and graver economic questions than those with which she is faced at the present time. She may have to travel a long way before she finds a satisfactory solution of her present problems. We are part of the Commonwealth of Nations, and some of the nations are commencing to realise that, although they may be of a different colour to us, they have a

*Mr. Taylor.*]

right, being in this world, to live, and they may decide on a certain course of action which may be detrimental to us as a white race and as an English-speaking community. We have to consider all these questions. Nothing should be done to weaken the ties, not which bind us—I would not like to use the word “bind”—but which connect us with the Empire at the present time. I say that in every possible way we should strengthen those ties.

Mr. COLLINS: Financial ties are fairly strong.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, I suppose they are; but financial ties are not everything in this world. The honour of a nation is greater than financial ties; and financial ties must not be allowed to interfere with those ties which bind us to Great Britain and Ireland in any shape or form. We do not want to see them interfered with.

Taking the list of Governors we have had in Queensland, and Governors-General who have administered affairs in the Commonwealth, I do not think we have much to complain about. We have had a very fine lot of men, and every one is agreed with regard to the present occupant of the office in Queensland. We have practically complete self-governing rights, and we are not interfered with by the old country in carrying out the laws which are framed in this Parliament. Therefore, in my opinion, it would be a retrograde step to alter the present system. Hon. members know that it does not matter what Government may be in power, as, when the time comes for the appointment of the Governor by the State Government, a political appointment will be made; it cannot be avoided.

Mr. COLLINS: They are all political appointments from Great Britain.

Mr. TAYLOR: Is that in the best interests of the State? I claim that men come out here unfettered as Governors, but they have got their political opinions. The late Premier has been closely associated with our present Governor, and in carrying out the policy of his party has had to take to him legislation—I was going to say of a revolutionary nature, but I will not use that word—of a nature which was not dreamed of many years ago. If the late Premier spoke the truth, he would say that he received no opposition or dictation from the Governor.

Hon. E. G. THEODORE: It is not on those grounds or because there has been any friction in recent years that the change is sought, but on the ground that we have citizens here who are capable of performing the functions of the office.

Mr. TAYLOR: I admit that we have men who are quite capable for the office; but I contend that the matter of selecting or electing the Governor should not rest with any particular party which may happen to have control of the Treasury benches at any given time. Personally, I think we shall get on much better with a Governor from abroad than if the appointment were made from the State.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: What about past Governments refusing to accept appointees from abroad?

Mr. TAYLOR: Exactly; you have the right of objection now. Before a Governor is appointed his name is submitted to the

[*Mr. Taylor.*

Government of Queensland, and, if they can put up a valid objection to the one named, he does not come.

Hon. E. G. THEODORE: In the Blake case, the appointment was made and publicly announced by the British Government. It was only afterwards that Sir Henry Blake himself retired because of the protest of the Queensland Government.

Mr. TAYLOR: It just shows the notice taken in the old country of valid objections made by the State Parliament or Government.

In looking through the Governor's Speech there is one remark which I think must commend itself to all members of this House. It is a reference to the fact that the Federal

Government have been instrumental in recent years in establishing a Loan Council. Representatives of the States are on that Council, and the needs of the various States are communicated to it by the respective Governments. The Council meets from time to time and discusses those requirements, and the requirements of the Commonwealth, and by arrangement with the States the Commonwealth has become the sole borrowing authority for them all. That is a very distinct step forward, and I think the Commonwealth Government are to be commended for the action which they have taken to bring about that necessary development. The haphazard methods which have been adopted for very many years throughout Australia with regard to loan matters and the conflict of the interests of the various States probably has resulted in the payment by the States of a much higher rate of interest for their accommodation than may be the case now that the Commonwealth has become recognised as the sole authority.

Mr. COLLINS: We shall get cheaper money now that we have gone to America.

Mr. TAYLOR: We may; I hope we shall. Personally, I look upon the step with a certain amount of regret—it only appears to me in one light—because I am sorry to think that Great Britain is unable to give us the accommodation. I do not like that. I should be very sorry to see Great Britain pushed into the background after what she has been in years gone by—practically the money market of the world. I would not like to see the control of money removed from London to New York; but I feel satisfied that in arranging a loan in New York the Federal Government have been guided by the best advice. Australia has had to go there, and I hope we shall have cheap money if it is possible to get it, because it will help us in the development of Australia, and enable us to do a great deal more than we are doing at the present time. I feel that Queensland and Australia will have to be borrowers for another fifty or sixty years—it may be for seventy or eighty years—at any rate, until very much more of the loan money which has been expended is producing the revenue necessary to pay the interest on the money already borrowed. Unfortunately, we are a very considerable distance from that period, although I never find any fault with borrowing, provided that the money is spent judiciously. It is not much use if we have to float other loans in London or in New York, whichever it may be, to pay interest. As the ex-Premier said on one occasion, we should spend our loan money in such a

manner as will enable us to obtain a sufficient return to pay the interest on that money. We have not been able to do that. I have said on more than one occasion that if ever a Government had magnificent opportunities to do great and splendid work for the State, the present Government have had those opportunities, but they have failed lamentably. During their term of office the revenue of the country has doubled, and, notwithstanding increased costs, they could have expended the money more judiciously, and we would not have been in the position that we are in to-day. I hope the time is not far distant when the Government will see the necessity for scrapping their non-paying State enterprises.

Mr. COLLINS: The railways?

Mr. TAYLOR: No.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: The State Insurance Office?

Mr. TAYLOR: There is a reason why the railways are not paying. I have expressed my opinion with regard to the railways time and time again. It has been proved beyond doubt that a number of the State enterprises are unpayable propositions, and will never pay, and the sooner the Government get out of them the better it will be for the State and the Government. We want to spend our money on works of a permanent, developmental, and reproductive nature. On several occasions when discussing the Estimates I have criticised the expenditure by the Mines Department, and the Minister has always stated that in carrying on the activities of mining—I am speaking now with reference to metalliferous mining, and not so much to coalmining—he was providing a certain amount of employment. I am quite prepared to admit that he was providing employment, but he could have spent the same amount of money and provided the same amount of employment without incurring the huge losses which the mining undertakings have been responsible for.

Mr. COLLINS: Is the hon. gentleman referring to Mount Morgan?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am referring more particularly to mining enterprises in the far North of Queensland. It would have been very much better for Queensland had the Government kept out of those enterprises and spent the money on permanent works, like road construction, etc. During the last twelve months the Government have had to write off enormous sums in connection with the Mount Mulligan coalmine and the Chillagoe State smelters. It is a very easy matter to write off money, but it is a very difficult matter to make money. We were told by a late Treasurer that "finance is the test of government." Finance is the test of government, and by that test this Government have been found sadly wanting.

Mr. COLLINS: We have met all our commitments up to the present.

Mr. TAYLOR: With borrowed money and excessive taxation. Governments are not brought into existence for the purpose of extracting taxation from the pockets of the people. They are brought into being to carry out the government for the people, and to act as trustees of public funds. We in Parliament from time to time pass legislation protecting the people for whom the trustees act, and providing that the money of which trustees are custodians shall be wisely and properly spent. If it has been

found necessary to introduce legislation of that character to protect those who place funds in charge of trustees, surely the Government recognise their responsibilities in connection with public funds. The Government have been given wonderful opportunities as a result of the increase in revenue in this State, but on account of taxation and other things our secondary industries have not expanded as they should have done.

The hon. member for Cooroora, when speaking this morning, referred to the boot industry. He quoted the fact that has been quoted in this Chamber before, and asked how it was that our leather goes to the southern States to be made into boots which come back to this State to be worn by the people of Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS: You might ask the same about wool.

Mr. TAYLOR: I have mentioned the same fact about wool. I ask how is it, and why is it, that in other States they have been able to double and treble their woollen mills, and yet we in Queensland have not been able to erect one additional mill, despite the fact that we are one of the greatest wool-producing States of the Commonwealth. Queensland is splendidly situated for the carrying on of secondary industries. Unlike Western Australia and South Australia we have from the Tweed River to Cape York practically unlimited supplies of coal. We all know that to carry on secondary industries successfully coal is the chief adjunct and one of the most necessary articles to compete and succeed against other States. Although we have coal at our doors and a magnificent climate, how is it that we are occupying such a secondary place compared with other States in so far as secondary industries are concerned? My only explanation is that those who have money to expend in secondary industries can use it to better advantage in the southern States than in Queensland. There is no disputing that fact. We have the evidence in every possible direction that what I am saying is true.

Another matter that has been foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech is the Childhood Endowment Bill. We do not know what the intentions of the Government are in regard to that measure, but I would urge the Government in introducing that measure—they know more about it than I do—to exercise every possible care to see that no further tax is placed on industry. \*If, to provide for that childhood endowment scheme the Government are going further to tax industry, then what the people will gain from the endowment scheme they will probably lose in the way of employment. We do not want to create a position such as that. If we are going to endow childhood, we want to see that no hardship in other directions will be inflicted on the community in finding the money which will be found necessary to pay that endowment. It is a pity that in the matter of childhood endowment—and we on this side of the House said the same when the Unemployed Workers Insurance Bill was going through—that action of a Federal nature is not taken. It stands to reason that if one State stands out with respect to humanitarian legislation of that nature and other States do not, the States which have not provided that legislation must have advantages in carrying on their secondary industries.

Mr. Taylor.]

Mr. FOLEY: It is necessary for some one to lead the way.

Mr. COLLINS: The people would be worse off then.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am asking the Government not to place a handicap on this State. If childhood endowment was legislated for federally, all the States would be on an equal footing.

Mr. COLLINS: Why is it that the Federal Government have not moved in the matter?

Mr. TAYLOR: Our efforts should be directed so far as possible to make such legislation of a Federal character so as not to inflict any disabilities on this State.

The PREMIER: Do you mean to say that we should wait for the Federal Government to give us a lead in the matter?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not say that, but we should take some action to induce the Federal Government to move in the matter. The Federal Government have appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into matters relating to national insurance. I do not know what they mean by that, but that Commission has been endeavouring to collect evidence in regard to that matter so that any legislation in that direction will be of a Federal nature and character. I quite realise that the social and economic conditions of the people have to be considered more to-day than at any other time. The needs and demands of the well-being of the people in years gone by did not receive that attention from Parliaments that they should have received. To-day those social and economic needs must be provided for, and there is an evolution of thought going in that direction. We do not want, by any legislation which we may introduce, to lead ourselves into a bog and give the other States a preference over us, and in some measure provide a means of unemployment.

Mr. FOLEY: Have you any suggestions on the matter?

Mr. TAYLOR: I consider the whole thing should be considered by the Federal authorities to see if a satisfactory Commonwealth scheme cannot be adopted.

Mr. FERRICKS: Do you not think action on the part of the Queensland Government will act as a spur on the Federal Government?

Mr. TAYLOR: At present we have a maternity bonus and an old-age pension instituted by the Federal Government and under our care, and it is quite on the cards that we might also get this provided.

The PREMIER: We, too, think it should be a Federal matter, but we are not prepared to wait until the Federal Government moves.

Mr. TAYLOR: I notice from the Governor's Speech that there is to be an alteration in the matter of arbitration. I have always been for arbitration. No one can find a word in any speech of mine against arbitration methods. So far they are the most satisfactory methods that we have evolved for the settlement of disputes, and though the awards which the Arbitration Court make may not satisfy both parties, the confidence in the Court is still there. In making any alteration in the Arbitration Court the Government should consider first and foremost whether that confidence might

be destroyed. If that confidence is destroyed by any alterations made in that Court, we shall probably have disastrous results in our arbitration methods. Personally, I do not think for one moment that parliamentarians should occupy positions on that Court, and the men who preside over the Court should be judges. I am quite content to leave the decision of these matters in the hands of men who are accustomed to hear, weigh, and sift evidence. There is no restriction whatever either on the employer or employee going to the Court and placing his case before the Court and whoever may be the President of that Court. I do hope that no Act in connection with this proposed change will tend in any shape or form to destroy the confidence at present existing between employers and employees in that Court, notwithstanding that they are at times dissatisfied with an award.

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*): Whilst it may be regarded as unnecessary to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Cooroora regarding the reasons which actuated the late leader of this party in resigning the leadership of the party, it might be as well for me to supplement the denial of the hon. member for Gregory by assuring the hon. member for Cooroora and hon. members opposite generally that the hon. member was entirely wrong in the reference that he made, and that the reasons he has given are as wide from the truth as are the poles apart. To sum it up, the hon. member for Cooroora is quite astray, and I do not think it necessary to say anything more on the subject.

In his Speech His Excellency the Governor took up considerable space with his introductory remarks, and they represented His Excellency's personal expression of opinion regarding his sojourn in this State. Why I regard his remarks as being of greater interest on this occasion as compared with previous occasions, is the fact that I believe that the end of Sir Matthew Nathan's term will terminate the policy of Imperially-appointed Governors as the vice-regal representatives in the various States. Indications point that way. That reform will be welcomed by the Labour movement as being a step forward to the greater reform which we aim at—the abolition of State Governors altogether—which will arrive, if not before, at least when the Commonwealth has attained, by the conferring upon it of greater powers, a more unified method of government. During His Excellency's term in Queensland as Governor he has made it his business to travel about and become acquainted with the people, and come closely in contact with them, and I have always held the opinion that at the time of his appointment, the anti-Australian and anti-Queensland propaganda, shrouded in the guise of anti-Labour propaganda, had reached its lowest depths—that this State of Queensland was regarded as being the head of anarchy, and lots of other things—and I thought at the time of the appointment of Sir Matthew Nathan, when he was busy travelling the outlying portions of this State after his arrival, that he was determined to see what this State of Queensland and what the people of Queensland were like. He has come, he has seen, and, presumably, he has judged. What his judgment may be is a matter for His Excellency himself, but I believe it will be favourable to Queensland, and that he

[*Mr. Taylor.*]

will make the most of his opportunities, when he returns to England, of voicing his opinions regarding this State.

There is another feature of his retirement which appeals to me rather strongly. Unlike many other Governors of the other States and of this State, he has not utilised the last three or six months of his period of appointment in leave. Most State Governors have adopted that attitude, and have returned to England really before their time was up. I notice that Sir Matthew Nathan will leave here on 7th September, and that he will leave Thursday Island about 23rd October. It reminds me of a paragraph I read in the "Brisbane Courier" about six months ago on the question of etiquette in vice-regal circles. In that interesting paragraph the "Brisbane Courier" stated that it was the practice in vice-regal circles for the retiring Governors never to meet their successors; that it was *infra dig* for them to do so, and was not regarded as playing the game. His Excellency will leave Thursday Island on 23rd October, and he will have a week's start of his successor, whoever he may be. I feel quite sure that the people of Queensland as a whole wish him well in health, and hope and believe that he will make the most of his opportunities in England of advertising the soundness and the potentialities of this great State of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

I want to touch on a matter which, in my opinion, is of greater importance than the retirement of the Governor of the State of Queensland; that is the present industrial upheaval which prevails throughout Australia in the shipping industry. I believe that this industrial upheaval has a connection with the subject which was dealt with so fully and so soundly this morning by the hon. member for Gregory; that is the indiscriminate and unrestricted immigration of Southern Europeans to Australia, particularly to North Queensland. Perhaps it may be as well for me to endeavour to put before the House my opinion of the genesis of the current trouble. In my opinion, it dates back to the retirement of Mr. Hughes as Prime Minister of Australia. Whatever faults Mr. Hughes may have had—and he has many, in my opinion—I believe that he was wrapped up in the idea of a Commonwealth line of steamers. The Commonwealth line of steamers was his creation—his baby—and I never will believe that he would agree to sacrifice it at the dictates of the business people. I firmly believe that was the reason for the retirement of Mr. Hughes from the Prime Ministership of Australia. Since the advent of his successor, Mr. Bruce, there has reigned in the Government ranks a policy of pinpricking, aggravation, and sabotaging in connection with the Commonwealth line of boats, in the endeavour to cause dissension and industrial trouble amongst the employees on those boats in the attempt to provide an excuse—not a reason—for the sale of the Commonwealth line of steamers. Single boats were sold, and eventually a proposal was made and announced to the world for the sale of the Commonwealth line as a whole; but I believe that the country representatives of the Federal composite Government party realise that, if the Commonwealth line of boats were sold, the export freight on wheat, wool, meat, and other primary products would increase a hundredfold. I believe that Mr. Bruce fell down on the job of selling the Commonwealth line of boats, and then retracted from it.

Mr. MORGAN: He could not get a decent bid.

Mr. FERRICKS: That was the excuse.

Mr. MORGAN: Would you sacrifice your State stations?

Mr. FERRICKS: One hon. member opposite said that he did not think the Federal Government would go to the country until the last minute. My opinion is quite the reverse. I believe that when the trouble was brought keenly to the front, it was in order to provide an excuse for the Commonwealth Government to rush to the country. Since they have been in office for the past two and a-half years their achievements from an Australian standpoint, legislatively and administratively, have been absolutely a bankrupt stock. They have nothing to go to the country with, and, in my opinion, this was the psychological moment for them to rush to the country. The methods they have adopted are plainly apparent to anyone who has followed the question from the commencement. While they laid up the Australian-owned boats in Sydney Harbour and in Hobson's Bay, trade by the thousand tons on the other side of the world was waiting to be transported to Australia, but the Federal anti-Labour Government would not send the boats of the Commonwealth line to transport that trade to Australia, but on the contrary they chartered British-owned boats to do the work which should have been done by the Commonwealth line of steamers, with the result that these chartered boats were landed in Australian ports manned by men who are paid infinitely less than the Australian rates, and work under absolutely worse conditions than the Australian seamen. Indeed, some of the boats had coloured crews, an evasion of the conditions which Australian seamen, firemen, and other maritime workers had achieved by industrial organisation in Australia over a great number of years past. What were the seamen of Australia to do? Were they to sit idly by and see the work which belonged to Australian boats and Australian seamen done by lower-paid seamen from the other side of the world, by coloured crews, and some of them even under conditions which would not be tolerated in any part of the Australian waters? Consequently, the seamen were absolutely forced to strike as a protest. Had they not done so, that would have been the end of Australian rates and conditions in maritime work.

The next move on the part of the shipowners was to approach the court for the deregistration of the Seamen's Union. Their application was granted, with the result that the shipowners then—and this is

[2.30 p.m.] the point I want hon. members to note—offered to employ the seamen and other maritime workers, who had been under the award of the court, under articles which specified no rate of wages and no conditions of labour. I ask hon. members opposite whether that was a fair proposition for the shipowners to put up, because, if the men had signed those blank articles, it is quite apparent that after having served their term of articles the owners would have been able to pay them off at the rate of 1d. a day, and the seamen and other maritime workers would have had no redress, because no pay was specified and no conditions of labour stipulated. Hon. members may be aware—I think the hon. member for Mitchell

*Mr. Ferricks.]*

will bear me out in this that freedom of contract was really the basis of the shearers' strike in 1891. I am sure that there is not a man in this Chamber who would endeavour to employ a man without telling him how much he would get or how many hours he would work, yet that was the condition under which the maritime workers were asked to engage. Mr. Bruce, the Prime Minister of the anti-Labour Government, was interviewed not only by representatives of the Seamen's Union but of all industrial unions of Australia organised in the transport group, who asked him to intervene in the interests of Australia and the successful and peaceful carrying on of the maritime industry. What was Mr. Bruce's reply? In effect, he said: "The Commonwealth shipping line is under the control of the Commonwealth Shipping Board, and the Commonwealth Government have no power to interfere with the conduct or the working of the ships." Then he went to the Rotary Club and denounced the seamen, not only before the whole of Australia but before the whole world, because the remarks of the Prime Minister carry more weight than those of Mr. Bruce, a private individual. I am not saying that in any feeling of anger, I am merely making a criticism of Mr. Bruce that he thoroughly deserves. Then, when the Commonwealth Shipping Board made an arrangement with the transport group of unions, the ship-owners went to Mr. Bruce. What did Mr. Bruce do? He sent a telegram to Sir William Clarkson, the chairman of the Commonwealth Shipping Board, asking for an explanation as to why it was made, and this notwithstanding the fact that six days previously he had told a deputation that he had no control of the operation of the Commonwealth Shipping Board! Whether he got that explanation or not did not appear in the public Press; but, when fruit and other perishable goods were awaiting shipment from Tasmania, and Mr. Bruce was advised to put into commission the idle Commonwealth ships on the wages and conditions stipulated with the Board, he refused to do so. And, in my opinion, when Dr. Earle Page came to Queensland on 28th May, his visit had more than ordinary significance. An insignificant paragraph appeared in the public Press to the effect that the Federal Treasurer had arrived in Brisbane the previous night, and would proceed to Gympie by that day's train. Certainly the Federal Treasurer has a son farming at Brooloo, and for that reason no notice is taken of his frequent visits to Queensland, but on this occasion it was announced that he would stay in Gympie and would address a meeting at the Town Hall. In my opinion, that was the beginning of a Federal election campaign. Whether Mr. Bruce has fallen down on the job a second time remains to be seen. For weakness and changing and going about and making speeches without any aim or any effort to bring about a cessation of the trouble, Mr. Bruce on this occasion absolutely takes the palm. With all Mr. Hughes's faults, if he had been in charge, he would at least have done something. Even if he did wrong, the people would have a much greater admiration for a man who tries than for the absolute weakling that the present Prime Minister has shown himself to be.

[Mr. Ferricks.

I desire now to deal with the question of immigration from Southern Europe. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Gregory has stated, that hundreds of them have entrained periodically for the northern part of Queensland. It appears that with every shipment of Italians on every occasion a hundred or so are dropped off at Fremantle, a hundred at Adelaide, another number at Melbourne, and another number at Sydney, and they are spread all over the Commonwealth. But the greatest aggregation is in North Queensland. These people are receiving employment in the Newcastle Iron and Steel Works to the exclusion of British-born subjects. No objection is taken by this party to the newcomers on the ground that they are Italians. I would take the same objection if an indiscriminate number of workers of any other nationality were dumped into any portion of Queensland without provision having been made for their absorption into industry. It is entirely wrong, it is unfair to the newcomers themselves, and it is doing great harm to the Queensland sugar industry. The apologists for the Federal Government say that the Federal Government accept no responsibility for this great influx of Southern Europeans. I believe that the Commonwealth Government have connived at the arrival of these newcomers by hundreds in boat after boat. I think that is made plain now by the action which I believe the Federal Government say they are taking. To show the attitude adopted by Mr. Bruce I would like to quote from a statement by the Premier which was published in the "Daily Standard" on 21st July last on the question of preventing undue immigration of Southern Europeans into the Commonwealth. The Premier, in quoting the Prime Minister's remarks, stated—

"Mr. Bruce said that the Commonwealth would hardly be justified in taking such drastic steps as were taken by the United States Government when it established by law its present quota system of immigration. It seems impracticable for Australia, which has no foreign service, to enforce the quota law."

That was his confession of inability to do anything. Now we read in the Press that the Federal immigration authorities are restricting the issue of permits, and are inquiring more closely into the guarantees which are given on behalf of prospective immigrants.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. gentleman knows that an embargo has been placed on Southern European immigration.

Mr. FERRICKS: The Federal Government have intimated that for the future each immigrant from Southern Europe will require to have a separate nomination form. Only one immigrant in the future can be nominated on the one immigration form, admitting, of course, that they may have put a number of names on the nomination paper previously. That is plain. They have been coming in in droves to the detriment of the Australian workmen, the Australian business man in North Queensland, and the whole of the Queensland sugar industry, which means the whole of Australia. I shall endeavour to show on what I base my opinion—that the undue influx of these people is having a very detrimental effect

in the Southern States regarding the sugar industry. I quote from the "Daily Standard" of 25th May last the report of some remarks made by Mr. Boardman—

"Despite the White Australian policy, North Queensland was captured by the Italians without firing a shot. White growers were selling out and Italians were earning from £15 to £25 a week. These workers were living under conditions which were not in accordance with the Australian standard."

That is a very surprising statement from a responsible man attending a fruitgrowers' conference; but is not so surprising when one knows the basis on which these Southerners have arrived at these opinions and conclusions. Only at the beginning of last year the State Arbitration Court was sitting in Cairns on the application of the field and mill employees of the sugar industry for a new award. Mr. G. H. Pritchard, the secretary of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association—a responsible man who was appearing for the employers—made this astounding and untrue assertion—

"An Italian after one season's cancutting has retired and returned to Italy."

If an Italian, after having been in Queensland for one cancutting season, has been able to return to Italy he has not been able to do so on his earnings from cancutting. That was an absolutely misleading assertion for a man like Mr. Pritchard to make. Such statements prejudice Southerners in their views in respect to the industry, and men like Mr. Pritchard should be more careful in the statements they make, and take a broader and more Australian view of these matters. Senator Crawford, when defending the sugar industry in the Senate, had to answer questions which had been raised on the tariff by the fruit and jam manufacturing interests in the House of Representatives, and to which the Nationalists in that Chamber were not game to stand up. Senator Wilson said that members were not going to advocate a retention of protection to the Queensland sugar industry in which agricultural labourers were able to earn up to £2 a day, while agricultural labourers in the wheat and fruit industries earned only up to 8s. a day. Senator Crawford said that statement was not true, but Senator Wilson in answer said—

"I am only quoting what the Hon. Minister told me himself."

It will be seen, therefore, that the manufacture of this propaganda aiming at the detriment of the workers and seeking to undermine their rates of pay is having a pernicious effect in the Southern States. I believe the expressions which I have quoted are founded on the assertions of responsible anti-Labour men in Queensland who should know better. I could quote further from the report of that fruitgrowers' conference, but I believe I have said enough.

Closely allied with the shipping dispute and the influx of Southern Europeans is the over-production of sugar. They are, in my opinion, all interwoven. I believe that an endeavour was to have been made to make a massed attack on the working conditions and rates of pay throughout Australia when the time was ripe. I believe these newcomers

were to be used in connection with that proposal. What made me come to that conclusion was that, having looked into the question for some months, I wrote an article on the over-production of sugar for the "Daily Standard" on 4th April last, and I pointed out that, if the Sugar Board keeps whittling down the price of sugar, £1 this year, £2 next year, until they get down to the prices obtaining in the bad old times, probably there is going to be an appeal to the Arbitration Court by the employers for a reduction of wages. They will say they are unable to carry on under the present award, and, while the Economic Commission which recently sat in Queensland stated that incapacity to pay was not the cause of the basic wage being reduced in Queensland in 1922, it is safe to say that, if the Sugar Board continues whittling down the price of sugar, an attempt will be made to lower the wages. If that is done—and I speak as one who has given pretty active support to the industry for the last fifteen years—and men are asked to work at bedrock wages, I am afraid some of my enthusiasm for this industry will be damped. Nobody can gainsay the fact that a section of the sugar-growers in North Queensland and other places have had the chance and have seized the opportunity of evading awards and of employing aliens. It behoves the better section of the sugar-growers to attempt to dissuade those people from that action.

While on this question of over-production of sugar I recollect that I heard the hon. member for Mirani move the adjournment of the House last year, and I heard other hon. members opposite refer to this question, but not one of them touched what I consider to be the kernel of the whole position, if we are to get over the present difficulty, and that is the unduly large margin which is allowed between the price of raw sugar and the price for refined sugar paid to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. In my article I said this, and I want this to be reported in "Hansard" because it will be informative to many people interested in the industry. I raised this question in the Federal Senate, and I pointed out that every time there has been an increase in the price of raw sugar to the grower—a proportion of which has been paid to the workers under Arbitration Court awards—there has been an out-of-proportion increase in the margin given to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Further to illustrate this I pointed out that when the price for raw sugar was £14 per ton the selling price for refined sugar was £20 per ton—a difference of £6 per ton. In 1915, when the price for raw sugar was £18 per ton, the selling price for refined sugar was £25 10s. per ton, leaving a margin of £7 10s. to the refiner. This was given under the Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915, which was introduced by the late Hon. T. J. Ryan and denounced at the time all round, but which has been so satisfactorily accepted since by everybody who has anything to do with the industry. In 1918 the price of raw sugar was £21 per ton and the selling price of refined sugar £29 5s. per ton, leaving a margin of £8 5s. for the refiner.

Mr. MORGAN: Did not the cost of refining go up, too?

Mr. FERRICKS: I am coming to that question, which is a fair one. I raised this

*Mr. Ferricks.]*

matter in the Federal Senate, and wanted to know where that £8 5s. margin came in. I received this reply—

“The Government recompenses the company for the actual cost of freight, £1 12s. 8d., which includes marine insurance, harbour dues, exchange, sacks, wharfage, and landing charges. The refining charge of £1 7s. 6d. per ton includes wages, coal, charcoal, water, delivery of refined sugar in towns, cartage, lighterage, and fire insurance. The cost of packages is 11s. per ton. The selling charge is 7s. per ton, and includes salaries and contributions to staff and wage earners’ provident funds, fees, rates, and rents, exchange on refined sugar, remittances, and charges, as well as taxes. Over and above that, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company receives a managing charge of £1 per ton to cover the use of the company’s services and its capital, and provide interest thereon.”

That makes a total of £4 18s. 2d. per ton. With all the charges they gave—and the House can accept it from me that the charges that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company gave the then Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, would be placed at the highest attainable point to make their case appear not so bad—these charges totalled £4 18s. 2d., which, with the margin of £8 5s. a ton, left a balance of £3 6s. 10d. a ton. That clear profit of £3 6s. 10d. per ton went into the coffers of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

Mr. BRAND: No.

Mr. FERRICKS: Yes. Many of the daily papers reprinted my remarks on that occasion, and the “Bundaberg Daily News” was amongst them, and, in addition, the “Daily News” had this editorial note—

“In the agreement which the Sugar Board entered into with the refining companies, any savings effected in connection with the work of refining on the agreed price allowed must be returned to the Sugar Board at the termination of the season, and in this connection we understand the Colonial Sugar Refining Company returned to the Board something in the neighbourhood of £1 5s. a ton (refined sugar) for the past season’s operations.”

Now that was a fallacy, and what they based that conclusion on was the statement made by Mr. Hughes in the House of Representatives in 1920, when he gave the detailed cost under the new agreement, setting down the charges of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company at £6 2s. 6d. per ton instead of £4 18s. 2d. per ton, and he enumerated the articles just as I have given them in the previous quotation, and in every one of the estimates he gave he said, “It is estimated.” He said: “It is estimated freight will cost £2 a ton instead of £1 12s. per ton. It is estimated sacks will cost £1 instead of 16s.” The wrong basis arrived at in that estimate is where a refund was made to the raw mills. There was no refund from the profit. Under the 1920 agreement the price of raw sugar was fixed at £30 6s. 8d. per ton, and the margin allowed to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was £10. No portion of that extra charge of £3 17s. 6d. per ton was returned to the raw sugar mill

—not a penny of it. It had jumped up from £3 6s. 10d. to £3 17s. 6d. a ton. My complaint is that, in 1920, under that agreement, when the selling price of raw sugar was £30 6s. 8d. per ton, the margin allowed the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was £10 a ton, and, according to a question which I asked in this Chamber on 7th August last year, the price of raw sugar was then £27 per ton, and the selling price of refined sugar was £37 per ton, leaving a margin of £10 a ton. Do you not see that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company maintained their margin of £10 notwithstanding the fact that the raw sugar millers were paid £3 6s. 8d. a ton less for their raw sugar? And this season £1 a ton has been deducted, leaving £26 a ton; and yet the Colonial Sugar Refining Company kept their margin of £10!

Mr. BRAND: All with the concurrence of the present Government.

Mr. FERRICKS: No. The agreement is made between the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and the Commonwealth Government, otherwise I could never have got that information in August, 1919, and the late Mr. Tudor could not have got that information from Mr. Hughes in 1920, which I have extracted from Federal “Hansard.” The agreement is made between the Commonwealth Government and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. All the Queensland Government do in the exercise of their powers is to acquire the crop for the Commonwealth Government, and the refining companies have to treat and put it on the market. The only thing which I deprecate is that the Sugar Board has not given us information. I asked a question for details of costs, which I was able to get myself in the Senate in 1919, and which Mr. Tudor got in the House of Representatives in 1920. I think the Sugar Board should have given that information to this House. If they have not got it, they should have got it from the Commonwealth Government. Members of this House are entitled to it.

Mr. BRAND: The Commonwealth Government have nothing to do with it.

Mr. FERRICKS: The Commonwealth Government make the agreement, and Mr. Hughes was very careful to obtain those details for the Commonwealth Government.

I expect to be told later on in this debate something in connection with Imperial preference for the sugar industry. I have touched on a point which undoubtedly would have been raised later on in the debate. Many hon. members opposite and sugar-growers outside will say what a glorious privilege this Imperial preference is, but in my opinion all the advantage, or the greater portion of it, granted by Imperial preference could be obtained from the undue margin allowed to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. I contend that for every £1 which is taken off the price of raw sugar which has to be exported, after the Australian rates have been fixed for the sugar consumed here, £1 should come off the margin of £10 allowed to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. That is a preference to which we are entitled. Let me quote to show those people who are so enamoured of Imperial preference what it means. In the columns of the “Brisbane Courier” as recently as 15th June last there appeared a comment on the vote in the House of Commons when Imperial preference was

[Mr. Ferricks.

re-established by the Baldwin Government. The leader described the Labour vote as a notable triumph for preference. I want hon. members opposite to listen to this. This is what the "Morning Post," a conservative journal, had to say about it—

"The 'Morning Post' described the Labour vote as a notable triumph for preference, and suggests that the Government might find another claim to the allegiance of the working men by making preference depend on the use of British machinery in the industries concerned. The Dominions would thus be encouraged to help unemployment in Britain, which can make all the refining, drying, and shredding machinery that the Dominions want to produce the sugar, tobacco, and dried fruits which the mother country consumes."

Do they not see that the question of Imperial preference is loaded from the Australian standpoint? The "Morning Post" suggests that they should make sugar-mills in England—that is what they mean by shredding machinery and machinery for drying fruits—in order to relieve unemployment in Great Britain. There is no one inside or outside this Chamber who can stand up for that from the Australian point of view: and I think that hon. members opposite in past sessions while I have been here have been very long-winded in coming to the question of local Australian markets. I remember when I happened to mention that the Australian market was the best market of all, the late hon. member for Drayton getting into quite a furore over the question when he was talking about markets oversea.

Mr. KELSO: You have made mistakes in that respect.

Mr. FERRICKS: There has been a change brought about since then. The construction of the Tully mill machinery was given to a Queensland firm instead of being sent to England.

Mr. KELSO: You will admit that you did make a mistake in that direction.

Mr. FERRICKS: Even before the "Morning Post" came out with its leader in relation to Australian markets, which hon. members opposite have so freely ridiculed and to which they have attached so little [3 p.m.] importance in bygone years, the "Daily Standard," in an editorial on 9th April last, quoted an extract from the "Australian Manufacturer" of 28th March last. Hon. members on both sides of the House should absorb this, since it is absolutely astounding and sensational in its importance—

"Australian factories bought £68,212,000 more raw material than was exported. Of £84,182,000 worth of agricultural products in 1922-23, only £20,152,000 were exported, the other £64,030,000 being consumed locally."

And yet we hear hon. members on that side of the House crying about oversea markets! This is the best market, and we shall never have prosperity unless we have successful expansion of our secondary industries, which men opposite and their supporters have long derided and ridiculed in an attempt to make men work for low wages.

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

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*): I have followed the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat with reference to the sugar industry, and I think he must agree that the sugar-growers are in a better condition under a Federal National Government than they have ever been under a Labour Federal Government in the past. It is interesting to note his condemnation of the preference which has been given by the Baldwin Government, and his remarks to a certain extent were a defence of the Ramsay MacDonald Government.

I would just like to endorse the remarks which have fallen from members on this side in regard to their regret at the departure of the Governor. I share their regret that this is the last session of Parliament that His Excellency will open. I think that no man has endeared himself more to the electors or people of Queensland than Sir Matthew Nathan. His moving about, not only in the cities but also in the country, has given him a first-hand knowledge of the requirements of Queensland, and I think that, when he returns to the old land, he will be an asset to us in his ability to expound our prosperity and the opportunities which Queensland offers to people to make good should they desire to settle in our midst.

I also would like to express my regret at the disaster which occurred to the mail train at Traveston just recently. The place where the accident happened is in my electorate, and I extend my sympathy to the people who were injured and the relatives of those who were killed. I appreciate, too, very much the very great kindness extended to the sufferers by the people living in that locality and also the endeavours of the many railway workers engaged in that part of the State to do everything they possibly could to alleviate the sufferings of those who were injured.

I find no mention in the Governor's Speech of any reduction in taxation. I do not know whether that matter will be brought forward in the Financial Statement, but it is regrettable that the Government could not in any way indicate that there is to be a reduction in taxation. I notice that the Federal Government recently have been able to announce a considerable relief; but, instead of our State Government being likely to reduce it, I am afraid that we must expect, perhaps, a greater increase in taxation than we can afford to pay.

The hon. member for Herbert spoke for some time upon the increase in our manufacturing industries, and the mover of the Address in Reply spoke of the increase in the value of our manufactures. The leader of the Opposition proved conclusively that, as compared with the other States, Queensland was lagging far behind in secondary industries. The hon. member for Townsville interjected, "What about the increase in primary production?" We know that there has been an increase in primary production, but the primary producer is not yet getting a sufficient return for his labour to enable him to receive equal to the basic wage. The value of production has expanded throughout the world. In the main that has been caused by inflated currencies, resulting in a depreciation in the value of money. Take the case of Germany. In terms of the mark

*Mr. Clayton.]*

she had increased the value of her production very considerably in 1923 as compared with 1914, but she still remains a much poorer nation. The best way to test the statement that we have increased our production in Queensland is to compare Queensland with the other States of the Commonwealth. We shall then be able to see whether the increase is such as we have been led to believe it is by hon. members who quote

only those figures that suit them. The figures taken from the report by the Economic Commission on the Basic Wage and from the Commonwealth "Year Book" prove conclusively that under Labour rule Queensland has lagged behind the other States in every department of industry, both primary and secondary. These figures will form very interesting reading for those who may read the speeches delivered by previous speakers—

## VALUE OF PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Industry.	1914.	1923.	Increases.	
			Numerical.	Per Cent.
	£	£	£	
Agriculture—				
Queensland .. .. .	5,680,000	10,105,000	4,425,000	77·8
Other States .. .. .	30,372,000	74,037,000	43,665,000	143·7
Pastoral—				
Queensland .. .. .	16,290,000	19,500,000	3,210,000	19·7
Other States .. .. .	44,765,000	71,975,000	27,210,000	60·7
Dairy, Poultry, Bee—				
Queensland .. .. .	3,499,000	6,000,000	2,501,000	71·4
Other States .. .. .	18,063,000	37,542,000	19,479,000	107·3
Forestry and Fisheries—				
Queensland .. .. .	1,326,000	3,000,000	1,174,000	64·2
Other States .. .. .	4,593,000	7,845,000	3,252,000	70·8
Mining—				
Queensland .. .. .	2,976,000	2,267,000	*709,000	*23·8
Other States .. .. .	19,077,000	18,049,000	*1,028,000	*5·3
Manufacturing—				
Queensland .. .. .	8,071,000	16,048,000	7,977,000	98·9
Other States .. .. .	54,885,000	115,800,000	60,915,000	110·9
Totals (all production, Primary and Secondary)—				
Queensland .. .. .	38,342,000	56,921,000	18,579,000	48·4
Other States .. .. .	171,755,000	325,287,000	153,532,000	89·4

\* Decrease.

Mr. COLLINS: Those figures are misleading.

Mr. CLAYTON: These figures are conclusive evidence of the condition of Queensland to-day. Other hon. members have quoted figures concerning Queensland alone. These show an increase, whereas by comparison with other States of the Commonwealth the fact is conclusively proved that Queensland is lagging behind. It is time that a Government was placed on the Treasury benches which would allow Queensland to progress as it deserves to progress.

The Governor's Speech has reference to agricultural legislation. I, as a primary producer, have associated myself with other primary producers on this side of the House in always affording the Government support on such legislation. I am pleased that the Government are taking an interest in agricultural legislation, but they have not given the practical support to the primary producer that we would wish. They have spent a considerable sum of money in the organisation of the primary producer, but they still have a lot to learn. They can learn a lot by turning up the speeches delivered by hon. members on this side of the House on such subjects. They will find in those speeches what the farmers are asking for at the present time. The Government state that they are going into the question of the organisation of the primary producer. That is a matter that hon. members on this side have been advocating continually. They have advocated that the primary producer should be organised on a commodity basis. Only last session the hon. member for Burnett, together with other members of the Country party, approached the late Premier, in the absence of the Secretary for Agriculture, in

an effort to induce him to reorganise the Council of Agriculture. The hon. member for Mirani moved a resolution to that effect last session, and it was supported on this side. I understand that it is the intention of the Government this session to move in that direction, but they have had ample opportunity of taking such action previously. I am inclined to the opinion that the reorganisation of the Council of Agriculture on a commodity basis will be something to be used to tickle the ears of the farmers at the next election. I am inclined to think that that is why they held back and would not reorganise at a time when we asked them to do so. I assure the House that it will be in the interests of the primary producers if they are organised on that basis.

With regard to reorganisation on a commodity basis, we have a good illustration of such organisation if we take the men engaged in the sugar industry. Those in that industry have been organised entirely in connection with that industry, and they have proved the success of their efforts by the increase in the returns the sugar-growers are now receiving. If you attempt to get a body of farmers together, and to organise when their interests are conflicting, you will not be successful. I am one who supported the establishment of such pools as the Maize Pool, but the Government were defeated in the establishment of that pool simply because they allowed farmers to have votes when they were not solely engaged in the maize industry. Recently I was present at a local producers' association meeting, where a district organiser had come along to speak on behalf of the Maize Pool. There were present two cane farmers, two dairymen, two poultrymen, two fruitgrowers, and a maize and dairy farmer combined. The organiser

[Mr. Clayton.

dwelt on the benefits to be obtained from the establishment of a maize pool, but when he was submitted to questions at the conclusion of his address he had to admit that the cane, the poultry, and the fruit farmers, who were present, desired cheap maize, while vice versa the maize farmer wanted cheap sugar. Unless you organise on a commodity basis, and allow farmers to deal solely with the primary product they are producing, the movement will not be successful.

I contend that our Federal Government have given us more beneficial legislation in connection with our dairying industry than have the State Government in other industries. The Federal Government have moved in a very beneficial way by passing the Dairy Export Control Act, and by insisting on the pasteurisation of butter. I look to that Act as one that is going to do an enormous amount of good in the matter of our export trade. It is pleasing to me to know that one of our Country party members in this House has been selected to take a seat on that Board. That hon. member tells me that, although they are but working in the initial stage, he has great hopes of ultimate success. I trust that the dairymen will benefit, and that the measure will be the means of placing thousands of pounds in the pockets of the farmers which at present they are not receiving. Now that we are producing more butter than we can consume, it is essential that we should look after our export trade. We know that overseas we are handicapped with our butter exports, in the first instance, through not having evenness of production. We have our flush season, which lasts a few months, and then we have our off season, and we have to compete with Denmark, which produces an even quantity all the year round.

Then, again, we have to compete with many cheap labour countries. We know that the standard of living in Queensland is much higher than it is in some of the countries with which we have to compete, so that it is in our interests to see that the marketing of our produce is done in an up-to-date manner. It is pleasing to note that we have at last established a brand—that is, the “Kangaroo” brand—and we can look forward in the future to seeing this brand of butter holding its own with the other imported brands that we have to compete with over there.

The hon. member for South Brisbane spoke a good deal on the sugar industry. The producers of sugar are in a satisfactory position at the present time, except for the matter of over-production. That is a very serious problem at the present time which is engaging the attention of many of those working in the industry who are au fait with the situation. The splendid organisation of the cane-growers has assisted them to get the industry into the satisfactory position it is in to-day, and it is responsible for the keen support given to us by the Federal Government. Mr. Bruce recently visited Queensland so that he might get a first-hand knowledge of the conditions existing, and of the importance of the sugar industry in regard to the White Australia policy. It was because of the position placed before Mr. Bruce when he visited Queensland that he moved in the matter, and saw that we got an embargo on sugar for the next three years. Personally, I think that the embargo should have been for five years, because I have

grown sugar myself, and I know that for the first three years you do not bring about a stabilisation of the industry, as far as the individual is concerned. The reason for the over-production is that we have increased our area from 160,000 acres to 220,000 acres, and we have 6,000 growers to-day, where we had 4,000 some time back. It is essential that we should do everything possible to assist the people engaged in that industry. The Baldwin Government in Great Britain have done admirable work in the matter of giving us preference in the sugar industry, and it is very gratifying to know that the British Government have not only given preference in regard to sugar imported, but are also dealing with other lines that are being imported into the United Kingdom. Dealing with this matter, the “Sugar Journal” says—

“The Collector of Customs advises that the export rebate on Australian sugar used in locally-manufactured goods exported from the Commonwealth has been fixed as from 1st December, 1924, at the following rates:—Jam, canned fruit, condensed milk, £11 13s. per ton on sugar content; other products, £13 per ton on sugar content.”

That must be very gratifying to those engaged in the sugar industry, because it is going to be the means of putting somewhere about £600,000 into the pockets of the sugar-growers, which they were debarred from getting when the Ramsay MacDonald Government were in power in Great Britain. Dominion preference is what we should look for, and we should be very pleased that we have a Government in power in Great Britain that have done so much for us in that regard. Australia's share in this preference amounts to £855,000. Several of the items are enumerated in this article, and amongst those that would benefit are—

	£
Sugar ... ..	614,000
Sultanas ... ..	105,000
Wine ... ..	60,000
Lexias ... ..	14,000
Currants ... ..	10,000
Canned fruit ... ..	4,000

It is very gratifying to know that we have been given such a substantial preference, and I am informed that this preference is to be in force for the next ten years.

The hon. member for Coorcoora dwelt for a time on the matter of State enterprises. As we have seen in the Press lately, the Cabinet have decided, on the advice of the Minister in charge of State Enterprises, to write the losses down by £808,000. If a private board of directors were to do such a thing as that, I do not think the shareholders in the company could look for dividends for a considerable time. When we have a body of directors such as the State Government doing that, it shows they have very little faith in the success of their State enterprises. The State stations last year showed a considerable loss. I am not going deeply into the matter, but the average price of stock on the State stations at 30th June, 1924, was £3 12s. 4d. I am going to show how the Government made the State butcher shops show a profit at the expense of the State stations. The Auditor-General's report on State Enterprises for the year ending 30th June, 1924, states—

“The principal factor affecting the  
*Mr. Clayton.]*”

increase in the sales for the year under review was the sale of 10,000 bullocks to the Riverstone Meat Company at £7 16s. 3d. per head on trucks at the nearest railway station. This sale alone represented £78,125, and one of the conditions of sale was payment in full by the 30th June, whether all cattle were delivered or not. At that date, however, only 5,261 head had been delivered."

Although there were only half the number of bullocks delivered on 30th June, the position was that the Riverstone Company had to pay for every beast, and that allowed the Government to show larger receipts than they were entitled to do. A summary of sales is given for comparative purposes. One of the items is the Riverstone Meat Company, 10,000 cattle, gross value £78,125; net value £75,886 3s. 6d. The State stations got that credit, yet the average price for the bullocks that they sold to the Riverstone Meat Company was £7 11s. 9d.

The Government sold to the State butcheries 3,949 head of bullocks, for which the net average price was only £3 13s. 3d. That is the price they were compelled to sell to the State butcher shops for to let them show a profit; and then they turn round and tell us that the State butcher shops are competing with private enterprise. The Auditor-General goes on to say—

"As indicated above, 3,949 head of cattle were sold to the State butcheries at prices fixed by the Commissioner averaging £3 13s. 3d. per head on the station."

There would have been a considerable loss shown by the State butcheries if, instead of getting the cattle at the average value of £3 13s. 3d. per head from the State stations, they had had to buy in the open market.

I asked to-day whether it was the intention of the Government to place the Hospital Tax on income instead of land, and I got a very emphatic "No" from the Home Secretary—a statement to the effect that they [3.30 p.m.] did not intend to amend the Act in the direction I indicated, and that the man on the land would still have to pay the tax. I say that no more iniquitous tax has been placed on the man on the land than the Hospital Tax. We have several hospitals in the Maryborough district, and the Maryborough City Council, with the assistance of the Committee of the Lady Musgrave Hospital in Maryborough, approached the Government with a view to the constitution of a Hospital Board, and a Board was established to include the Municipality of Maryborough and the Shires of Tiaro, Woocoo, and Burrum. Mr. Chuter came up to address the delegates, and told them that a Board was to be created, and went on to say—

"Taking the existing conditions as a basis, in Maryborough, if voluntary contributions continued, the burden on local authorities would be .56 of a penny in the £1, and without contributions .90 of a penny in the £1."

Already the local authorities are being taxed 1d. in the £1, and since that tax has been imposed the Board has made application to borrow £20,000 for the erection of buildings which will involve the payment of £560 yearly in interest and redemption. That is apart altogether from the increased cost of running those institutions. The result shows that at the first attempt they were wrong.

[Mr. Clayton.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Where were they wrong?

Mr. CLAYTON: Mr. Chuter was wrong in stating the tax would be under one penny. It is most unjust to place 40 per cent. of the cost of the upkeep of hospitals on the man on the land, when there are many persons who are evading the tax altogether. A man who is engaged in primary production must have in my district land worth £500 if he is to make the equivalent of the worker in the city who is getting a basic wage. Suppose that the income of that man with £500 worth of land is £200 a year, and the professional man, who only needs an allotment worth £100, has an income of perhaps £600, it means that the man on the land pays five times the tax of the man with three times the income. Where is the justice of "dealing it out" to the man on the land in that way? Do you not think that the Hospital Tax should be placed on all incomes instead of only on the man on the land? We know that in the cities in many instances it can be passed on, but the primary producer is compelled to pay it. Moreover, it was contemplated when the Hospitals Act was passed that the voluntary contributions would continue to the extent of at least 30 per cent., but there is evidently something wrong in the experience of the Maryborough Board. The Board appointed one of the keenest organisers you could get to go through the district and organise benefits for the hospitals. He canvassed the towns and district within the area. For the first fortnight of his appointment he collected £24, for the second fortnight £57, and for the third fortnight £28. His remuneration was £6 a week and 5 per cent. on collections and residence, etc. It was costing £16 to collect £24, and he got disgusted and would not continue in the position.

Let me now show the unfairness of the Home Department with regard to our hospitals. The amount of endowment for the period from 1st July, 1923, to 30th June, 1924, for the Maryborough Hospital was £5,693 13s. 5d. The department had already paid £2,844, leaving a balance of £2,849 13s. 5d. Subsequently they forwarded £946, leaving an endowment due amounting to £1,903 13s. 5d. The people who had contributed during the year 1923-24 were told that, if they contributed £1 towards the upkeep of the hospitals, the Government would subsidise the amount to the extent of £2. I understand that these endowments are paid quarterly. For the first two quarters the Government met their obligations, but during the next quarter the Hospital Board was established, and the Government paid endowment for two quarters and two months only. Nothing was paid for the last quarter. The Government were four months short in their payment of endowment for that year. The Board has been treated most unjustly by the department. The department should have kept faith with those who subscribed towards the upkeep of the hospitals. The Board has been deprived of one-quarter of the endowment due.

Let me now deal with the question of the boundary of the Maryborough Hospital district. It extends to within 9 miles of Gympie. The Gympie Hospital is carrying on under the voluntary system, but it is hard to get any voluntary contributions from the area which is contributing towards the upkeep of the Maryborough Hospital. That position is going to be the means of forcing the Gympie Hospital under a Board, and it has taken a certain amount of territory from the Gympie

Hospital district and placed it in the Maryborough Hospital district. The Gympie Hospital and ambulance are conducted on very sound financial lines, and this change in territory will act against the best interests of the primary producers in the Gympie area. The action of the Government in handing over that territory to the Maryborough Hospital district will compel the Gympie Hospital to come under a Board in the near future. I am utterly opposed to the boundaries of the Maryborough Hospital district. Just recently I introduced a deputation to the Home Secretary regarding this matter. He informed the members of the deputation that nothing would be done in the matter, and added that he was going to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter of the redistribution of the shire boundaries, and on receipt of this report the matter would be rectified.

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

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): A perusal of the Speech delivered by His Excellency on Tuesday last must add to the regrets we all feel at his departure from Brisbane. No further proof of the desirableness of having a Governor possessing unbiassed views—one who has not taken part in the controversies which divide us—is required than the present occupant of the office. Sir Matthew Nathan has discharged the duties of his office with great advantage to the State. I fail to understand the sort of insane desire which seems to actuate hon. members opposite in their endeavour to sever every tie that binds us to the Empire. Looking at the matter wholly and solely from an Australian point of view, what would be our position with our handful of 500,000 or 600,000 people, and the seething mass of coloured population only a day's sail from our shores, if it were not for the British Empire? What would be saved from a monetary point of view by the appointment of a local Governor? A local man would require just about the same staff as an imported Governor, and judging by what we have seen of the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite when they have had the opportunity to indulge in what we commonly call "swank," the expenses would be a great deal more. I do not suppose the salary would be less. The appointment of a Governor from overseas tends to keep the Empire together, while the interchange of views, the conveyance of knowledge of the position in the different parts of the Dominions to the centre in Great Britain; and the return after a few years of office of such men as Sir Matthew Nathan must be of advantage to those who control the destinies of the Empire at headquarters. Every argument tends towards the retention of the present custom of getting men such as our present Governor from the old country to reside amongst us.

Then, again, His Excellency points out himself the very great advantage he will be to this State for some time to come after he leaves us and returns to England. He will be there at the centre of the Empire, able to point out the advantages we possess, and the wonderful country we own. It does seem that the preferential tariff for Empire products will assist to keep the Empire together. I speak very feelingly on the subject, because this Empire preference is going to be of great advantage this year to the interest I represent. These preferential duties will add

something like £600,000 to the sugar interests this year. But for the preferential duty of £4 per ton on sugar, the position as regards this great agricultural industry would, unfortunately, have been worse. That appears peculiar, in view of all that hon. members opposite say in the matter and of their denunciation of Empire preference. As regards the portion of His Excellency's Speech expressing his opinions, it speaks for itself to all who wish to read it.

Regarding that portion where His Excellency is speaking for his advisers, we come to the usual dope that is administered to the electors of Queensland year after year for the purpose of concealing the position. I think it is becoming increasingly difficult to conceal that position. We know that our secondary industries are stagnant at the present time. Take the case of one of our big primary industries—mining. Through the recent action of the Government, the directors of one of our largest mines contemplated closing down, and the mine is kept open only by means of the subsidy supplied by the Government. That subsidy is only postponing the evil day. It is limiting the ability of that mine, and will still further react on the mass of unemployment in the State. That subsidy distinctly comes from the pockets of those who are already furnishing employment, and so it lessens the ability of those people to employ labour. Such a condition of affairs is a disgrace to any Government representing a country like Queensland.

Regarding secondary industries, speaker after speaker has acknowledged that the success of our primary products is largely dependent on the local markets. Hon. members opposite try to gloss over the position, but their efforts are simply administrations of dope. The hon. member for Chillagoe recently stated that our present position was due to the action of the Federal Government. If that is so, how is it that other States are able to go ahead, and that Queensland is the only State handicapped? I shall quote the number of factory employees in the different States, and, after all, that is the principal feature to view, as their increase or otherwise indicates the standard of our industries and the general position of employment—

EMPLOYEES IN FACTORIES.			
State.	1918-1919.	1922-1923.	Increase.
New South Wales	127,591	152,266	24,675
Victoria.. ..	122,349	152,625	30,276
Queensland ..	40,990	43,403	2,413
South Australia	27,915	34,695	6,780
West Australia..	12,917	19,097	6,180

While the other States in the Commonwealth have increased the number of employees in the secondary industries during three years by from 6,000 to 30,000, in Queensland the number of employees working in the secondary industries has only increased by 2,413.

As showing how Queensland compares with the rest of Australia, I find that, whereas the increase in the number of employees engaged in secondary industries for the whole of Australia during that period was 4.30 per cent., in Queensland it was only 2.73 per cent.

Now let us take agriculture. In the year 1914—the year before the present Government took office—there were 792,586 acres

*Mr. Swayne.]*

under the plough. In 1923 the area under plough had reached 871,968 acres—an increase of 79,382. That is not a very large increase in such a State as Queensland, but, when you take the circumstances into consideration, you will find that even that increase is not nearly so large as it would appear, because I find that the greatest increase was in connection with the sugar industry. I may say that credit for the prosperity in the sugar industry does not in any way rest with this Government. If anything, the Queensland Government have hampered instead of encouraging the sugar industry. Prosperity in the sugar industry depends on the price we receive for our sugar, and the fixing of the price is entirely in the hands of the Commonwealth Government. Of the total increase of 79,382 acres under cultivation over 58,000 acres are due to the increased area under sugar-cane, leaving the increase in general farming at a little over 20,000 acres for a period of something like ten years. That shows what a disastrous position we are getting into compared with the other States, not only in regard to our secondary industries but also in regard to our primary industries. This has led to stagnation of trade in Queensland.

Take another very important feature—mileage of railways constructed. In a vast country like Queensland it is necessary that we should have communication with our back country, and we find that during the period 1914 to 1924—that is the term that the present Government have been in office—only 1,202 miles of railway were opened. If you take the nine years before the present Government came into power, we find that 1,621 miles of railway were opened. In other words, 33 per cent. more miles of railway were built during the last nine years of the previous Government than have been built during the time the present party have been in office. That justifies me in saying that in their hands the country is going back. It really is going back, because you cannot call that progress in a young country like Queensland. If no further argument were given to induce the electors to change their administrators, I think the figures I have quoted are quite sufficient.

Coming back to agriculture, I wish to point out that, although the increase has been so despicable during the time the present Government have been in office, the increase in the number of acres under cultivation for the nine years before they took office was 269,820 acres compared with a total increase, including sugar, of 79,382 acres since they came into office.

It is a strange thing that in a young, sparsely populated country like Queensland the question of immigration is absent from the policy of the Government as indicated in the Governor's Speech. But, although that is absent from the Speech, it has bulked very largely in the discussion this afternoon. As usual, hon. members opposite have made reflections on the Commonwealth Government. I am alluding to the furore we have had from the other side with regard to immigration from Southern Europe. For sheer cant, humbug, and hypocrisy, it would be very hard to beat hon. members opposite. We had the hon. member for Gregory and another hon. member getting up and insinuating that there is some deep conspiracy between Mr. Bruce and the south-eastern nations of Europe on this point.

[Mr. Swayne.

Compare their utterances with those of other prominent members opposite on this point. I have a very high regard for the Italians and for their ability in carrying out agricultural work which, unfortunately, many of our own people seem loth to undertake. The stand I take is that, while we welcome all good immigrants from Europe, it is a bad thing to see them congregated together and forming communities of their own, in which they live apart from the rest of us and do not become Australians, but simply remain as it were natives of the country they came from, keeping their own language and customs apart from ours. I do not think that is a good thing, and I object to them congregating in unduly large numbers in the sugar industry. It seems to me that all hope of getting a continuation of the treatment we are at present experiencing from the South will be largely minimised if the sugar industry is allowed to get into the hands of one class of alien owners. It would destroy the great argument for fair treatment from the sugar consumers. It is very difficult to ascertain the position of hon. members opposite. These are my views. What are those of hon. members opposite? For instance, I find that the hon. member for Chillagoe—perhaps with a view to future contingencies in regard to a contest that he has in contemplation—speaking in Townsville on 14th April last, said—

“The difficulty which existed was not that the Italians were coming in, but that the market was flooded. That difficulty would have existed if the same number of any other nation came in. The difficulty was not that the Italians were coming in, but that there was a tendency for them to centre in one district. But the 1,800 Italians who came into the country last year were only a small proportion of the total, as 14,000 people had come to Queensland, many of them from the Southern States; therefore, if there was a labour difficulty, the Italians were not wholly to blame.”

Yet, on the other hand, we know that the South Johnstone mill was hung up for some weeks over this difficulty. We had the Secretary for Mines and another Cabinet Minister commenting on the seriousness of the question when they came back from the North, pointing out how they were displacing British and Australian workers. Again, we find that our present Premier, when speaking in Brisbane at the time of the recent New South Wales election, said—

“The matter was reviewed at length by the State Cabinet, yesterday, and subsequently the Premier (Mr. Gillies) made the following statement: ‘In view of the recent great increase in the number of alien migrants arriving in North Queensland, the Cabinet to-day decided that the matter was one for immediate and serious consideration by the Government. I had already, on Saturday last, wired to the Prime Minister in the following terms:—“In re the recent influx of aliens into North Queensland, I desire to call your immediate attention to the Press statements—that awards are being evaded by methods difficult to deal with.”

Then we have him again saying, when speaking at Tweed Heads—

“The Labour party favoured immigration of the right class, but objected to

the flooding of the country with the scum of Europe."

I do not know whom he calls "the scum of Europe." Then again, we find the same hon. gentleman making a statement [4 p.m.] in which he endorses the remarks of the late Premier. I am now quoting from the "Standard" of 14th April of this year—

"The Premier, Mr. Gillies, when asked to comment on Mr. Theodore's reported utterance at Townsville regarding the Italian influx and immigration generally, and on the suggestion that Mr. Theodore's views were in direct conflict with those of the Cabinet, said this morning—'On the contrary, Mr. Theodore's remarks are quite in accord with my own.'"

I have just read an utterance of the hon. gentleman which appears to me to be in direct conflict with Mr. Theodore's statement, so that it is really hard to understand where the present Premier stands on the matter. A former Agent-General, Mr. J. M. Hunter, made these remarks about the same question—

"Regarding migration, Mr. Hunter said he had approved of a very large number of Italians being brought out by Queensland because they went to the North and engaged in the development of the sugar fields. As they got accustomed to the country they became holders of small areas, and developed into useful citizens, and would assist to solve the labour difficulty to a large degree, because the big sugar estates would disappear in favour of smaller holdings, which Italian families themselves would work."

Yet we have members of the same party denouncing Mr. Bruce because he refuses to take some drastic action against these people. To show further the differences of opinion which prevail on the other side on this matter, I shall quote what an official of the Australian Workers' Union, Mr. T. J. Morrissey, has to say on the point—

"Never has this matter caused so much reflection or thought in these parts amongst the British population as at present, and on all sides the unanimous note has been sounded that unless the importations of these people cease, the British workers will be compelled to forego their right of obtaining a livelihood in an industry which has taken years of effort on their part to make it what it is to-day—an industry fit for the white man to live in."

Now, let us see what the position really is. As I say, the Labour party's whole concern seems to be to throw responsibility on the Commonwealth Government. I just want to show, however, that they have in their own hands the fullest powers to deal with this matter as it affects the sugar industry, that is, if they like to take action, if it is necessary—as they say it is—and, had they done so, it would have prevented the strike at South Johnstone this season and prevented a loss of three weeks in the work of that mill. I have here the Sugar Cultivation Act of 1913, as published in a book issued in 1922, by the Department of Justice, called "The Labour Laws of Queensland," so that it is pretty recent. The Sugar Cultivation

Act prohibits the employment of certain forms of labour except under certain conditions. Section 2 defines what is meant by a certificate of having passed a dictation test, describing how it shall be administered by a State officer, and then section 3 provides—

"After the passing of this Act, it shall be unlawful for any person who has not first obtained in the prescribed manner a certificate of having passed the dictation test to engage in or carry on the cultivation of sugar-cane upon any land within Queensland of which such person, whether individually or in partnership or association with others, is the occupier."

It goes on to say that any person who contravenes the section is liable to a penalty not exceeding £100 and the forfeiture of his crop, and section 4 goes on to provide—

"After the passing of this Act—

(i.) Any employer who either directly or indirectly or under any pretence or device, attempts to employ or employs or authorises or permits to be employed, in or in connection with the industry of the cultivation of sugar-cane and the manufacture therefrom of sugar, any person who has not first obtained a certificate of having passed the dictation test;

(ii.) Any person who has not first obtained a certificate of having passed the dictation test who is employed in or in connection with such industry; shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to the penalties following:—

(a) In the case of an individual employer, to a penalty not exceeding £5 for each day on which such employee is employed in contravention of this provision;

(b) In the case of an employer who is a partnership, firm, or corporation, to a penalty not exceeding £10 for each day on which such employee is employed in contravention of this provision;

(c) In the case of an employee, to a penalty not exceeding 40s. for each day on which he is employed in contravention of this provision."

That section justifies me in saying that already the Government have sufficient powers on the statute-book to enable them to deal with the difficulty and correct the abuse, if there is an abuse. Why all this talk about the Prime Minister, and why all this concoction about a conspiracy on the part of the Federal Government? It is all utter nonsense. The remarks of the hon. member for Buranda and the hon. member for Gregory are pure nonsense. The Government have sufficient powers in their own hands.

Mr. HYNES: Have the Bruce Government not got sufficient power?

Mr. SWAYNE: The Government have the power to take action if they think harm is being done by the introduction of these people. We are not questioning the position. Hon. members opposite are questioning the position, and, if they are game to stand up to their opinions, they have sufficient power to take action. The hon. member for Chillingoe, when he was electioneering amongst those people and pandering for their votes, remarked what excellent colonists they were.

*Mr. Swayne.]*

Judging by the ex-Premier's climb-down on the 44-hour week question it is apparent that the Australian Workers' Union is his boss, and that organisation denounces the Italians and desires to excommunicate them with bell, book, and candle. On top of that we have the remarks made by the hon. member for Buranda and the hon. member for Gregory.

All is not well in Queensland. We are not establishing any secondary industries, and discouragement has extended to our primary industries. In support of my statement I desire to quote comments made on remarks by Archbishop Duhig. The remarks are contained in the "Brisbane Courier" of 19th September, 1924—

"Archbishop Duhig on Wednesday last said that they had been the 'victims of circumstances against which they should have been guarded.' These circumstances were the 'faulty methods of land settlement.'"

Yet hon. members opposite have the effrontery to say that all is well under their rule!

We know that at the present time the prosperity in the sugar industry is threatened by the maritime strike. The spirit which is at the bottom of that strike has been encouraged by the present Administration.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you blame us for the strike in China?

Mr. SWAYNE: At the commencement of the session I asked the Secretary for Public Lands a certain question, and, although he avoided the question or prevaricated, I maintain that the people of Queensland were entitled to a proper answer.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in using such language in regard to the Secretary for Public Lands.

Mr. SWAYNE: I do not desire to be unparliamentary. The people will be able to form their own opinions upon the matter. What I want to refer to is this distinct countenancing and approval by hon. members opposite of the Russian Soviets. If they stand for the methods adopted by that body, well and good; let them stand up and say so and justify it. What I complain of is the hypocrisy of them when they go before the electors. They then pose as moderates, but at the same time they smoothe and pander to those people at every opportunity that offers. If these things are wrong, they have a bad effect on the young people growing up, especially when they see the rulers of the land countenancing and encouraging the exhibition of such sentiments as have been displayed on occasions. This is no mere bogey! There is no doubt whatever that the Bolsheviks are spending large sums of money the world over in propaganda; and, if the truth of the matter were known, the trouble in connection with Australian shipping would be found to be due to them. (Government laughter.) In 1917, when the endeavour was made to put Australia out of the war and prevent her assisting the allies, and industrial troubles occurred, the source of the trouble clearly pointed to the Bolsheviks, and the present shipping difficulty is due to the same cause. On 12th March last Mr. W. Marks, M.P., delivered a speech before the members of the Nationalist Club in Sydney. The report of his speech stated—

"He referred to the growth of the influence of Russian Communism, and said that 75 per cent. of the strikes in

Australia were engineered from outside. He added that he had heard more about recent strikes in Australia from Russian observers in Berlin than he had read here, and they could tell him more about Federal politics than he knew himself. He assured them that the menace was far more deadly than people could imagine, and that all the disturbances engineered here were part of a gigantic effort to destroy the British Empire."

Then, again, we find this extract from the "Times"—

"One of the activities of the Red Army is the fomenting of trouble in neighbouring States."

We also find from the report of the Central Executive of the Communist party in the South that several Queensland branches support the inclusion of avowed Communists in the movement. According to the official organ of the Australian Railways Union, the following resolution was carried by the Brisbane branch of the Australian Labour Party—

"That we request the Q.C.E. to rescind the resolution demanding the expulsion of Communists; (2) that all branches of the A.L.P. be communicated with with the view of similar resolutions being passed by them."

That spirit is extant in Australia as in other countries, unfortunately, and the strikes which periodically threaten the very existence of some of our important industries are largely due to the same propaganda. If hon. members opposite are against such a policy and believe in constitutional methods, then it does not seem logical that they should on such occasions as I have referred to countenance these matters. It is a matter that the people should pay some attention to.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They will do so. They paid a lot of attention to it in New South Wales at the last election.

Mr. SWAYNE: The agitation for the 44-hour week was instigated very largely from the same source—a source which does not seek to assist to build up our industries, but to destroy them.

I would like to point out the effect that the 44-hour week is going to have upon industry. The treatment of the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company is only staving off the evil day, and it is going to make matters more difficult for other employers. Again, through this 44-hour week, if the State Government had not gone to the assistance of the Mount Morgan Company, and enabled the undertaking to be carried on an unbusinesslike basis—it is not businesslike to subsidise a business that cannot pay its way—Australia would be dependent upon outside sources for its copper supply. All that is due to this 44-hour week. It has added £300,000 per annum to our expenditure so far as our railways are concerned. We know that the Railway Department is already losing anything from £1,000,000 to £1,500,000 per annum. Why is this further burden added? It is pointed out in the "Sugar Journal" that it will add 12 per cent. to the cost of production in that industry; and this addition is made at a time when we have to compete with the world with our own production. A more inopportune time than the present could not have been chosen for the imposition of such a burden.

[Mr. Swayne.

We heard a great deal from the hon. member who seconded the resolution about tawdry pomp and vanity in connection with the opening of Parliament. I desire to point out that another even more real malpractice is the "swank" and ostentation displayed by the spurious democrats on the other side. We all know that it is impossible, under the present Administration, to get our trains in ro time, yet I saw quite recently the Townsville Mail four hours late because it was over-loaded, and part of that load was represented by a heavy carriage weighing about 50 tons—I think it is termed the Commissioner's carriage, which contains a special bedroom, drawing-room, bathroom, and other things—being added to an already over-loaded train. That carriage was added for the benefit of one hon. member, who happens to be a candidate for Federal honours in the Herbert electorate, and his family. It was added for the sake of seven or eight people. Is that the democracy for which the Labour party stands? I do not think so. Yet hon. members opposite talk about tawdry pomp and vanity! You can far more accurately describe their attitude as spurious democracy of the worst form. Hon. members opposite appeal to their fellow-workers under the guise of being one of themselves, and yet at such a time an already over-loaded train is further over-loaded with a 50-ton carriage for the sake of one member who calls himself a democrat.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): Mr. Speaker—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This is not the Mitchelton speech—go straight on. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: You have been reading the "Courier."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What is wrong with the "Courier?"

Mr. KERR: In perusing the Speech which has been presented to Parliament, one can see at once that it contains the usual number of proposed amendments to existing legislation. That shows that the legislation of this Government has been very much of an experimental nature, which has proved to be impossible in some parts and unworkable in other parts. It also proves that the legislation has been hastily conceived; that it has been little understood, and when put into execution, it has been badly administered. One would think that after ten years' practice in administration we would have reached a state when the administration of affairs would be on a higher plane than it is. There are several proposals contained in the Speech which undoubtedly will appeal to the people at election time. It certainly contains proposals for various Bills that are more or less of a humanitarian nature. We know that when an election is due, we can expect such proposals; but I hope that before we part the serious consideration of this House will be given to them, and that experiments such as we have had to put up with from time to time will no longer be tried to the detriment of this State.

I want to say a word in passing in regard to the financial situation. I will take the opportunity when the Financial Statement is before the House of speaking further on this matter. There is one outstanding feature in regard to the finances of this State. It is that we have been living beyond our resources. We have had to borrow money to pay interest on our public debt, which is a dead loss to this State. Our public debt

has been gradually increasing, and money has been invested in unproductive works that are giving no return to-day. This is a question that can easily be tackled. Where money is to be spent it should be considered to a greater extent than is the case at the present time. It is easy enough to talk about not spending money. It is easy to spend money, especially by a Government, in directions that will not give a sufficient return for the expenditure. Taxation itself has increased to such an extent that the industries of the State are on the decline through no other reason than because of the pinpricks placed on industry. We have the Workers' Compensation Act, a very fine thing and something that is essential, but when the Government are able to place in reserve somewhere in the vicinity of £100,000 a year in connection with workers' compensation, there is something wrong. The Government are extracting too much from industry in that connection. We hear a good deal about Mount Morgan and miners' phthisis. The extraction in connection with workers' compensation from Mount Morgan is something in the vicinity of £24,000 a year. These extractions could very well be reduced, and could be placed on a footing that would give a full benefit to the people in industry.

In regard to expenditure, there is no question but that the Railway Department to-day is a sink into which money is being put. That is another thing that can be tackled. It is alleged that the loss on our railways is attributable to low rates and fares. During the last few years freights have gone up by 58 per cent., and freights on agricultural produce have gone up by 60 per cent. On sheep and wool recently there was a 20 per cent. increase, and fares have gone up considerably in the metropolitan area. The workers are suffering because of the high fares in the metropolitan area to-day. That is a factor well worth considering—that where the fare previously was 3d. it is now 4d. The statement has been made that other States have increased fares to a larger extent than Queensland. I will give the Government credit for the fact that they have not increased the fares as much as some of the other States of Australia, but, irrespective of that, the fares in Queensland are still greater than in any other State of Australia. Still the Government contend that fares and freights would have to be put up before the railways could be made to pay. The Commonwealth Statistician in the Commonwealth "Official Year Book," No. 17, 1924, page 314, shows that the freight rates in Queensland are higher than in any other State. He states that the freights in Queensland are the highest in Australia, whilst the losses are also the greatest in the Commonwealth. Then, again, our railways are not giving the service to the metropolitan area that they should do. The congestion at the Central Station to-day is a disgrace. The accommodation between the Central Station and the Enoggera and other lines is over-taxed. They are talking to-day of the potentialities of that line. What is necessary to be done is to bring about the electrification of the metropolitan railway lines, and by so doing we shall get a return for what we spend on it at a very early period. The Railway Department was never intended to cope with the traffic in the metropolitan area at all. The people want facilities to enable them to get into town, but that work

Mr. Kerr.]

should not be imposed on the Railway Department. It should be undertaken by the Tramway Trust. Yet while we have this state of things and the railways cannot give proper service to the people, the Government step in and veto the tramway extensions recommended by the Tramway Trust, acting in a dog-in-the-manger way. The people want the services, but the Government refuse to give them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The tramways cannot carry the people on the lines already built without the extensions.

Mr. KERR: The Tramway Trust applied for an Order in Council for an extension into my electorate. After approaching the

Government they were deliberately vetoed by the Cabinet, who declined to grant the extension. The time has come when we have to recognise that the people require these extended services, and the Government will either have to provide them or else get out. It is claimed by the Government that the land revenue should go as a contra account to the losses on the railways. I will not deny that there is a good deal to be said for that argument, but the whole increase in rents for the last ten years is insufficient to make up the deficits which have accrued on the railways. A great deal of regret and sympathy have been expressed on all sides in regard to the Traveston railway accident. I want to say in that connection that something must be wrong with our Railway Department, and, in my opinion, it appears to be a question of starvation to efficiency.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: How do you make that out?

Mr. KERR: I shall quote statistics to prove what I have to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to the hon. member that as the accident is now the subject of an inquiry, it is sub-judice.

Mr. KERR: Well, I would like to say, without dealing with the cause of the accident, that the personnel of the Commission who are making the inquiry is not likely to give satisfaction for this reason: The chairman is a judge of the Supreme Court, who is naturally engaged to a large extent on other important business of the State and cannot give his whole time to that important matter. Moreover, whilst the Government and the unions have been careful to look after their own interests, the concern of the public has been overlooked altogether. Had such an accident occurred in Great Britain, the Board of Trade would have stepped in immediately. They would represent the people: in effect they would be the people. In Queensland, although the people are entitled to just as much consideration, no protection is given to them, and unfortunately it seems to me that under those circumstances no useful purpose is going to be served by the inquiry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: A very unfair statement.

Mr. KERR: It is not an unfair statement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are reflecting on the personnel of the Commission.

Mr. KERR: I am not reflecting on the personnel of the Commission who are making the inquiry at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What have you been doing for the last three minutes?

[Mr. Kerr.

Mr. KERR: I say that the judge can give only the fag-end of his time to a most important public duty, and the Government are responsible for making that appointment. I say that the gentlemen who are making the inquiry do their utmost, but it is not fair to the public that they should not have a proper legal representative appearing before the Commission.

On an Address in Reply it is not usual to go into small details but to deal with larger features of public affairs, and one of the most important things with which we can deal to-day is the primary production of Queensland. No doubt hon. members opposite will contend that the State has progressed, but I can quote figures to show that that is not so. In the nine-year period prior to 1914 the number of land selections was 5,310, whereas in the ensuing nine years to 1923 the number dwindled to 2,476. During the first period there was an increase in the area under occupation of 92,000,000 acres, whereas in the second period there was a decrease of 30,000,000 acres. That is to say, whilst our population is increasing, the volume of land selection has decreased. There must be some explanation of that. And that fact has reacted upon the State in this way: The cities have increased in size whilst the country towns have dwindled. In the eight years prior to 1914 the population of the cities and towns increased by 23 per cent. and that of the shires by 34 per cent., whereas in the following eight years the percentage of increase in cities and towns was 22 per cent. whilst that of the shires had dropped down to 4 per cent. That is a position which demands some consideration from Parliament. There has been a decrease in the number of grazing farms and homesteads; there has even been a decrease in the number of prickly-pear selections.

All these things are happening under Labour administration to-day. They are the result after ten years of Labour administration.

Many years ago millions of pounds were allotted by Parliament for the purpose of assisting immigrants to this country, and no hon. member will deny that those immigrants have made the best Queenslanders and Australians that we have to-day. Fully 90 per cent. of the people of Australia are Australian-born, and by our immigration methods we were able to bring out the forefathers of those happy Australians, and we are in the happy position of having one of the best type of citizens that you can get in any country in the world. I am firmly convinced that there is not a better type of manhood and womanhood than is to be found in the Australian nation to-day. The Australians have characteristics of their own, and are capable of accomplishing great things.

Mr. DASH: Does the hon. gentleman still say the country is going to ruin?

Mr. KERR: I am saying that the people of this country are not given the fullest opportunity by the Government. When we were spending millions of pounds on immigration we were able to keep our finances on the right side of the ledger, and we were able to build up a big white army for Australia.

Mr. HYNES: The hon. member for Mirani had a "Red Army" a while ago. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: If the matter can be remedied, then we should all join in and assist to build up a nation of white people. I represent an electorate containing a large number of people, and I expect the suggestion that I have put forward to be considered.

I want to draw the attention of the Government particularly to the method of land settlement in Victoria. The Government are entitled to their own policy, but if the leasehold system is responsible for the lack of success in land settlement, then why not adopt the New South Wales or the Victorian scheme, and throw open 100,000 acres of freehold farm land every year? The system of leasehold is not giving beneficial results, and why should we continue with a theory that is not giving a beneficial return? The Government have had ten years to try out their theory; but, instead of it being a success, there has been a falling-off in figures with respect to land settlement. Another factor operating against the success of land settlement is the lack of money available for that purpose. Restrictions and embargoes of all descriptions have been imposed because we are told that the money is not available. If the money is not available, then whose fault is it? It is the fault of the Government, and if they are not going to stand up to their responsibilities, then it is time that we told them it was their duty to do so.

Mr. COLLINS interjected.

Mr. KERR: Talk a little bit of sense for a change. (Laughter.) I can understand the hon. gentleman not getting into the Ministry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Perhaps you did 100 yards in even time last night. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: I know all about that. A few years ago, where some of the States progressed at three or four times the rate of Queensland, they are now advancing at six and seven times the rate of our State. That only goes to show that the other States are obtaining money and advancing it to the farmers to enable them to increase their production. In Queensland land settlement is going back, and it is absolutely imperative that some beneficial action be taken.

All these factors are operating in regard to land settlement. There is the fact of land taxation. Before this Government came into office no land taxation was levied. Since their advent to office they have collected in land taxation over £4,000,000. Land rentals have also gone up considerably, and the capital value of land has increased by 10s. an acre. All these facts demand some consideration. The important factor I desire to emphasise is that, while the figures in regard to this land settlement have shown no improvement at all, there has been no compensating factor for the increase in the population of the cities of Queensland. It was said at Geneva that Queensland and Australia generally should be a primary-producing country. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I do not agree with that view. There should be a compensating factor for the increase of population in our cities. We find to-day that the industries are going down. In the 1914-23 period the number of factories in Victoria increased by 1,446, whereas the increase in Queensland was only eighty-two. In the small State of Tasmania, which is more of a primary-producing State than Queensland—

The PREMIER: Do you know that a building with one man and a machine constitutes a factory in Tasmania?

Mr. KERR: A shop with a counter constitutes a factory in Queensland. The increase of factories in Tasmania for the same period numbered eighty-six. For the same period there was an increase of 34,000 employees engaged in the factories in Victoria, while the increase in Queensland was only 121. Yet our population has increased by thousands; our boys have left the schools in thousands, and many of them are without trades. The increase in the number of factories has not progressed with the increase in the population. Although a Labour Government has been in power in Queensland for twelve years or a little longer, a lower percentage of the output from the factories is received by the employees therein than in any other State. In Queensland the employee only receives 19.69 per cent. of the output from the factory, whereas in Western Australia the percentage is as high as 32.92 per cent. Here in Queensland, with a Government in power allegedly to help the workers, a less percentage of the output is returned to them than in any other State in Australia. The value of the production from factories for the 1914-23 period undoubtedly calls for serious consideration. Whereas the average increase for Australia was 102 per cent., the increase in Queensland was only 59 per cent. That is a fair basis of comparison. I have here the report of the Inspector of Factories and Shops for 1924, in which is stated—

“The number of employees in factories is slightly less than in the previous year, while the employees in shops have increased by 940.”

It is all right to talk about the large buildings being erected, as some hon. members opposite have done to-day, but there is the undeniable fact that, while last year the number of employees in shops increased approximately by 1,000, the number of employees in factories last year decreased. These are facts which require the very serious consideration of the Government. Things are not progressing. We have had the best of seasons lately. There has been a great turnover in wool, an abundant harvest of sugar, and conditions in other industries pointing to prosperity. Either these statistics are wrong, or the State is not progressing. Certainly something is wrong, and the worker is not getting the result for his output, as are workers in other States.

Again, the Executive Council of this Government are exercising too much power altogether. In many respects that Council is to-day exercising the functions of Parliament itself. If one turns up proclamations issued by that Council and dealing with certain Acts, it will be found that they are doing absolutely anything they like. I have one which I shall read. I have not the date of it, as it is an extract—

“Whereas it has become necessary to take such action as appears most conducive towards safeguarding the interests of the public, the operations of the Sugar Acquisition Act of 1915 is extended.”

and so on, to exclude or include any possible thing that they could think of. The Government bring in these additions to Acts without being subjected to any control. That is a

position that should not be tolerated by any State that has a representative Parliament. Even Labour members will agree with that. I have another Order in Council or proclamation by the Cabinet dealing with the Fish Supply Act of 1916 providing that, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, that Council may from time to time make whatever alterations, practically, that it thinks fit. From time to time I have found these additions to Acts, outrageous things that are done without the knowledge of the public and without the sanction of this Parliament. If insufficient provision is made in a Bill, the Executive Council bring in an Order in Council to make good what has been omitted. It is time that such a state of affairs was remedied.

Passing over to the matter of the unemployed, one reads with amazement the allegedly marvellous book issued by the present Government, called "The Unemployment Problem. Proposed Solution by the Labour Government of Queensland." Actually we find that another year of unemployment has passed, due obviously to the policy of this Government. Want and misery have increased in Queensland. Big business interests are better catered for to-day by this Government, and are coining money. It may be a paradox, nevertheless it is true that, while the workers are suffering from unemployment, big business interests are being catered for and are making enormous sums of money. Any clear-thinking man will realise that that statement is correct. In this book we have recent reports of union secretaries to guide us as to the true condition of affairs. When reporting conditions, these secretaries categorise matters "Poor"; "Very poor"; "Not encouraging"; "Not bright"; "Worse"; "Number unemployed"; and against that last classification we read "Large number."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: How does it compare with Victoria?

Mr. KERR: I am not concerned about Victoria. I am talking about the proposed solution of the unemployed question by the Labour Government. There are numbers of unemployed to-day, and you cannot do anything with them. You do not know what to do with them. You enacted legislation, and under the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act the Government say that, when there are large numbers of unemployed, they will instruct the local authorities to carry out certain works. Unemployment is rife to-day, and they have not been game to do that. I say definitely that they would rather see these people starve than give the local authorities the millions they are requiring for urgent works.

Mr. HYNE: Why don't you put them on canvassing?

Mr. KERR: There is no necessity in the Enoggera electorate.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You could have given one of the unemployed a job last night in acting as your seconder. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: There were some twenty people there quite all right.

Let me deal now with another point. While the people are unemployed, and while there is a good deal of distress in our midst to-day, what about the housing problem? You cannot get a house to let in Brisbane

[Mr. Kerr.

to-day. Commission agents to-day are subdividing houses—not subdividing land, but subdividing houses—and calling for tenders. Why are they doing that? Because the Government have never been game enough to borrow money to build workers' dwellings.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They subdivided the Opposition, too, lately.

Mr. KERR: After ten years of Labour government there are hundreds of people in this city of ours of nearly a quarter of a million who are ready to buy land in order to build a home, but the Government say that it is impossible to advance money to build homes. An embargo is placed on workers' dwellings. This under a Labour Government! If the Country Progressive party get into power, a loan will be immediately floated to supply the wants of the people in this regard. Not only will they do that, but they will advance up to 95 per cent. to enable these men to build their homes. You cannot expect the working man to plunk down as much as £50 to obtain a home. These are the things that are happening in our midst under a Labour Government. The Government in the opening Speech have not tackled this question of housing.

Mr. COLLINS: Have you read the Workers' Homes Act?

Mr. KERR: The Workers' Homes Act does not appeal to the majority of the people at all.

Mr. HANSON: Why?

Mr. KERR: The hon. member should know that it deals only with leasehold land, and the people will not have it. They all want freehold. Why, the Premier himself has a freehold in my electorate. Good luck to him! The people have a mind of their own, and you have to meet their requirements. All these years the Labour Government have been trying to guide people into channels that do not suit their requirements. The Government to-day have closed down on workers' dwellings, and the people are asking what they are going to do.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the seamen's strike?

Mr. KERR: The seamen's strike and the agitation going on is backed up by the Labour Government to-day. I have no doubt at all that the Bruce-Page Government will deal with the matter as it should be dealt with. The Bruce-Page Government will handle the situation as the Australian people expect them to handle it. Make no mistake about that. The Bruce-Page Government in the Commonwealth are quite capable of handling this situation, and I venture to say that they will give the people of Australia what they expect. We have hundreds of men thrown out of employment because of this strike, and other men being put off here and there, and something will have to be done to bring about a better state of affairs. Even in Great Britain they have placed as much as £12,000,000 to a fund established under an Act passed for the purpose of the acquisition of small dwellings for workers. These things ought to be done in Queensland. There are no investors to-day who will build homes to let; but they will build a home for about £400, which they will sell for £700 with a deposit and charge up to 3 per cent. interest. The housing of the people is a social problem. About one-third of our

population are without proper house accommodation to-day, and they will have to be provided for. In Queensland and Australia generally the people are mostly living in the capitals. In England the people do not live in the capital cities to the same extent as the people do in Australia. I believe that the population in London is only 7 per cent. of the whole population of the country. Here we have as many as 44 per cent. of the population of Australia living in the six capital cities of Australia.

Mr. HYNES: There is a smaller percentage of the population living in the cities in this State than in any other State of the Commonwealth, and we have had ten years of Labour Government.

Mr. KERR: I know that is a fact, but the population is coming into the cities in Queensland from the country districts, and we must improve the situation.

There is another aspect of the question. Medical officers are continuously through the Press warning us of the serious effect of malnutrition, overcrowding, and the need of more house accommodation. In moving about I have seen some desperate hardships suffered by children because the housing accommodation is not what it should be. This is a problem we can very well tackle, and, if a Bill is brought in to make the housing conditions better than they are now, it will have the full support of every hon. member of the House.

The present Premier lately stated—

“One of the best proofs of a country's prosperity was the value of its exports over imports. Taking this test for the last three years Queensland showed to great advantage. Queensland's total exports over imports amounted to £16,954,843.”

Mr. HYNES: It shows that the State is in a solvent position.

Mr. KERR: I am not denying that the Premier's statement is correct, but he has not tackled this question properly. There was an election on at the time he made this statement, and he made some of the most misleading statements I have heard. What is the other side of the question? We must make a fair and equitable comparison. The figures with regard to exports and imports in Queensland for 1914 and 1923, respectively, are as follow:—

COMPARISON.

—	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of Exports.
	£	£	£
1914 ..	13,015,484	6,428,688	6,586,796
1923 ..	15,782,072	10,783,541	4,998,531

So much for the figures quoted by the Premier. Going back as far as ten years, we are able to show that the excess of our exports over our imports was greater than it is to-day.

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

Mr. KELSO (*Vundah*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.  
Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 5.0 p.m.