

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 4 AUGUST 1925**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 4 AUGUST, 1925.

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

QUESTIONS.

NON-VOTERS AT TOOWOOMBA BY-ELECTION.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Attorney-General—

In connection with the recent by-election at Toowoomba,

“1. How many names were on the roll at the date of the election?”

“2. How many electors failed to vote?”

“3. How many show-cause letters were sent out by the returning officer to the persons who failed to record their votes?”

“4. What number of replies to such letters were received?”

“5. What number of such letters were returned through the dead letter office?”

“6. How many persons have been prosecuted?”

“7. How many intended further prosecutions?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) replied—

“1. 7,696.

“2. 1,595.

“3. 1,595.

“4. 494.

“5. 573.

“6. 4.

“7. 1.”

HOUSE SHORTAGE IN GREATER BRISBANE;  
ADVANCES FOR WORKERS' DWELLINGS.

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

“1. Is he aware there is a house shortage in the Greater Brisbane area?”

“2. What embargo was placed by the Government in regard to advances for workers' dwellings, giving amounts and dates since 1st July, 1923?”

“3. Would it not be to the advantage of the State to meet the requirements of the community, so far as housing is concerned, to deviate funds from losing State investments into homes for the workers. If so, will he make every endeavour to meet the situation?”

“4. What rate of interest was charged the Advances Corporation for moneys appropriated by Parliament for the financial years ended 30th June, 1924 and 1925?”

“5. At what rate did the Government secure these funds?”

“6. When the State Savings Bank was transferred to the Commonwealth, what were the accumulated profits standing to reserve?”

“7. Was this paid into the ordinary revenue account of this State?”

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

“1. The numerous Press advertisements of dwellings for sale by house agents suggest that there is no appreciable shortage. Perhaps the hon. member is referring to a possible shortage

of houses for renting by persons who do not wish to purchase a home; the Government is not engaged in the business of building houses for this purpose.

"2. December, 1923.—Applications were received without restriction, but priority of construction was given to houses not exceeding a cost of about £500. August, 1924.—New applications were not received for workers' dwellings nor for workers' homes to cost over about £500. January, 1925.—Applications were received for both workers' dwellings and workers' homes up to a cost of about £500. June, 1925.—The foregoing restrictions were removed.

"3. See answer to No. 1. The Government will continue to suitably provide for the operations of the State Advances Corporation in a way which will best serve the interests of the community.

"4. From 4 per cent. to 4½ per cent.

"5. From 4½ per cent. to 6 per cent.

"6. £362,205 ls. 2d.

"7. The amount was credited to a Trust Fund, and subsequently portion was transferred to revenue. The accumulated profits in connection with workers' dwellings operations are carried forward from year to year as shown by the annual reports of the manager of the State Advances Corporation."

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND—RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

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

"1. What is the total amount of money contributed under the Unemployed Workers' Insurance Act of 1922 up to and including 30th June, 1925, by—

(a) Government employees?

(b) The Government?

(c) Employees other than Government employees?

(d) Employers other than the Government?

"2. What is the total amount of unemployed insurance disbursed up to and including 30th June, 1925?

"3. In what manner are contributions under the Act invested, and at what rate of interest?

"4. What is the total amount of interest earned on such contributions up to and including 30th June, 1925?

"5. (a) Are blacksmiths, carpenters, clerks, labourers, shop assistants, stonemasons, waterside workers, and miners paid unemployment insurance under identical conditions; (b) If not, why not?"

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

"1. Separate particulars as above are not available. A record is available of the amount contributed by permanent employees of the State and by the Government as employer in respect of such permanent employees, for the financial year ended 30th June, 1925. Full particulars will be given in the annual report, which will be tabled in the course of a few weeks. The total amounts contri-

buted up to and including the 30th June, 1925, were—

	£	s.	d.
(a) Employees ...	181,554	5	8
(b) Employers ...	181,554	5	8

Total ... .. £363,108 11 4

"2. Presumably the information desired is the amount of sustenance disbursed. Sustenance payments to the date in question amounted to £337,120 12s. 2d.

"3. All contributions are remitted to the Treasury. The investment of surplus funds is a matter in the discretion of the Honourable the Treasurer.

"4. See answer to Question 3.

"5. With the exception of waterside workers and workers in the coalmining industry, the workers in the above-mentioned callings are paid sustenance under identical conditions. With regard to waterside workers and workers in the coalmining industry, the Unemployment Council, on which employers have representation, made rules in pursuance of powers given them by the Act, providing for the payment of sustenance based on the number of days unemployed in each month. In ordinary callings workers are not paid sustenance for the first fourteen days of unemployment. This provision is not easily applicable to callings where the work is only casual or intermittent, hence the special scheme for waterside workers and workers in the coalmining industry."

REPORT BY HON. J. A. Fihelly ON AGENT-GENERAL'S OFFICE IN LONDON, ETC.

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

"1. The late Agent-General (J. A. Fihelly) having publicly stated, on his return from England, that he would make a report to Cabinet, will he, the Premier, state if any report has yet been received, particularly in regard to his (Mr. Fihelly's) retirement? If so, will he lay such report on the table of the House?

"2. If no report in this connection has been received, what action was taken by the Government to secure one?

"3. The honourable member for Chillingoe, Mr. Theodore, stated that Mr. Fihelly informed him that he (Mr. Fihelly) intended to make certain recommendations in regard to the English office. Will the Premier state if any action was taken on such recommendations if submitted?"

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

"1. A memorandum furnished by the late Agent-General (Mr. J. A. Fihelly) was laid on the table of the House on the 2nd September, 1924. (See "Queensland Parliamentary Debates," volume CXLIII., page 535.)

"2. See answer to No. 1.

"3. No action has been taken in regard to such recommendations."

INCREASED RAILWAY RECEIPTS DUE TO INCREASED FARES AND FREIGHTS.

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

"1. What was the increased amount for

the year 1924-1925 it was estimated would be received by the Railway Department on account of the increased fares and freights?

"2. What increased amount, approximately, was received because of such increase?"

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

"1. £350,000.

"2. Approximately £394,000."

SPECIAL ALLOWANCE TO POLICE FORCE IN LIEU OF REDUCED HOURS OF DUTY.

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

"1. In paying special allowances to the Police Force, in lieu of reduced hours of duty, what is the estimated saving to the Police Department per annum?

"2. Is he satisfied that the spirit and intention of the legislation dealing with the 44 hours per week has been carried out?

"3. Will he permit by Order in Council, or allow to be duly registered agreements based on a similar basis between private enterprise and employees? If not, on what grounds would this be prohibited?

"4. If the agreement entered into with the police to work more than forty-four working hours per week is not *ultra vires* the Arbitration Act, will he kindly specifically state the clause wherein such agreement is covered by law?"

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

"1. There is no saving. Only one scheme was considered, and that involved an increase in expenditure.

"2. The honourable member should be aware that a question should not involve an expression of opinion.

"3 and 4. I am only concerned with matters which can be dealt with by me as Home Secretary."

STATE STALLIONS.

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

"1. How many mares were served by each State stallion during the 1924 season?

"2. What fees were earned by each stallion, and cost for each stallion during 1924 season?

"3. How many foals to each stallion (named) were foaled alive in 1924?

"4. Were any concessions in reduced fees allowed for mares missing from the previous season?"

"5. What is the total cost to date of all stallions, including cost of keep and total earnings?

"6. How many of them are—(a) Alive now; (b) having the necessary organs for service?"

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

"1. From the table hereunder it will be noticed that the number of Clydesdale stallions used for this duty for the season 1924-25 were increased to eight by the inclusion of the Department of Agriculture and Stock stallions 'Prospector' and 'Warwick Lad,' which animals were seconded from Gindie State Farm and Hermitage State Farm, respectively, in order to cater for the requirements of as many owners of mares as possible for that season.

Stallions.	No. of Mares.
Baron Again ... ..	56
Bold Wyllie ... ..	63
Fabric's Heir ... ..	44
General Wallace ... ..	76
Glenalla ... ..	66
Premier Again ... ..	50
Prospector ... ..	64
Warwick Lad ... ..	36
Total ... ..	455

'Fabric's Heir's' quota of mares was fifty-nine, but this stallion died (19th November, 1924) before the completion of the season. The quota for the colt 'Warwick Lad' was limited owing to the fact that it was his first season.

"2. Fees earned by each stallion during 1924 season—

	£	s.	d.
Baron Again ... ..	117	12	0
Bold Wyllie ... ..	132	6	0
Fabric's Heir ... ..	92	8	0
General Wallace ... ..	159	12	0
Glenalla ... ..	138	12	0
Premier Again ... ..	105	0	0
Prospector ... ..	134	8	0
Warwick Lad ... ..	75	12	0

Total ... .. £955 10 0

The total cost of all stallions during 1924 season was £1,213 13s. 3d., which gives an average of £151 14s. 2d. for each stallion.

"3. The only information available is from replies regarding mares in foal to State stallions received from the owners of mares in response to a circular letter forwarded from the Department of Agriculture and Stock to the owners of all mares which received service in 1923. As will be noted from the following figures, no information is available in respect of thirty-six mares:—

Stallion.	District.	No. of Mares Served.	Replies received in respect of.	Unaccounted for.	No. of Mares in Foal.	No. of Mares not in Foal.	Percentage of Mares in Foal.
Premier Again .. ..	Roma-Wallumbilla..	52	52	..	25	27	48
General Wallace .. ..	Clifton .. ..	57	57	..	28	29	49
Glenalla .. ..	Rosewood .. ..	57	48	9	23	25	48
Fabric's Heir .. ..	Boonah .. ..	59	51	8	25	26	49
Bold Wyllie .. ..	Nanango .. ..	60	55	5	36	19	65.5
Baron Again .. ..	Mary Valley .. ..	49	35	14	15	20	43
Totals .. ..		334	298	36	152	146	302.5

Mean percentage of foals, 51 per cent. Generally, weather conditions were very dry during this season.

"4. No. Service fees were refunded, however, in respect of ten mares which refused service.

"5. Total payments to 30th June, 1925, of all stallions, £6,875 11s. 9d.; total earnings of all stallions to 30th June, 1925, £1,652 14s.

"6. (a) Five; (b) four."

AGREEMENT BETWEEN SUGAR BOARD AND COLONIAL SUGAR REFINING COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. BRAND (*Burru*) asked the Premier—

"Will he lay upon the table of the House a copy of the agreement entered into between the Sugar Board and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, Limited, for the refining and disposal of the present year's sugar crop?"

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

"No agreement has been entered into between the Sugar Board and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, Limited, but I lay on the table a copy of the agreement between the Government and that company."

Whereupon the Premier laid on the table of the House copy of the agreement between the Government and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, Limited.

REPORTS OF FARM WORKERS AND COTTON WORKERS' INDUSTRIAL BOARD.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"In view of the fact that the Farm Workers' Industrial Board and the Cotton Workers' Industrial Board were constituted over twelve months ago to report on the question of the application of arbitration awards to rural workers—

"1. Have the reports of these Boards yet been presented?

"2. What was the total cost of each Board?

"3. Will he lay upon the table of the House a copy of each report for the information of members representing country electorates?"

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

"1. The reports have been presented to the Court of Industrial Arbitration.

"2. (a) Farm Workers' Board, £2,534 4s. 9d.; (b) Cotton Farm Workers' Industrial Board, £1,119 3s. 3d.

"3. The reports were furnished at the request of the president of the Industrial Arbitration Court and not the Department of Public Works. As the applications to the Court for awards for the callings of farm workers have not yet been finalised, the reports are not published and may remain so until the Court orders their publication."

COST OF MURGON-PROSTON AND WINDERA BRANCH RAILWAYS.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What was the estimated cost of the Murgon-Proston line and the Windera branch line, respectively?

"2. What was the actual cost of each of these lines?"

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

"1 and 2. The information is in course of preparation."

ROCKHAMPTON-TOWNSVILLE RAILWAY—COST OF SECTIONS.

Mr. KING (*Logan*), for Mr. Moore (*Aubigny*), asked the Secretary for Railways—

"What was (a) the estimated, (b) the actual, cost of each section of the Rockhampton-Townsville line, other than sections which were open to traffic prior to 1914?"

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

"The information is in course of preparation."

SUGGESTED BROADCASTING OF PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*) asked the Premier—

"In view of the fact that the Government has established a radio station in Brisbane, will he favour the alteration of the hours of the sitting of the House from 2 p.m. until 9 p.m. to enable the public to listen in to the speeches of members in the evening?"

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

"No. The present broadcasting programme is being provided by a temporary station, and the hours of working will probably be revised at a later date."

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Police Investment Board for the year ended 31st December, 1924.

Rules for the general government and discipline of the members of the Police Force of Queensland, dated 23rd December, 1924.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulations 15, 16, and 17 of the Primary Producers' Levy Regulations, 1925, made under and for the purposes of the Primary Producers' Organisation Acts, 1922 to 1923, and published in the "Government Gazette" of the 25th July, 1925.

Regulation 144 made under and for the purposes of the Dairy Produce Act of 1920, and published in the "Government Gazette" of the 25th July, 1925.

PRIMARY PRODUCTS POOLS ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Primary Products Pools Acts, 1922 to 1923, in certain particulars.”

Question put and passed.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Primary Producers' Organisation Acts, 1922 to 1923, in certain particulars.”

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I am sure that I am expressing the sentiments of every hon. member when I say that it is with extreme regret that we learn that the Governor will soon be departing from Queensland. I think that of all the Governors who have been here Sir Matthew Nathan has seen more of Queensland than any of them, and there is not the slightest doubt that the information which he has gained during his tours of Queensland will be of inestimable benefit to the State when he goes Home again. As a matter of fact, he will be one of our best advertising agents. Hon. members opposite, according to their platform, must of necessity advocate the abolition of Imperial Governors, but I hope that the time is far distant when we shall have a locally appointed Governor, because it is very nearly impossible for any locally appointed Governor to divest himself of party interest as compared with an Imperial Governor, who comes here unbiased and ready to learn the local conditions.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: He is a party man appointed by a party in England.

Mr. KELSO: It is suggested that, if he is a party man appointed by a party Government, he must of necessity take on a party colouring. Very well; we have the example of the Governor of Tasmania, who was a Labour man appointed by a Labour Government. Would the hon. member suggest that the Governor of Tasmania is biased?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No.

Mr. KELSO: Of course, everything that comes from the other side is unbiased, and everything that comes from this side is biased; but the hon. member must recognise that, the precedent having been set of appointing a man who professedly is a Labour Governor, and who does not fail to take every opportunity to say that he has been a Labour man, hon. members on the other side suggest that he must be absolutely unbiased.

I compliment, first of all, the hon. member for Toowoomba on the speech he made under the difficult circumstances he made it. The seconder of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Buranda, being an old campaigner by this time, thought fit to make some remarks with reference to the display which generally takes place when the Governor opens Parliament. He does not like the “pomp and circumstance”; he does not like the retinues; he does not like the mounted police and the artillery, the mounted troopers, or the soldiers. The hon. member is a plain-minded man; he is trying to make us believe that he does not believe in any pomp or ceremony whatever. Let me remind the hon. member that probably he was marching in that procession on last May Day, when the banners were flying, when they had those emblems painted in gaudy colours representing their particular section.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have a section; you have not.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman admits that the Labour party is a section. I am very glad to hear that; they are always trying to make us believe that they are always for the people. Let me quote the words of one of the Labour members in England, the Right Hon. J. H. Thomas, P.C., M.P.

Mr. HANSON: Who is he?

Mr. KELSO: The hon. member does not know his Labour confères at Home. In “Pearson's Magazine” for March last Mr. Thomas wrote an article giving his experiences as a Labour member. I would advise hon. members on the other side to read what Mr. Thomas has said; it will be a revelation to them.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Did he say anything about unity?

Mr. KELSO: He said that the experience they had had as a Labour Government was worth a tremendous amount to them. On the question of pomp and ceremony let me give one quotation:—

“Criticism and abuse has been meted out to us as Labour Ministers, less for our participation in Court functions than for our acceptance of precedents in regard to dress. The cause of the trouble was that we donned, on these occasions, the plumes and trappings of the ancient aristocratic régime. People who talk like this are narrow-minded.”

I hope that the hon. member for Buranda is listening—

“One incident gave me genuine amusement. I was a participant in a brilliant scene at Buckingham Palace. As I looked round on the dazzling scene, I perceived that the keenest members of the whole company were a group of representatives of Soviet Russia. How inconsistent! Fancy being abused by the very same folk who were evidently filled with wondering delight to be where they were—at Buckingham Palace—hobnobbing, so to speak, with a ‘real live King and Queen.’”

That is the opinion of a very prominent Labour man, who was a member of the Imperial Cabinet, and I think his remarks are worth listening to.

*Mr Kelso.]*

In the Governor's Speech this reference is made to the Soldier Settlements—

“As a result of the recent investigations by the Revaluation Board, an amount approximating £93,000 in respect of improvements, live stock, and implements has been written off soldier settlers' loan indebtedness. In addition, a very liberal concession has been granted by way of writing off amounts payable for accumulated interest. Action is being taken with a view to the transfer to better land of some of the settlers who acquired lands that did not give them a chance of making a living therefrom.”

I want to say something about this matter because in my electorate is the Highlands Soldier Settlement, with the members of which I have had a good deal to do during the last two years. They claim that they have not had a fair deal. In the first place, they say that the land allotted to them was not suitable for such a settlement; that it was land on which you could not grow anything. It was subdivided for dairying purposes into blocks of 40 or 50 acres each, and hon. members must admit that from 40 to 50 acres of very inferior land is not sufficient for that purpose. Again, most of these soldiers went on to the land unused to any form of land settlement—they had to feel their way as they went along. They started with brave hearts and they kept on, thinking it would be all right in the long run, but they found that it was impossible to make a living on those areas. The Revaluation Board, to which reference is made in the Speech, was supposed to have sent a representative up to the settlement. A gentleman went up to revalue these places and go into the whole question; but, unfortunately, he made his report without going round the various holdings in order to see for himself exactly what the position of each farm was, what the land was like, and what the houses were like. The consequence is that an injustice has been done to these men, who feel that the indebtedness on their holdings is more than they can really afford to pay. Yet many of them have made an offer which may help them to meet it. They have suggested that a number of them should leave the settlement if the department will give them land on which they can grow something, placing them in the same position regarding indebtedness as they are in the Highlands Settlement. They point out that this will have the double effect of giving them a chance of making a living and of enabling those who remain to have larger areas so that they will have some hope of dairying with success. Let me give hon. members a concrete example. Only yesterday I met one of them. We will call him Mr. A—. I do not want to mention his name. This gentleman had two heifers which cost £15. He offered to exchange them and put on the farm two of his own. They were sold by the department for £5, so that he lost £10 by that transaction. I should say that there is a feeling that very poor cattle were provided for the soldiers on this settlement, yet they were debited with the full price of first-class animals. I have, in fact, heard frequent complaints of the quality of the cattle. Many of them have died in the meantime, fortunately, because they were not worth milking. But in the case I am quoting even the £5 which the department got for the two heifers has not been credited to the settler.

[Mr. Kelso.

He possessed a house that had cost him £338. The Department has written off £48, leaving a debt of £290. The amount expended on labour for erection was £30 under the day labour system—a system advocated by the Government, notwithstanding that similar houses were erected close by under the contract

[11 a.m.] system for £35 for labour only.

The objection on the part of the settler is to the extra cost under the day labour system, which is saddled on to him and which would not be the case under the contract system. Under the latter system the settler would have saved the difference between £35 and £80, and to inflict that additional cost is certainly an injustice to the settler. Some of the settlers have not been able to make a success of their venture, and have thrown up their blocks. When that action is taken by those men the Department sells their houses. The particular settler to whom I have referred mentioned that a settler near him abandoned his holding, and his house was sold for £70 to a man who re-erected it close by at a cost of £30. The purchaser of that house, at a cost of £100, now has a house equal in value to the house of Mr. A., on which there is a debt of £290. These are manifest injustices that should be rectified immediately. Some of the men are anxious to leave the settlement in order to make room for others, but the Department has refused to place them on land in another part of Queensland. Yet the Governor's Speech says that “arrangements are being made.” Why do the Government not tell the true facts? Here we have good settlers who desire to go to the Mary Valley and start afresh on decent land under the same financial conditions as apply to their settlement, but they are refused. The only satisfaction they can get is that they can take part in a ballot for land and take the usual chance of securing a block. I hold that no treatment is good enough for these soldier settlers who have gone on the land and endeavoured to make land settlement a success. They have done their best, and the Government should come to their rescue and place them on better land under the same financial conditions. I hope that the Secretary for Public Lands will give due consideration to the matter.

Reference is made in the Governor's Speech to an amendment of the Industrial Arbitration Acts, making provision for the appointment of lay judges. Apparently the system of appointing legally trained men to the bench does not suit the Labour party, and they are beginning to realise that judicial men go carefully into all questions and come to the conclusion that certain things— not approved of by the Labour Party— should be done. During the war period when prices were rising, and when wages had to be increased to meet the extra cost of living, everything was right and the judge was a good man, but now, when the time arrives for taking into serious consideration the competition with southern States, these men, in their judicial capacity and with the economic knowledge which they have gained, have come to the conclusion that there should not be any increase in wages in a certain direction. Naturally the unions putting forward claims for increased wages are not satisfied. Why, last session the hon. member for Fitzroy “let the cat out of the bag” when he said that arbitration was a failure.

Mr. HARTLEY: So it is. It is not only a failure but it is a fraud. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: He let the cat out of the bag when he said that it ought to be all right as they had had their own judges on the bench. Here was an admission by the hon. member that they had their own judges on the bench. But he was finding fault with them because they would not increase the wages every time the unions came forward with such a plea. Does it not stand to reason that, if we are going to have lay judges, there are likely to be political appointments? If rumour is correct, our friend the Attorney-General is marked out for preferment as a lay judge.

Mr. MAXWELL: And the Secretary for Public Works.

Mr. KELSO: When the Secretary for Public Works fails to secure nomination against a certain gentleman who is coming out against him he will be placed in a nice position there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am not an applicant for the job.

Mr. KELSO: A few days ago a statement by the Trades and Labour Council appeared in the Press. If hon. members on the other side will read that, they will find representations unblushingly put forward by this body to have representatives there—representatives who will take their seat on the bench from the start with biased opinions. That is to say, their mission will be to see that their unions get what they want, and, if they do not get what they want, they will never be satisfied. If the Government are going to be satisfied with that instruction—and we know that at the crack of the whip of the Trades Hall hon. members on the other side have to act—we shall have men on the Arbitration Court bench who will be biased right from the very start against the employers and will give the unions what they want. Has the time not arrived when the employer ought to have some say in the matter? It is a fact that, whenever a decision is given by the Court, the employer has to abide by it. He has assets which can be taken from him in the event of his refusal to carry out the decision of the Court. What happens when the employee is not satisfied with the decision of the Court? He can go out on strike, he can flout the Court, and he can do what he likes. When he makes up his mind to go back to work at his own sweet will and pleasure everything has to be forgotten. It is inequitable that the employer should be forced to obey the award of the Arbitration Court unless some means are devised by which the employees will also be forced to carry out the wishes of the Court. When the Government are introducing the Bill to amend this Act, I commend to them the suggestion that they should devise some means whereby the employers should also be protected. These men are law-abiding citizens. They have to be so, as their assets are at stake, and what is sauce for the goose should also be sauce for the gander. Hon. members on this side of the House expressed the opinion last session, when the 44-hour week proposal was being discussed, that the whole question should be left to the Arbitration Court to decide. They should have the right to go into the whole question. The Court should not be hamstrung at the start and be compelled to say, no matter what decision they

arrive at, that there should not be work for more than forty-four hours a week. We know that the instructions to the Court at the present time are that the wages of the employees shall be based on the prosperity of the industry. The introduction of the 44-hour week has affected secondary industries to the extent of 12½ per cent. I would like to ask hon. members opposite: How then do they expect secondary industries to advance? They have been stationary for a number of years. Is it likely that they are going to make any advance whatever, if in comparison with Victoria, where the employees work forty-eight hours a week, they are hampered right from the start to the extent of 12½ per cent, through the employees working four hours less. We know the stock argument that men working forty-four hours can do just as much work as men working forty-eight hours, but that has yet to be proved. If workers can prove that they can do in forty-four hours what the men in Victoria do in forty-eight hours, there will be something in the argument. We know that the teachings of hon. members on the other side are "Go slow" all the time.

We have that illustrated in day labour as against contract work. Just a few minutes ago I quoted an example from the Highlands Soldier Settlement to show the difference between contract and day labour. Let us see the difference it will make in regard to Mount Morgan. In 1923, in order to save practically the whole of the mine from being closed down and the employees thrown on the unemployed market, the Government subsidised the mine to the extent of £45,992 per annum. In 1924 the Government found £53,700 while the company found £159,000. It is estimated that under the 44-hour week the company will lose a further £45,000 a year, and what we want to know is: Are the Government prepared to come to the rescue of Mount Morgan again in order to enable the men there to work the 44-hour week?

If the Government are to do that, then I ask: Are they prepared to do it in the case of any industry in Queensland that can produce its books and show that it is working at a loss, and wants to keep its doors open in order to provide employment for the men? Such action opens up a big question, I can understand why the Government single out Mount Morgan, because we have the Home Secretary representing that electorate.

Yesterday's paper stated that the unions were applying for greater wages to be paid to the cattle industry. Is that the principle that is to be applied under the new Act that is to be brought before us during this session? It appears that any industry showing a profit must pay greater wages, while those which are carrying on at a loss are to have the Government come to their rescue in order to keep their doors open.

Mr. HYNES: The Baldwin Government is doing that in England to the extent of £12,000,000 a year.

Mr. KELSO: I shall have something to say in a few minutes about the celebrated tour of the Northern Rivers by the Premier and the Secretary for Public Works.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We did good work in New South Wales. Our party won.

*Mr Kelso.]*

Mr. KELSO: I have already stated the effect of a 44-hour week on factories. In Queensland factories have been stationary, while there have been increases in Victoria and New South Wales to this extent—

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF FACTORIES.

State.	
Victoria	1,448
New South Wales	1,433
Queensland	82

INCREASE IN FACTORY EMPLOYEES OVER A TEN-YEAR PERIOD.

Victoria	33,236
New South Wales	35,655
Queensland	121

PROPORTION OF POPULATION ENGAGED IN SECONDARY INDUSTRY.

	Per cent.
Victoria	37.01
New South Wales	36.92
Queensland	10.53

INCREASE IN MANUFACTURE OF RAW MATERIALS, 1908-1914.

	Per cent.
Queensland	125
Victoria	60
New South Wales	72
Western Australia	50
South Australia	49
Tasmania	50

Since Labour took office we find that quite a different tale is told—

INCREASE IN MANUFACTURE OF RAW MATERIALS, 1914-1924.

	Per cent.
Queensland	72
Victoria	150
New South Wales	120
South Australia	93
Tasmania	88

The figures show a swing round from an increase of 125 per cent. to an increase of 72 per cent. in the case of Queensland, while in the case of Victoria the increase has been progressive, from 60 per cent. to 150 per cent. Yet we wonder why secondary industries in Queensland do not go ahead!

We have been promised a Childhood Endowment Bill, but, as in most of the statements made in the Governor's Speech, we do not get very much information about this Bill? It would be interesting to know what the Government intend to do. It has been said outside by men who are Labour supporters that the Government intend to start with the basic wage, and once they get that up they do not intend to reduce it.

Mr. W. COOPER: Who said that?

Mr. KELSO: I have heard it said outside.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I think you dreamt it.

Mr. KELSO: I believe they have said that, if they get wages up, those wages will not go down. The basic wage will be taken as the amount which provides for a man, his wife, and three children in reasonable comfort. In addition it is proposed to subsidise every child above the age of three years, and a certain proportion of that subsidy is to be paid by secondary industries. There is another hit at secondary industries. I saw in the papers the other day that a protest had been made at Ipswich to the effect that, if a certain proportion of the extra cost of

[Mr. Kelso.

this child endowment was placed on industries, it would mean that most of the factories would have to close up. These are things that the Government will have to take into consideration. Certainly on general principles child endowment is an equitable thing—that a man who has ten children should receive more than the man who has no children.

Mr. HYNES: How much more?

Mr. KELSO: If the hon. member will tell me what the Government intend to do, then I will tell him what I think about it. I have a very serious question to ask just now. The Home Secretary recently had a tour up North, and he visited the aboriginal settlements. According to the report that was handed to the Press—an official report, I understand—when the hon. gentleman arrived at one aboriginal settlement he was hailed as "the father of all aboriginals." (Opposition laughter.) The Home Secretary has a large family suddenly thrust upon him, and I should like to ask the only Minister on the front bench whether it is the intention of the Government to make a special exception in this particular case under the Childhood Endowment Bill, and to give the Home Secretary the endowment which otherwise would have gone to the mothers—an endowment which is sufficient to keep in reasonable comfort this very large family which has been thrust upon the Home Secretary? (Laughter.)

The question of railways is referred to in the Speech. I am sure we all regret the unfortunate accidents that have occurred. But it is an extraordinary thing that every day since the Speech has been delivered we hear of further accidents. Last week, on two different occasions, the engine drawing the train in which I was travelling was so tired that half the train was left in the tunnel and the other half just reached the Central Station platform. We are having accidents everywhere.

Mr. HYNES: It was an accident that you got into this House.

Mr. KELSO: It was not an accident that I got into the House; it was an absolute certainty. There was no doubt about it. We have taken pride in the fact that there has been an immunity from accidents for many years on the Queensland railways. Why have we such serious accidents at the present time? It is quite plain that the Government, in their endeavour to try and reduce the enormous deficits on the railways, have been starving the rolling-stock and starving the permanent way. The inquiry which has been taking place into the disaster at Traveston has opened the eyes of the public to the fact that there was grave mismanagement.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. KELSO: At the present time there are hundreds of men there. The Government are spending thousands of pounds to try and put that line in a condition that trains can travel over it in safety.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is not so.

Mr. KELSO: All you have to do is to read the evidence of the gangers and others.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: The matter is sub judice.

Mr. KELSO: I understand this matter is sub judice; I had forgotten that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You ought to have remembered that.

Mr. KELSO: Only yesterday the train in which I was travelling to town was rolling so badly when leaving Brunswick Street that an Eagle Junction man said to me, "It is quite on the cards any day that this train will run off the line." If you sit on the platform at Brunswick Street and watch the trains passing through, you can see the rails heaving up and down. The railways have been starved by the Government, and in order to put the permanent way in proper order some millions of pounds will have to be spent. Until that is done the public will not feel satisfied that they can travel in safety on our railways. What did we find last year? A revenue of £1,367,600 from the railways more than was received in the previous year, and £618,000 more than the Government expected to receive. They had a total revenue of over £7,000,000, yet they cannot keep the permanent way and rolling-stock in order, nor can they provide decent engines to pull the trains.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Then you say there are too many men employed in the railway service?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. KELSO: I am very pleased to see that the Government are at last waking up to the fact that one of the great national assets of this State, the forests, is rapidly disappearing. They have had reforestation in their programme for a long time, but we find that now Parliament is nearing its end they have to justify themselves at the next election and are making a big bid for popularity by talking about the development of the forests. The increase of royalties which they have received has increased the cost of housing. If they had devoted their energies to reforestation, we would probably be in the same position in thirty or forty years that New Zealand hopes to be in. A statement was made some time ago that the Forestry Department in New Zealand is so efficient that it is expected that in forty years the value of the forests will be equal to the national debt. This is the position Queensland should be on the way to; but precious time has been lost during the last ten years, and the forests have suffered in consequence.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: We are going to better that.

Mr. KELSO: I am glad to see it, but the delay has been lamentable. Let us notice some of the things which the Government have not placed in the Speech—some of the things they would rather not say anything about. They do not admit that they are not going to bring in a Bill, as they promised to do in 1923 when they were before the electors, providing for the initiative and referendum principle; they do not tell the people here that the initiative and referendum is one thing which they are shy about and are afraid to bring forward. When the referendum was taken over the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council what did they do? Although the referendum is a part of their platform, they absolutely ignored that referendum, and swamped the Upper House to get rid of it. Those are the things they do not tell the people.

In the few minutes at my disposal I want to refer to the celebrated tour which was made by the Premier in the Byron electorate over the border.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: He put in some effective work over there.

Mr. KELSO: So did we. The hon. member for Toowong and myself, on finding that such fairy yarns were being circulated in the Byron electorate—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They were your fairy yarns.

Mr. KELSO: We decided to accept the invitation of one of the members there to go down and scotch some of the misstatements which were being made by hon. members opposite who toured that district. The Premier went down to help his brother—a very nice thing to do—but he was not prepared to go by himself. The hon. gentleman went down, and he had his State car and chauffeur, driving through the Byron electorate and drawing his £2 2s. a day and expenses. Then we had the Secretary for Public Works, the Secretary for Railways, and the Attorney-General. These four Ministers were touring the Byron electorate, all at the expense of the taxpayers of Queensland, in order that the Premier's brother might get a seat in Parliament. Then we heard rumours of a nebulous character in regard to the person of the hon. member for Warrego who seemed to be flying here and there. Now and again he would touch ground, and finally he travelled away to Sydney. Then we had the hon. member for Herbert, who went down and told some fairy yarns. He repeated the same story that he told us the other day. He had his lesson all learnt. He said, "Look at the great increase in Queensland products! They have increased from so many millions to so many millions more, and we are the best State in the Commonwealth." The question I was asked more than anything else was this, "Can you tell us how it is that, if Queensland is as you represent it to be, the Labour party have been in power for ten years?" That seemed a wallpaper to start with, but we easily disposed of it. We told them that in 1915 the Labour party gulled the electors by promising them all sorts of things—amongst others, the celebrated—"Three B's"—cheap beef, cheap butter, and cheap bread.

(An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Cheap beer? [Laughter].)

Mr. KELSO: In 1918, we told them, when they had not kept their promises they scratched their heads to see what sort of an excuse they could give, and they came along with a cry of "No reduction of employees and no unemployment!" We pointed out by figures which could not be contradicted that they were only promises. We told them how many men actually were deflated, we told them that members of the public service had had their salaries reduced by 5 per cent., we told them that the public servants had been denied access to the Arbitration Court. And in 1923, we told them, they came up smiling with a Redistribution Bill, and we pointed out that although on two different occasions we had a majority of anti-Socialist votes, they managed by that measure to get returned with 43 members as against our 29. Invariably we were told that the position was cleared up now, and that we could not have won under those circumstances. Someone asked how the hon. member for Eacham had been made Premier. "We know Mr. Gillies," they said to us, "he had a farm down here, we have known him from boyhood. How was it that he was

*Mr Kelso.]*

made Premier?" I said on one occasion to a gentleman that I very much regretted the way in which the hon. gentleman had been elevated to the position of Premier—that he had made a bargain with the late Secretary for Education that, in return for the vote which he would give him, the Secretary for Education would give his vote to the Premier, who was therefore appointed by a majority. (Government interruption.) As a matter of fact, that was the way in which the party were prevented from getting the best brains in the person of the Secretary for Public Lands. That is the way the thing was fixed up, and I think it is an eternal disgrace to the State of Queensland that high offices are marketed away in such a manner.

The PREMIER interjected.

Mr. KELSO: They believed us better than they believed the other side. When we had a meeting at Murwillumbah—the largest meeting, they told us, ever held there—the supporters of the hon. gentleman were so concerned that they sent an urgent message to Brisbane, and next day the Premier and his henchman, the Secretary for Railways, went post haste to Murwillumbah and spoke the same night. It may be asked—hon. members are quite right in asking it—How is it that Mr. Gillies won? Let me say that wherever we went through the electorate—it is only fair to say this—we heard nothing but good of the brother of the hon. gentleman from a personal point of view, and his popularity stood him in good stead. I was asked afterwards, "How was it that the man you were supporting did not win the election?" and I said "They won, just the same as they have always won, when there has been disunity on our side." There was disunity in our midst, and unfortunately the sectarian issue was introduced at that election. There was a division in the ranks of the Nationalists, and the hon. gentleman's brother crept in and managed to win the seat from the sitting member. The Premier during that election threw out this challenge, which I have cut from a Grafton paper—

"To those who had criticised Queensland and would continue to criticise that State, Mr. Gillies threw out the following challenge. His statement, he said, was based on that of the Commonwealth and State Statisticians, and figures furnished by the recent Queensland Economic Commission."

Unfortunately I have not time to go through the long list of his misstatements, but the answers we made to them were quoted from official documents.

I shall refer to a few figures. Both the Premier and the Secretary for Public Works stated on different occasions that there was more money in the Savings Bank [11.30 a.m.] in Queensland than in any other State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman made reference to the prosperity of Queensland. I propose to show that his statement was incorrect and did not reveal the true position. He stated that the credit in the Savings Bank of Queensland had increased from £10,889,658 in 1915 to £20,410,364 in 1924.

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

[Mr. Kelso.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eueham*), who was received with Government cheers, said: First of all I desire to thank the leader of the Country Progressive party and the leader of the Nationalist party for their congratulations extended to me, and for their assurance of support in all matters going through this House which will be of benefit to the State. The hon. member for Windsor attached a condition to his assurance, but I feel sure, from my knowledge of both the hon. member for Windsor and the hon. member for Aubigny, that they will give me every assistance, realising as they do the difficult task that a leader of a Government has in carrying out the duties devolving upon such a position. I desire also to thank the many thousands of people throughout Australia who congratulated me on achieving what falls to few men to achieve in their lifetime—the position of Premier of a great State. I realise that, whilst there is great honour attached to the position, there are great responsibilities, great cares, and great worries, requiring a great deal of energy, tact, and foresight. I realise, too, that, no matter how strong a man may be physically or mentally, after he has held a position for a few years he must necessarily tire of the job. I must say that the statement by the hon. member for Cooroora that my late chief, the hon. member for Chillagoe, was pushed out is untrue. The same thing was said when the late Hon. T. J. Ryan left the State Parliament for Federal politics. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the members of my party are concerned, the hon. member for Chillagoe could have remained Premier and leader of this party as long as he wished to do so. Notwithstanding that he is a young man and a very strong man, I can quite understand that, after the strenuous life he has lived, he has felt the severe strain of the position, and has decided for a time to relinquish those heavy responsibilities attaching to such a position. In my opinion he will make good in the Commonwealth Parliament, and in the course of time will perform for the Commonwealth as good work as he has undoubtedly done for this great State of Queensland.

Mr. MAXWELL: We hope not.

Mr. CLAYTON: He has doubled the national debt of Queensland.

The PREMIER: No doubt Queensland requires a few able champions to assist Mr. Forde, M.H.R., and other members in the Federal Parliament. Queensland requires those men to ensure the rights of this great State being placed before the Federal Parliament. I am satisfied that in the course of time Mr. Theodore will be leader of the Federal Parliament, and will accomplish for Australia what he has accomplished in a smaller way for Queensland.

Mr. MAXWELL: God help Australia.

Mr. CLAYTON: Is he going to double the national debt?

The PREMIER: I will give a few figures which will take hon. members opposite some time to digest.

Mr. MORGAN: It will be a national calamity if Mr. Theodore becomes leader of the Federal Parliament.

The PREMIER: I do not want to reflect in any way on the speeches delivered by hon. members opposite. I am very sorry to know that the hon. member for Aubigny has suffered ill-health. I realise the tremendous

strain that the leader of a party in Opposition has thrust upon him, especially when his party is disunited.

Mr. CORSE: Your party is disunited.

The PREMIER: The difficulties to be faced by a leader require him to be in good health, and I sympathise with the hon. member for Aubigny in his illness. But, if the case for the Opposition is contained in the speech delivered by the hon. member for Aubigny or by the ex-leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Dalby, or the other hon. members who followed them, then that case is a pretty poor one. I carefully listened to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Aubigny, and I afterwards read it in "Hansard." I was sorry that I was called away to receive a deputation when the hon. member for Windsor was speaking. Although that hon. member differs from me in politics, I nevertheless regard him as an honourable man. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KELSO: Is the hon. member for Aubigny not honourable, too?

The PREMIER: In the words of Shakespeare, "Those are all honourable men." I repeat that, if the speeches of the hon. members for Aubigny and Dalby contain the case for the Opposition, then they certainly have a very poor case.

On the 29th July, the day following the opening of Parliament, the "Courier," in dealing with the Governor's Speech, said—

"Judged on its face value, the programme that was presented yesterday to the State Parliament contains nothing that need cause a single tremble to the Opposition, nor is there anything in it that is likely to send a thrill of excitement through the ranks of the extremists."

I do not know whether to take that as a compliment or not. I take it that, in the opinion of the "Courier," there is nothing in the Speech to cause the Opposition any alarm, or, in other words, the Opposition will not be called upon to oppose any legislation forecast in the Governor's Speech, and neither will the so-called extremists have any cause for excitement.

Mr. KELSO: It is what you have left out that is the trouble.

Mr. BRUCE: You were left out. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: I do not know who these so-called "extremists" are, or what pleasure they take out of the term, because there is no such thing as extreme or moderate justice. It is either justice or not justice.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is either common sense or not common sense. You cannot have extreme common sense. The Labour party are not concerned about the people called extremists. If it gives our opponents any satisfaction to call members of my party by that name, or to call them moderate men, it does not concern me. There is no extreme or moderate justice, and the Labour party stands for justice.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Would they talk about a man being moderately honest?

The PREMIER: I suppose that remark would apply to those people who object to the policy of the Labour party. The "Courier," on the day of the opening of Parliament, also stated—

"In at least two of those elections

Labour came back victorious for the reason that the Opposition had been demoralised, and had been split into factions. The position to-day is worse than ever it was; and it would be futile to deny that in an appeal to the country Labour would be returned probably with a record majority."

If the case for the Opposition were based on the two speeches I have mentioned, there would be very little to reply to; but there are one or two things to which I wish to refer. I wish first to refer to the policy promised by Mr. McGill, the leader of the new party that has been formed. I only hope that, when it appears before the people, it will contain something that the people will be able to understand. I see by the "Daily Mail" of 11th July that Mr. McGill has put forward the following as some of the broad principles of his policy—

"Land laws reformed"—

whatever that may mean—

"Encouragement of primary and secondary industries"—

whatever that may mean also—

"Individual effort as opposed to nationalisation of industry."

I suppose that means the handing over of our railways and the State Insurance Department to private enterprise—

"Absorption of unemployed by encouragement of industry; Relief to soldier settlers; Nationalisation of hospitals."

Mr. MORGAN: This is not a circus.

The PREMIER: It is, so far as hon. members opposite are concerned. Mr. McGill further goes on to state these additional points of policy—

"Arbitration Court to be supreme in industrial matters"—

It is supreme now—

"Cessation of the expenditure of loan moneys in unproductive works."

I suppose that such works as main roads, not being productive, will have to be closed down.

Mr. KELSO: Then you should close down the railways.

The PREMIER: I suppose the hon. member would do so. Mr. McGill goes on to state—

"Greater facilities for education."

I would like to say in regard to education that this Government has spent about three times as much per annum on education as any previous Government—

"Protection of sugar and cotton industries."

The policy of the Labour Government with regard to the sugar industry is an absolute embargo against black-grown sugar. That cannot be exceeded. Is it proposed to go back to the old protection of a variable tariff?

The concluding plank is "Railway Reform." All those things are vague generalities which do not contain principles at all, nor do they contain any definite promise about what is likely to take place. I hope that, when the policy is framed—no matter by whom—we shall be able to understand definitely what is meant. If a definite declaration is to be made that all

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

perpetual leaseholds will be abolished, why then let us know.

Mr. CORSER: You know that now.

The PREMIER: If the railways are to be controlled by a political body who will give their friends the boodlers what they want, let us know.

Mr. NORT: Is that not the case now?

The PREMIER: I ask the Opposition for goodness sake to let us have a platform with a purpose, like that of the Labour party—one that can be understood. Our platform may be wrong in their eyes, but it certainly can be understood by those who read it, and it is certainly being carried out. Mr. McGill's platform reminds me of a statement made by Mr.—now Sir William—Irvine in 1914—

Mr. MORGAN: Is that "the iceberg?"

The PREMIER: The gentleman was afterwards appointed Chief Justice of Victoria. Mr. Irvine made a statement in connection with a Liberal platform which had been submitted to him. He said that—

"Being an Ulsterman himself, he was not averse to fighting for anything that was just, but that he could see nothing in that platform that would arouse any martial feeling in even the most bellicose beast. That fighting programme appeared to have been arrived at by the simple process of elimination, by the taking out of anything that could offend the susceptibilities of anyone. All the bones had been carefully removed and nothing left but a gelatinous compound, political food for infants and invalids, warranted not to cause the slightest inconvenience to the weakest digestion."

This present platform contains nothing that is definite; it promises the people nothing.

Mr. MORGAN: Wait until you see it.

The PREMIER: It has been said by the anti-Labour members and by their Press that that Government governs the best which governs the least. Our experience of coalitions, both in the State and in the Federal sphere, has been that a Coalition Government accomplishes nothing. The Labour Government cannot please all the people, but it certainly sets out to do something, whereas a Coalition Government gets nowhere. The Labour party are opposed to all coalitions. However, we realise and sympathise with the difficulties experienced by hon. members opposite.

I wish now to make a few remarks about our Governor. The leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Dalby, and the hon. member for Windsor, made some reference to the departure of Sir Matthew Nathan. Some reference was also made by the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. I wish to congratulate those last two hon. members upon their speeches. The hon. member for Toowoomba made a speech that certainly left a good impression in this House, and I predict a brilliant future for the hon. gentleman. I took part in the campaign that secured victory for the hon. member, and I have never taken part in any election campaign that gave me greater pleasure.

Mr. KELSO: What about the promises you made?

The PREMIER: It is a pleasing fact that the hon. member for Toowoomba was

able to double the majority of his predecessor.

I shall have another opportunity of saying something with reference to the departure of Sir Matthew Nathan, and hon. members will later have an opportunity of meeting the Governor at a farewell gathering before he departs. The opportunity will then present itself to those who so desire to make appropriate remarks as to His Excellency's work in Queensland. I know it is the fashion always to say that the last Governor is the best. That is not confined to Governors. But I think we can truthfully say, with all due respect to his predecessors, that Sir Matthew Nathan possesses qualities which have endeared him to the people of this State. In the first place, he is a man who has taken a great interest in all our industries, and also in the progress of science, art, and education; and indeed everything that makes for the progress and welfare of the people of this State has received the support and assistance of Sir Matthew Nathan.

Mr. KELSO: Yet you do not want any more like him.

The PREMIER: We want as many more like him as we can get; but it is a very poor compliment for any man to pay to his own country to say that there is no man in his own State capable of holding the highest position within the gift of the State, or the gift of the King.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Because the Labour Government in Queensland or any Labour Government in the Commonwealth of Australia have a plank in their platform that favours the appointment of Australians as Governors, that is no reflection on anyone who has occupied the position in the past, and certainly no reflection on the present occupant of that position in this State.

Mr. KELSO: Don't you favour the abolition of Governors?

The PREMIER: Some of the State Labour parties do, but the Queensland platform provides for the appointment of Australians to the position of State Governor. It is just over 100 years since the first Legislative Council was set up in Sydney for the passing of laws to govern the State of New South Wales. It is over a quarter of a century since the Commonwealth was established, and since the first Governor-General was appointed by the King, not only to represent the Commonwealth but to represent all the States; and the attitude that the Labour party take up with regard to this question is that as the Commonwealth Governor-General represents the King, the States should be able to appoint a local man at much less expense to carry out the purely formal duties of State Governor.

Mr. MORGAN: Could not the Governor-General perform those duties and save the appointment of a State Governor at all?

The PREMIER: I am not going to discuss that aspect of the question just now. The Labour platform provides for the appointment of Australian citizens as State Governors. That reform can be accomplished at a considerable saving to the taxpayers, and the purely formal duties of the Governor of the State can then be carried out without the great expense involved at the present time; and they can be carried out without any weakening of the ties between Australia

and the Empire, but rather with a strengthening of those ties by the Imperial Government acknowledging that Australia is a grown-up daughter, and is entitled to nominate one of her own citizens for the position of State Governor.

My own name has been associated with the position of State Governor, also that of the hon. member for Chillagoe. I am quite confident that either the hon. member for Chillagoe or myself could carry out the duties of Governor as well as they could be carried out by anyone selected in the Commonwealth; but I want to say, as far as I am concerned, I am not an applicant—and I think the same applies to the hon. member for Chillagoe—

Mr. THEODORE: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: When either of us leaves active politics, it will be for the purpose of taking on some work that is more congenial and certainly more useful to the people of this State. That is my view of the position, and I say that because my name has been associated with the position of Governor of this State. I have no intention of retiring from active politics at the present time, but when I do, perhaps in the course of a few years, I hope it will be to occupy some position that I can suitably fill, and some position that I regard as being of use and of benefit to the State. I say again that the purely formal duties of State Governor can be carried out by local citizens with less expense to the taxpayer, and without any weakening of the ties between Australia and the Empire. The Melbourne "Age," which cannot be considered a Labour paper by any stretch of the imagination, had this to say in regard to the matter—

"Of all the extravagant and useless features of Government this continuance of the system of importing Governors is unquestionably the worst, and any Government which has courage enough to make a serious effort to effect a change will merit the approbation of the people of the Commonwealth."

Then Mr. Toucher, a Tory M.L.A., in Victoria, said during the recent debate on this question in the Victorian Parliament—

"He remembered that Sir William Irvine stated that a communication had been received from Lord Beauchamp suggesting the discontinuance of the office of State Governor at the time of Federation for the reason that the King was sufficiently represented by a Governor-General. To his knowledge Lieutenant-Governors had never been questioned as to their impartiality when they had acted in the absence of the Governor in times of political crisis. On the other hand, there had been times when the impartiality of Governors had been questioned."

With regard to the statement that local Governors would be partisans, I desire to remind the House that of the ninety-two Governors we have had in the Commonwealth of Australia and the various States, about 50 per cent. were ex-politicians. I have yet to learn that the Imperial Parliament, which recommends the name of a Governor to the King, is free from party bias. It is to the credit of the men who have been selected that they have been enabled to suppress their party bias and

carry out their duties impartially, with one or two exceptions; but, after all, the suggestion that a local man would be appointed or nominated by a political party only calls attention to the fact that the imported men is likewise nominated by some political party.

Some reference was made to another point. One or two speakers questioned the figures I used in the Northern Rivers district in New South Wales during the election campaign, and also at Toowoomba with regard to unemployment. Those figures were supplied from the most reliable sources. I admit that our statistics are at times inaccurate and unreliable, both State and Commonwealth. Our Arbitration Court has called attention from time to time to the lack of reliable figures with regard to industry and other important matters, but we can only quote the figures of the authorities. The figures I have quoted are those given by our Commonwealth Statistician. In dealing with unemployment, briefly I find that the Commonwealth Statistician's figures for the March quarter of 1925 show the position with regard to members of unions—

*Percentage of Members of Unions.*

Tory Government—	
New South Wales ...	13.2 per cent.
Victoria ...	7.7 per cent.
Labour Government—	
Queensland ...	5.1 per cent.
South Australia ...	3.6 per cent.
Western Australia ...	5.8 per cent.
Tasmania ...	5.5 per cent.

Then we have—

*Number of Unemployed Unionists in May last (estimated), by Director of Commonwealth Bureau of Commerce and Industry.*

New South Wales ...	23,000
Victoria ...	10,000
Queensland ...	2,000
South Australia ...	1,300
Western Australia ...	1,300
Tasmania ...	500
Total ...	38,100

With regard to Great Britain the total amount of unemployment benefit paid in 1924-1925 was £40,962,000. Over 1,292,000 persons were unemployed as at 27th April, 1925—say, 10 per cent. of those registered under the Act. The contributions for unemployment insurance in Great Britain for 1924-1925 were—

	£
Exchequer ...	13,474,000
Employers ...	19,224,000
Workpeople ...	17,301,000

Unemployment insurance has been criticised and condemned by our opponents. I suppose they will repeal that very fine piece of legislation, which was brought in by the then Secretary for Public Works, following on the lines of the British Act. Miss Rathbone in her work, "The Disinherited Family," gives the following figures spent on unemployment relief in Great Britain for the year ended 31st March, 1922—

	£
Unemployment Insurance	
Fund ...	67,500,000
Poor Law Relief ...	7,750,000
Relief Works ...	6,000,000
Miscellaneous ...	1,500,000
Total ...	£82,750,000

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

The extent of unemployment in Great Britain following the Great War is shown by the following figures taken from the "Ministry of Labour Gazette" for November, 1923:—

December, 1920	...	...	701,179
June, 1921	...	...	2,044,655
December, 1921	...	...	1,776,131
June, 1922	...	...	1,405,293
December, 1922	...	...	1,357,981
June, 1923	...	...	1,189,059

On top of that we have the cabled statement in yesterday's papers that the Baldwin anti-Labour Government in Great Britain have found it necessary to subsidise the coal industry by £10,000,000 to enable it to be carried on.

Mr. COLLINS: A good old Tory State.

The PREMIER: And by a good old Tory party, as the hon. member for Bowen points out. They are compelled to follow the example of Labour in the relief of unemployed, and to carry out many of the schemes which they condemn when adopted by their opponents.

The leader of the Opposition had something to say about the 44-hour week, and he made some reference to Nelson turning his blind eye on the enemy, alleging that we were not prepared to take notice of the warnings which have been visible from time to time. I find that in 1920-21 in New South Wales, before the adoption of the 44-hour week, there were 5,837 factories, whilst in 1921-22, after the adoption of the 44-hour week, there were 6,356 factories. I want to qualify that statement by saying that I do not regard those figures as very important, because, according to the Commonwealth Statistician, a factory is "a place or building where power is used and where one or more persons are employed," and the number of factories merely does not count for very much in these days of mass production. For instance, in order to emphasise my point, I would like to remind hon. members that under a Tory Government at one time 118 sugar-mills were manufacturing 40,000 tons of sugar, but last year there were thirty-four up-to-date mills manufacturing 400,000 tons of sugar under a Labour Government. In fact, they manufactured so much that we were not able to consume it—indicating the necessity of our having more people to consume our product. But I want to give further figures to show that in 1919-20 in New South Wales, before the 44-hour week came into operation, the total value of the plant and machinery used in the factories was £26,000,000 in round figures, and in the following year £31,000,000, whilst in 1921-22, after the 44-hour week had been introduced, it was £35,229,000.

I shall also make a similar comparison in regard to the number of persons employed. In 1919-20 in New South Wales the number was 144,000, whilst in 1920-21 it was 145,000, and in 1921-22, after the introduction of the 44-hour week, it was 148,876. All those figures are from the Commonwealth "Year Book," and now New South Wales, under a Labour Government, is about to return to the 44-hour week. I am quite prepared to admit that anomalies and inconveniences will be brought about by the introduction of the 44-hour week, but no reform has ever been put into operation which did not cause some anomalies and inconveniences, or which was not met with some hostility, or did not cause some Jeremiah to rise and cry, "Blue ruin!" I remember quite distinctly in this House that, when the fixed award rate of 8s. a day was proposed to be applied to the sugar industry, the Tory Secretary for Agriculture got up and declared that in less than twelve months not one stick of cane would be grown or crushed in the State of Queensland.

Mr. MORGAN: Not 8s.

The PREMIER: Eight shillings a day under the Dickson award was the basis on which the great sugar industry was put on a sound footing, the people of Australia recognising that, having adopted a policy of a "white Australia," they could not expect white men to work in an industry for a wage that would satisfy the kanakas. I say that the false predictions of these Jeremiahs—all their cries of "stinking fish"—have ended in the same way. They have always criticised reform. Any

[12 Noon.] attempt at reform to improve the conditions of the workers is met by the usual criticism and the cry of "blue ruin." There is always the cry that it is going to ruin the country, and that capital is going to flee from the State. The hon. member for Aubigny stated that the railway employees in Victoria received wages higher than were paid in Queensland. To make comparisons the Tory is very fond of going to Victoria—an old settled State, only one-seventh the size of Queensland, where all the railways and roads were built with cheap money in the early days, and with a population twice that of Queensland. Those comparisons are most unfair. But even if they were fair, I am going to show by way of comparison that conditions are better in Queensland than in Victoria for railway workers. I will reply to the statement by the hon. member for Aubigny with respect to railway employees in Victoria and Queensland. These are the daily rates of pay—

	Queensland.	Victoria.
	(Per Day.)	(Per Day.)
Guards	17s. 3d. to 20s.	14s. to 18s. 5d.
Signalmen	15s. 5d. to 20s. 2½d.	15s. 5d. to 18s. 11d.
Porters	14s. 8½d.	13s. 11d.
Drivers	17s. 7½d. to 20s. 11d.	17s. 10d. to 21s. 10a.
Firemen	15s. 3½d. to 16s. 4½d.	14s. 10d. to 16s. 10d.
Cleaners	8s. to 14s. 8½d.	6s. to 14s. 4d.
Fettlers	15s. 2d.	13s. 11d. to 14s. 5d.
Gangers	17s. 2d. to 18s. 6d.	15s. 8d. to 17s. 2d.

Although the rates of pay per day in some instances are higher in Victoria, the allow-

ances and conditions are more favourable in Queensland. In Queensland we have a

[Hon. W. N. Gillies.

44-hour week as against a 43-hour week in Victoria, and the cost of living in Victoria is 13.5 per cent. higher than in Queensland. The area of Victoria is 63,000 square miles, that of Queensland 670,000 square miles, while the population of Victoria is 1,633,000 as compared with 827,000 in Queensland. To compare a new State like Queensland—where developmental work is going on, and where there were practically no roads in existence before the Ryan Government adopted a road policy—with a settled State like Victoria, with one-seventh the area and twice the population—is a most unfair comparison to apply to the public debt or anything else in connection with expenditure.

In reply to an interjection the hon. member for Aubigny said that he was in favour of a wage tax. I wish him good luck in his progress with regard to a wage tax. He said that Queensland was groaning under the burden of taxation. I have already called attention to the fact of the small population and the large area of this State, which is carrying out a rapid developmental policy; and it goes without saying that the per capita tax must, if the Government are doing their duty, be higher than in an old settled State with a large population. That all goes to show the necessity for carrying out a developmental policy and for attracting more people to assist to pay the taxation. The figures that I shall quote speak volumes as to the methods of the Labour party in regard to taxation. We believe in imposing the burden of taxation on those best able to pay.

Mr. EDWARDS: The primary producer has to pay the burden of taxation.

The PREMIER: I will show that that is not so.

Mr. MORGAN: He has to carry the burden.

The PREMIER: Before I sit down I will expose the mass of ignorance as disclosed by those interjections. Taking the income tax paid by a married man with a wife and family of three in Queensland, we find that a man on a net income not exceeding £440 per annum pays no income tax at all. In the other States the payments per taxpayer with an income of £440 are—

	£	s.	d.
New South Wales ...	1	10	0
Victoria ...	0	10	0
South Australia ...	3	12	11
Western Australia ...	0	7	0
Tasmania ...	13	0	2

I would now like to touch upon the amount of income tax paid by the farmers.

Mr. KELSO: When you were assisting to have your brother returned for Byron Bay you only gave one example.

The PREMIER: The hon. member can give those examples from legislation passed by his past Governments and Governments in other States, with which he ought to be familiar. I am not quoting examples of past Governments. The total number of farmers who paid land tax in 1923-24 was only 3,552, holding 1,000 acres or less land in Queensland, out of a total number of 25,000 to 26,000 farmers.

Mr. MORGAN: How many paid income tax?

The PREMIER: I will give you those figures too. The total number of people who paid income tax in Queensland, as shown by the 1924 report, was 25,706, and the

number of farmers included in this number was 2,791. The total income tax paid by individuals was £856,613, whilst the total paid by farmers, including sugar-growers, was £78,599. Of this latter sum £62,675 was paid by sugar-cane growers. It will be thus seen that only a very small sum was paid in income tax by farmers.

Mr. MORGAN: It is deplorable to think that the farmers of Queensland earn so little that they cannot pay income tax.

The PREMIER: If the income tax paid by the farmers was allocated over the whole of the farmers of Queensland it would mean that a flat tax of between 15s. or 16s. would be paid by each farmer.

Mr. MORGAN: It is deplorable to think that their incomes will not permit of them paying the tax.

The PREMIER: I want to make some remarks in answer to the statements made concerning the increase in the public debt of Queensland. The figures which I used in regard to the by-election at Toowoomba have been criticised during the recent New South Wales election campaign when, I am very proud to say, I assisted at least one good man in the Northern Rivers district to be returned to the New South Wales Parliament to support the Labour party. The whole fight in the North Coast electorates hinged on what the Labour party had done in Queensland. The Jeremiahs of Queensland, who have made their wealth out of Queensland, went down there and made disparaging statements concerning the condition of their own State. The time has arrived or is fast arriving, when a law should be enacted to deal with men who malign their own State. There has been a great deal of talk about the deportation of undesirables from Australia, but the man who criticises his own State in which he has made a huge fortune, as is being done in Queensland, is a great deal worse. A lot of criticism has been hurled against the Government for increasing the public debt. It has been stated that the public debt is increasing alarmingly. That is not the case. It is not increasing at the same rate as in States in the South with Tory Governments. I have already pointed out on previous occasions that these are settled States, which should have carried out their developmental work years ago, and whose debt should not be increasing in the same ratio as the debt of a young State like Queensland. Expenditure on such public works as railways, land development, and reforestation schemes cannot be met out of revenue received through taxation. This expenditure must be carried out under a loan policy. From the following figures, showing the manner in which the public debt has been increasing in the various States of the Commonwealth, it will be seen that Queensland has nothing to be ashamed of:—

	Increased Loan Indebtedness 1915 to 1924.
	£
Commonwealth ...	378,171,269
New South Wales ...	96,444,110
Victoria ...	51,024,399
Queensland ...	33,692,304
South Australia ...	34,935,206
Western Australia ...	25,743,160
Tasmania ...	10,599,639

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

Mr. KELSO: How much is that per capita?

The PREMIER: I will give the hon. member those figures in a few minutes, if he has patience. Let me now give the—

## PUBLIC DEBT PER HEAD OF POPULATION.

	£
New South Wales ... ..	100
Victoria ... ..	75
Queensland ... ..	109
South Australia ... ..	132
Western Australia ... ..	174
Tasmania ... ..	111

Queensland's gross debt includes a floating debt of about £5,000,000, which was not shown in the 1915 figures as part of the debt. That is a point I might emphasise, and it is one to which the hon. member for Chillagoe has called attention on more than one occasion. That brings the figures down by £5,000,000.

I make no apology with regard to the increase in the public debt, because we cannot carry out our developmental policy on loan money. It is a sad thing to admit that we cannot regulate usury. We are paying a fabulous price for money. I believe the ancient Romans attempted to do away with usury altogether, and later to control it. One of our greatest problems at the present time is to exercise some control over the money-lender. The Federal Loan Council have endeavoured to do so by appointing one body to make the necessary arrangements with regard to the procurement abroad of loan money.

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

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

“That the Premier be granted an extension of time.”

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I do not intend to impose upon hon. members, but I wish to reply to certain criticism, and will be as brief as I can.

Mr. MORGAN: It is all right so long as you extend the same courtesy to us.

The PREMIER: I shall quote a few figures in reply to the Jeremiahs who say that this State is going to be ruined by increased wages. I realise that, if wages are paid and not properly earned, such a system is injurious not only to the industry but to the worker himself. To show the wonderful prosperity and development of our State, I shall quote a few figures made available by the Economic Commission appointed by the Arbitration Court to supply certain much-needed data that should be available to the Arbitration Court.

Mr. MORGAN: Are you dealing with the prosperity of Brisbane or of Queensland?

The PREMIER: With that of Queensland. I shall quote the value of production for the years 1914 and 1923, leaving out other years, because the table has been published and is available to anyone who wishes to secure the information.

Mr. KELSO: Will you give us a comparison with other States?

The PREMIER: The figures are—

## VALUE OF PRODUCTION—STATE OF QUEENSLAND.

	1914.	1923.	Estimated Value, 1924.
	£	£	£
Agriculture .. .. .	5,680,000	10,105,000	15,000,000
Pastoral .. .. .	16,290,000	19,500,000	22,425,000
Dairying, poultry, &c. .. .. .	3,499,000	6,000,000	6,600,000
Forestry and fishery .. .. .	1,826,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Mining .. .. .	2,976,000	2,267,000	2,267,000
Manufacturing .. .. .	8,071,000	16,048,000	17,653,000
Total value of production .. .. .	£38,342,000	£56,920,000	£63,945,000

I desire hon. members on both sides of the House to take particular notice of those totals.

Mr. MORGAN: Those figures are most unfair. The hon. gentleman knows that prices have doubled since 1914.

The PREMIER: Now I will give the number of employees engaged in industry, as these figures are a good indication as to the progress made.

## NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN INDUSTRY.

1914.	1923.	Estimate for 1924.
145,409	154,922	157,600

The following figures are more important still, as they show that the workers are producing more.

Mr. ROBERTS: You know that is not so. The value has increased.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Another slander on the worker.

The PREMIER: The figures are:—

## AVERAGE VALUE OF PRODUCTION PER HEAD OF EMPLOYEE.

1914.	1923.	Estimate for 1924.
£263.68	£370.00	£424.78

[Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

I think these figures speak volumes, and they are a great compliment to the workers of Queensland, as they show that, when men are well treated, they will work properly.

Mr. ROBERTS: They did not tell you that at Ipswich.

The PREMIER: Now we come to the excess of imports over exports. The leader of the Opposition had something to say about secondary industries, and I am very pleased to know that the hon. member now is beginning to take an interest in secondary industries. As Secretary for Agriculture, I believed it my duty to encourage in every possible way primary industries, and I think that we have been able to do, so far as legislation goes, all that is possible to encourage primary industries in this State. The result speaks for itself. But I have

always stated that a nation cannot stand on one leg; it must stand on two legs—that is, on her primary and her secondary industries; and the time has arrived when the State must pay more attention to secondary industries. If the people engaged in those industries are not going to establish them, then something must be done to accomplish that object, the same as has been done in connection with our primary industries.

With regard to the figures of the hon. member for Aubigny, I say that the question of factories is not a test, nor in a State like Queensland, practically a primary producing country, is the test of secondary industries one that can be applied to the Government. The increase in our exports over our imports, I submit, is the crucial, and should be the final test of production in a State that is a primary producing State. I want to give the figures:—

## MARCH QUARTERLY SUMMARY, 1923-24.

	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of Imports over Exports.	Excess of Exports over Imports.
	£	£	£	£
New South Wales .. .. .	58,225,180	43,146,722	15,078,458	..
Victoria .. .. .	49,592,643	29,612,548	19,980,095	..
Queensland .. .. .	11,605,668	14,628,305	..	3,022,637
South Australia .. .. .	12,700,321	16,912,932	..	4,212,611
Western Australia .. .. .	6,662,729	12,412,625	..	5,749,896
Tasmania .. .. .	1,817,320	2,766,032	..	948,712

That shows that New South Wales and Victoria—two Tory-governed States—went to the bad, New South Wales to the extent of nearly £15,000,000—that is to say, her imports were nearly £15,000,000 more than her exports; and Victoria, that much mis-governed Tory State, went to the bad £19,000,000 in the same time. These figures speak for themselves, and show that Queensland has made good progress in the ten years under Labour rule.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Figures are tiresome, and it is not my practice to quote figures, but I found these figures were so important and so conclusive that I think I am justified in taking up a little time this morning in getting them into "Hansard." I think we are prone to attach too much importance to "Hansard," but it is important that these figures should be stated by someone in authority.

I want to reply now to the leader of the Opposition, who made, in my opinion an unwarranted attack on the Price Fixing Commissioner. I think he should be the last man to do so, because he was criticising something that the Price Fixing Commissioner did in the interests of the farmers—in the interests of wheat growers and maize growers of the State—with regard to bags.

What are the facts? The hon. gentleman simply repeats the stupid statement of some aggrieved profiteer. Numerous complaints were received by the Commissioner of Prices from the Local Producers' Associations, the Council of Agriculture, and individual far-

mers with regard to the price of bags. Reliable information showed the likelihood of a sharp increase, and Mr. Ferry took action. He issued a proclamation on the 19th May, declaring wheat sacks to be "commodities," and after that a notice fixing the price. No protests were received with regard to that action, but quite a number of associations wrote to Mr. Ferry congratulating him on the action he had taken: Among those who asked for the action to be taken were the Local Producers' Associations at Teviotville, Fassifern, Brisbane Valley, Field Representative Dinges, Drayton, Thornton, Charwood, and Rocky Creek, in my own electorate, and the Department of Agriculture forwarded them to Mr. Ferry, who took the necessary action to regulate or control the price of sacks. When he found that jute had increased in price in India and the bags naturally would be quoted at a higher price, he revoked that decision; but I submit that the decision was arrived at by Mr. Ferry on the evidence before him, and in the interests of the primary producers of the State. The leader of the Opposition should be the last man in this Chamber to criticise that. We may have our own views in regard to price fixing—I regard it only as an expedient at best—but I say that the Commissioner of Prices has accomplished good work in the interests of the primary producers and consumers during the time he has held that position. He is a man of great capacity, and his only concern is to do the right, honourable, and fair thing by the farmers.

With regard to prickly-pear, the late leader of the Opposition had some criticism

*Hon. W. N. Gillies.]*

to advance about the action of the Government in that direction. If the present Secretary for Public Lands deserves credit for one thing more than another, not only in this House, but from the point of view of the benefit of every man, woman, and child in Queensland, it is in regard to this matter, because prickly-pear is the greatest vegetable pest known to science, and it is only a matter of time when, if it is not dealt with, the pest will kill Australia. The pest is spreading at the extent of over 100 acres in Australia every hour. That means that an area twice the size of the Botanical Gardens here has come under pear since I rose to speak.

Mr. MORGAN: It is time you realised that.

The PREMIER: It is time, as the interjector says, that the Government realised the necessity of doing something. The function of the Opposition has been to say, "Why didn't you do it before?" If we do anything we do not get the credit for it, but are told we should have done better. I am prepared to admit that it should have been done 40 years ago. As an ex-member of the Public Works Commission, when the Commission went through the Taroom district we heard it stated that this was one of the legacies of the Tory period; that, like the cattle tick, they had allowed it to spread over the State and had done nothing. Now, when the Labour Government do something to come with this great pest, even a little bit of tardy recognition or praise does not come our way. The Brisbane "Courier" of 30th July last in a sub-leader on the report of the Prickly-pear Commission stated—

"The paragraphs devoted to pastoral occupation, to the need for a more sympathetic regard for the welfare of the small settler, and to the imperative need in places for the encouragement of closer settlement, strike a note not merely of courage but of statesmanship."

What about the Opposition? Why cannot the Opposition rise to the occasion and give credit where credit is due? The "Courier" goes on to say—

"This report bubbles with the certainty of success and with the realisation of something attempted and something done."

And I say again, when the Labour party do anything, it is always too soon, or it is too slow, it should have been done years ago, or the time is not ripe. I congratulate the Secretary for Public Lands upon attempting to deal with this great problem in a business-like way, and I want to congratulate the Commission for the good work they have done during the short time they have been at work. I hope that, as time goes on, Parliament will be able to make available larger sums of money for this work—money which in future will be allocated from loan funds—because money can be spent in clearing large areas of pear, which is capable of being destroyed economically and which can be sown to Rhodes grass or something else and yield a good return.

Just one word now with regard to the interjection of the leader of the Opposition that this party were under an agreement to be subsidised by the liquor trade. I deny that. I deny that there is any such agreement with the Government party or any

member of the party. The Labour platform is clear and definite on the point.

Mr. MORGAN: There was an agreement. One of your members said so.

The PREMIER: I deny that there is any agreement between myself or any member of the party and the liquor trade, and I resent the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MORGAN: They paid £10,000!

The PREMIER: Before I sit down I just want to connect the party which has tried to connect my party with the liquor trade with an outside organisation.

Mr. HYNES (to Mr. Morgan): You sold your soul to the National Union.

The PREMIER: I thank the hon. member for his interjection, because I want to say just one or two words before I sit down about the Opposition being bound and shackled, and I shall convict them from the mouths of their own friends. The daily papers, the "Courier" included, have repeatedly referred to the fact that the present Opposition are bound and shackled to the National Union. They get their funds from that union, and, as the "Courier" points out, no doubt the people who supply the funds will call the tune, and will dominate their policy. No matter what is printed and circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country, it is the financial institutions in the South that will determine what policy is to be carried out if the people of Queensland are so misguided in their judgment as to allow hon. members opposite to assume the reins of office.

Mr. MORGAN: Did the liquor trade do that to you when they gave you £10,000?

The PREMIER: "The Producers' Review" of 10th March last says—

"The 'Melbourne Age' has declared that the National Union is representative of trusts and combines and other powerful Melbourne interests. Those concerns certainly have no sympathy with the small man on the land. . . . Until the Country party ceases to be associated with city parties and city organisations it will be known as the camouflaged wing of the big interests of the city."

Again, the "Courier" of 18th March last, quoting Mr. Fergus McMaster, of Winton, said—

"An organisation that collects and controls funds, constituted as the National Union is, must, and will, have a policy, either public or secret, and must, and will, exact conditions upon those whom it subsidises."

Mr. EDWARDS: £10,000 for ten years!

The PREMIER: As Scotchmen say—

"Facts are chieft that winna ding,  
And daurna be disputed."

And, as the Englishman says, "Facts are stubborn things." These are facts.

Mr. KING: They are not facts; they are only statements.

The PREMIER: The "Courier" of 11th March last said—

"In old-fashioned surgery, doctors frequently introduced a foreign body into an open wound in order to irritate it and prevent its healing quickly. That was

called a seton. That is exactly what the National Union is in Queensland politics."

[12.30 p.m.]

The "Courier" on 5th March, 1925, said—

"The National Union on the other hand, is so unrepresentative that nobody appears to know the names of the Committee, *i.e.*, nobody outside of a very special and select circle, and, as we frankly stated some days ago, we have been unable to smash through the barriers of secrecy that surround it and ascertain more than a few of the names."

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. Knight was a member of that Committee at one time.

The PREMIER: The "Courier" continues—

"We have challenged this coterie to come into the open and say who comprise it, what interest they represent, and by what authority did it give representatives of southern money the right to interfere in Queensland elections."

In the same article the "Courier" states—

"We have specifically stated that the whole issue is whether anti-Socialist campaigns shall be conducted by Queensland people, through their elected delegates and committees, or by gentlemen whose names are unknown to the public, and who represent only themselves, their own particular firms, or big interests in Melbourne and Sydney."

On 28th February, the "Courier" stated—

"But this National Union is a self-appointed body, consisting of the managers of big trading firms in Brisbane. The firms donate subscriptions, but their managers do not. The managers, however, in their capacity as members of the National Union, arrogate to themselves the spending of the funds."

In its leader on 4th February the "Courier" stated—

"To suggest that the trouble between the Southern Divisional Council of the United Party and the National Union centres around such a sordid matter as the collection and distribution of party funds is ridiculous, and is hardly likely to appeal to anybody with a shred of intelligence. The trouble revolves around a great principle, the principle whether the organisation is to be controlled by the people themselves or by a self-appointed oligarchy that does not tell the people for whom it stands, for what it stands, or what interests it seeks to conserve."

Further on in the same article this is stated—

"Let the National Union frankly tell the people of Queensland whom it represents and by whom it is being maintained in existence. . . . The time has come when the branches of the United party must get to work and ascertain in the most unequivocal language whether their parliamentary representatives are going to hold their political trusts for the people or for the National Union."

On the 2nd February, 1925, it stated—

"It would hardly be consistent with the love of power that resides in most men and bodies of men if the National

Union did not assert the right to say how the money should be spent, and whether or no this or that candidate should receive endorsement and support. No man of the world would believe the National Union of so anemic a constitution as to put up with the form of power when by using its monetary authority it could acquire the substance. . . . The parliamentarians may be blind enough to hand themselves over to the tender mercies of the National Union, but the men and women in the various electorates who placed them where they are will not consent to surrender their rights of choice to such an arbitrary combination."

Mr. MORGAN: Does the hon. gentleman believe the "Courier." (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: I believe the "Courier" knows more about the Opposition than I do, and I am prepared to accept its statement with regard to the National Union. Let me now quote the remarks by the hon. member for Burnett as contained in the Maryborough "Chronicle." He is thus reported—

"That paper (the "Courier") has also reproached the National Union, which was to have been the collecting authority under the old agreement. The "Courier" would create the impression that the union was composed of a few self-appointed individuals. That might or might not have been a fact in the past, but the Country party has asked for and secured eight of its supporters as representatives on that body."

(Government laughter.) In the words of the hon. member for Burnett the Opposition are connected with the National Union.

Mr. CORSER: Read the whole of the article. That dealt with the past, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

The PREMIER: From the lips of the hon. member for Burnett, the Opposition are connected with the National Union.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman is deliberately misquoting.

The PREMIER: There are one or two other matters that I would like to deal with. There are one or two important Bills to come before the House on which I should have had something to say. They were referred to by various speakers, and should have been replied to in this debate, but as the House has extended to me the privilege of an extension of time, I will not abuse that privilege.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by thanking hon. members for their courtesy in granting me an extension of time.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KING (*Logan*): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WEIR: Is this the speech you were to have made last night?

Mr. KING: I desire to say a few words on the motion before it goes through. In the first place, I would like to congratulate the Premier and those with him who have been recently elevated on their elevation. I hope that their attainment of office will be a happy one as long as the Ministry remain in power, which I know they will not after the next general elections. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BRUCE: Alf. Jones is no longer the optimist in this House.

Mr. King.]

Mr. KING: I also would like to pay my tribute of respect to His Excellency, Sir Matthew Nathan. Everyone will agree that during his term of office Sir Matthew Nathan has won the respect and approbation of all sections of the community, and no Governor will leave the shores of Queensland with more respect, or with greater feelings of regret from the populace than Sir Matthew Nathan. I sincerely trust that the practice of appointing State Governors, which has hitherto prevailed, will not, according to the desires of some hon. members opposite, be changed. I hope that we shall still have Home representatives as the Governors of the Dominions, and especially in this State of Queensland. The principle has worked well in the past, and it is far better to have a representative of His Majesty coming to govern this State than to have a man in that position who is trammelled by party bias and prejudice, as would be involved in the appointment of a political "has been." Apart altogether from the splendid results which accrue to the State by the appointment of an overseas Governor, who travels through the State, takes notice, and uses his experience on his return for the benefit of this State, I still feel that there is a little bit of sentiment in having the Governor appointed from the centre of the Empire. The appointment of a Home representative binds the State to the Crown and Empire. I know that hon. members opposite would like to cut all that out.

Mr. WEIR: They cut you out last night. (Laughter.)

Mr. KING: I have still that little bit of sentiment which I hope I shall never lose.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Sentiment ought to begin at home.

Mr. KING: I would like to refer to the remarks which have just fallen from the Premier. I wish particularly to deal with his references to the National Union. It appears to me most extraordinary that the Premier should get up in his place to deliver an important speech and that the Treasury benches should be practically empty. There was not, apparently, a particle of interest shown in his speech by his followers or the representatives of the Government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh! (and dissent).

Mr. KING: That only shows what is generally recognised outside—that there is dissension in the Cabinet, and that the Premier has not the confidence of the majority of his party.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Just have a look at your own ranks!

Mr. KING: Yes, I see our own ranks.

Mr. BRUCE: You could not find them last night. (Laughter.)

Mr. KING: It is deplorable that the leader of the Government should have such a poor following or support when making an important speech as he did this morning. When the hon. member for Chillagoe was Premier and made a Ministerial statement it was usual to see the Treasury benches crowded. To-day there were not more than fifteen members present at any time when the Premier was speaking.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is a deliberate untruth.

[Mr. King.

Mr. KING: Let me refer for one moment to the National Union. It was all very pleasant for the Premier to make his statements about the National Union, and, if there were any justification for them, they would form still more interesting reading, but there is no justification for the hon. gentleman's remarks. Everything the hon. gentleman said about the National Union and the Country-Progressive party in connection with that union is based on an absolutely rotten foundation. I made a statement when the Country-Progressive party came into being, and I have not veered from that statement in any shape or form. I said that we were not connected in any way with the National Union, and the position remains the same. This Country-Progressive party has not, and never has had, any connection with the National Union. It has not received any funds from the National Union, and has no expectation of receiving any such funds.

Mr. BRUCE: You must be getting your funds from Germany, then.

Mr. KING: We are not getting them from compulsory levies on the rank and file of the workers. We have set up the necessary authority, and are getting the money we need from voluntary sources.

Mr. CLAYTON: There is no levy on the publicans, either.

Mr. KING: All the remarks made by the Premier in connection with the National Union are based on extracts the hon. gentleman has read from the "Courier," and all the articles in the "Courier" are based on an assumption which the "Courier" knows has no foundation. I say that deliberately. I desire to tell hon. members that the "Courier" did its best to try to trap me into answering certain questions, which I would not answer. I said that I had given a plain statement which, if the King's English means anything, meant what it said. I stated that this party have nothing to do with the National Union: that if the "Courier" was trying to trap me into making a statement which would be used—not for the benefit of the Country-Progressive party, but for a stick or club with which to bang the National Union—I was not going to provide that stick. At the same time, the National Union has my sympathy.

Mr. HYNES: What about the agreement of the 19th January of this year?

Mr. KING: If the hon. member for Townsville had any sense at all, he would recognise that that was an agreement entered into before the coalition came about; that we were then separate entities; and that state of affairs has ended.

Mr. THEODORE: What caused the split in the National United party?

Mr. KING: I am not going to answer that question. (Government laughter.) I might as well ask what caused the split in the Labour party that caused the election of the hon. member for Bowen as Premier. (Opposition laughter.) I say emphatically and finally that this Country-Progressive party has nothing to do with the National Union, and I know exactly what I am speaking about.

Now I will deal with the hon. gentleman's speech. I think it was one of the poorest attempts that a leader of the Government ever made in attempting to justify his party.

It was the poorest attempt I ever heard, and as to answering the criticisms of the leader of the Opposition, it was only an attempt; it was nothing approaching an answer.

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member for Wynnum is making notes. You be careful. (Laughter.)

Mr. KING: The hon. member for Wynnum is well able to look after himself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KING: The last part of the hon. gentleman's speech seemed to me to be a futile attempt to justify his own Government. For about a half a minute he made some reference to the Governor's Speech, but he never mentioned anything about the programme before the House. That was what we were expecting, but he seemed to be quite content to take up the time of the House in talking about the speeches he made in support of the candidature of his brother on the other side of the border, and his attempts to answer the leader of the Opposition. He also made some reference to the ex-Premier, the hon. member for Chillagoe, and he denied that that gentleman had been kicked out of his party. I do not believe for a moment that the hon. member for Chillagoe was kicked out of his party. At the same time I think that, to a very large extent, he lost caste with his party, and he is now seeking a haven of rest away from his party. He is looking for that haven of rest in the Federal district of Herbert. He is not member for the Herbert yet, and he has got a great deal to do before he gets there.

Mr. BRUCE: It is a "knotty" question.

Mr. KING: It is a "knotty" question, and he will find that he will have very great difficulty in winning that seat. The Premier expressed the hope that the hon. member for Chillagoe would be able to go to the Federal House and do for Australia what he has done for Queensland. If he "does" Australia the same as he "did" Queensland, then I am very sorry indeed for Australia.

Mr. MAXWELL: God help us.

Mr. KING: Without being offensive in any way, I hope that the hon. member for Chillagoe will not have the opportunity of exercising his talents down there. That he has many talents nobody doubts, but I hope he will be given an opportunity of exercising his talents in some other sphere than politics. The Premier also tried to cast aspersions upon certain statements that have been made by Mr. McGill, President of the Country-Progressive Party Organisation. Much as the Premier might like to cast aspersions on that policy, a portion of which has been given to the Press, it is just as well that too much publicity should not be given to the policy of the Country-Progressive Party. (Government laughter.)

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Keep it dark.

Mr. KING: We are going to keep it dark, because otherwise the Labour party would collar it. (Government laughter.) Hon. members opposite are looking for something to catch popular opinion, and that is why they are so put out, and why they are trying to treat the statement of Mr. McGill with a certain amount of contempt. The Government will get the Country-Progressive Party policy in due course and at a time when they will not have an opportunity of stealing what we intend to put before the electors.

It is rather difficult to follow the Premier at a moment's notice. He gave us a tremendous number of figures, but there is just one matter I would like to refer to in connection with the argument raised by him when dealing with income tax. He said that a man in Queensland with a wife and three children, and earning £440 per annum, would not pay any income tax. That is quite true, but the hon. gentleman picked out the one particular case to suit his purpose. I want to compare Queensland with Victoria, and show how unfavourably Queensland stands in this regard—

	Queensland.	Victoria.
Net income of £325—		
Single .. .. .	£ s. d. 2 15 0	£ s. d. 1 11 3
Married .. .. .	1 4 0	0 18 9
Married (1 child) ..	Nil	0 6 3
Married (2 children)	Nil	Nil
Net Income of £425—		
Single .. .. .	7 3 7	2 16 3
Married .. .. .	5 6 2	2 3 9
Married (1 child) ..	3 2 10	1 11 3
Married (2 children)	1 4 0	0 18 9
(2) Taxation per capita	4 9 2	2 11 3
(3) Average rate of tax per £1 of taxable income—		
Individuals .. .. .	19-19d.	5-39d.
Companies .. .. .	33-78d.	12-00d.

That shows with regard to the particular argument which was raised by the Premier that, compared with Victoria, the conditions in Queensland are infinitely worse in regard to a married man with a moderate-sized family.

The third paragraph in the Governor's Speech states—

"While I am satisfied that a large proportion of Queensland is and must remain pastoral, I am also satisfied that the area at present utilised for the various branches of farming and agriculture could be vastly increased."

I believe that statement. There is not the slightest doubt that these areas could be very largely increased, and I say that the Government are not doing their duty in fostering or developing the agricultural industry as they should. Country life must be made attractive. There has been nothing done to make it attractive. The perpetual lease tenure also is not sufficiently attractive to the agriculturist. The conditions of the leases are too onerous; there is not sufficient freedom given; there is too much dictation from the Minister. Then on the top of all we have heavy land taxation. The policy of previous Governments in connection with agricultural lands was to allow selectors the opportunity of acquiring the freehold of the properties. The very best thing that happened to Queensland was that there were such statutes in existence. They enabled agriculturists to go out and acquire their properties. These men were the pioneers of the State, and they certainly made good. If the conditions which existed then were in operation now, I feel sure that primary production would go ahead far quicker and with better results than it is doing at present.

Mr. King.]

Now, I want to take the figures for the areas under the crops during certain periods. First, the period from 1905 to 1914—

	Acres.
1905	522,743
1914	792,568

Increase in nine years 269,820

Then take the period from 1914 to 1923, during which the Labour party were in power—

	Acres.
1914	792,568
1923	871,968

Increase in nine years 79,400

Those figures show in a striking fashion how the increase in the area under crop has become less and less as the years go by under Labour rule. The conclusion is further borne out by looking at the figures giving the land under occupation for the same periods—

	Acres.
1905	240,152,615
1914	331,499,703

Increase in nine years 91,347,093

1914	331,499,703
1923	307,658,290

Decrease in nine years 23,841,418

Now, I propose to take some figures relating to the value of the actual production in the Commonwealth, to show that, whilst it has increased in Queensland, it has not increased in anything like the same ratio as that in which it has increased in other States—

	Queensland.	Other States.
	£	£
1914	38,342,000	171,755,000
1923	56,921,000	325,287,000
Increase	18,579,000	153,532,000
Percentage increase	48.4	89.4

The £ sterling in 1914 (according to Commonwealth statistics) was equal to 34s. in 1923. The value of Queensland production in 1923 in terms of the 1914 money value was, therefore, £33,483,000, which shows a decrease from 1914 to 1923 of £4,859,000 in the real value of production under identical conditions of the currency; this, in spite of an increase in population of over 20 per cent. Taking the values of production for 1914 and 1923 at 1914 money value on a population basis, we get the following result:—

Value of production—

1914	£56 13s. per head of population.
1923	£41 5s. per head of population.

[2 p.m.]

In every department of industry, primary and secondary, Queensland, unfortunately, shows the worst results in comparison with the other States of Australia since 1914.

Mr. MORGAN: A deplorable thing.

Mr. KING: These figures, taken from the Economic Commission's report on the Queensland basic wage and from the Commonwealth "Year Book," indicate a disheartening state of affairs in Queensland.

[Mr. King.

They show the position in various industries in the years 1914 and 1923—

	Increase.
	Per cent.
Agriculture—	
Queensland	77.3
Other States	143.7
Pastoral—	
Queensland	19.7
Other States	80.7
Dairy, Poultry, Bee—	
Queensland	71.4
Other States	107.3
Forestry and Fisheries—	
Queensland	64.2
Other States	70.8
Mining—	
Queensland	*23.8
Other States	*5.3
Manufacturing—	
Queensland	98.9
Other States	110.9
Totals (all productions, primary and secondary)—	
Queensland	53.4
Other States	89.4

\*Decrease.

Those figures show that in every department of primary and secondary industries the decreases are more noticeable in Queensland than in any other State of Australia.

Another drawback to production in Queensland has been land taxation. Prior to the advent of the Labour Government, there was no land taxation in Queensland, but since that Government came into power they have collected £3,804,999 by way of land taxation up to 30th June, 1924.

Mr. COLLINS: A very just tax.

Mr. KING: The hon. gentleman may think so, but it is collected at the expense of the country. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not own any land. Prior to 1923 the land tax exemption was only £300. Further, the Government have abolished freehold, and have increased the capital value of Crown land for selection by over 10s. an acre. They have imposed a further land tax for the upkeep of hospitals in hospital districts. All this taxation tends to drive people from the country into the cities and towns. It is well to see what is the exact position with regard to the drift of the population from the country to the cities and towns. For the nine-year period between 1905-14 the increase in the population of the cities and towns was 24 per cent. Between 1914-23 the increase amounted to 28 per cent. That is in the cities and towns, but see how the shires fared in connection with these population figures. In the nine-year period 1905-14 the shires showed an increase in population amounting to 41 per cent., but in the similar period 1914-23 the increase only amounted to 8 per cent. This shows conclusively that the shires, represented mostly by country electorates, are not getting the increase of population expected and which is justified in a State like Queensland, having so much agricultural land. The population, instead of going to the country, is drifting to the cities. The figures I have quoted prove that fact conclusively.

Mr. COLLINS: Does not that coincide with the position all over the world?

Mr. KING: I quite agree that it does, but it is happening more markedly in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is not correct.

Mr. KING: I know that it is happening to a greater extent in other States, for instance, in Victoria, but Victoria has not the amount of farming and agricultural land that Queensland has, neither has it the financial resources which will induce the people to get out into the country on to the land and not settle in the cities.

I would just like to say another word in connection with the part of the Governor's Speech dealing with the wool position. The Speech starts off—

“Little can be said at present on the wool position.”

I am pleased to see by this morning's newspapers that the prices of wool have increased, and that they are more stable now; but the perversity of fate is strikingly illustrated in the wool question. We know that in 1915 the Government set out to “make the squatter squeal.”

Mr. MAXWELL: To make everybody squeal.

Mr. KING: Since that time the squatter, through the phenomenal prices he has received for his wool, has undoubtedly saved the Government from financial disaster.

Mr. WARREN: Hear, hear!

Mr. KING: The squatters, through the London money-lenders, have made the Government squeal more than the Government made the squatters squeal. The Government have been forced to grant the squatter terms which they never dreamt of receiving—terms much better than the small grazing selectors receive, and much better terms than if the so-called “Repudiation Act” had never been passed. Unfortunately, the Government muffled its squeal in the caucus room for fear the electors should become aware of the true facts of the case. The amounts that the Government have been compelled to forgo as a result of the passing of the “Repudiation Act” have never yet been stated.

Mr. COLLINS: No such Act as a “Repudiation Act” was ever passed.

Mr. KING: We know that the Land Act the Government passed was known as the “Repudiation Act.” I do not want to take up the time of the House giving the increases in the price of wool since 1914 beyond saying that there has been a marked increase; but I would like to refer to the export statistics, in which wool has played such an important part. The total value of the whole of our exports in 1914 was £13,015,484, as compared with £15,782,072 in 1923. The total value of wool exported in 1914 was £4,393,185, which figures jumped in 1923 to £10,422,712. It will therefore be observed that the total value of exports, other than wool, fell from £8,622,299 to £5,353,360 in 1923. In other words, the value of exports, other than wool, shows a slump of over £3,000,000. The Government cannot take any credit for the increased value of wool exported, as the actual production of wool also shows a decrease, being a good deal less during the present Government's term of office than was the case previously. The figures are—

WOOL PRODUCED IN QUEENSLAND.	
1914	155,473,740 lb.
1923	121,913,075 lb.

being a shortage of 33,565,665 lb. during that period.

At 2.12 p.m.,

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): Mr. Speaker, I beg to call attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): Probably the action of hon. members opposite was in retaliation for my criticism about the small attendance of hon. members on the Government benches during the Premier's speech.

Mr. MORGAN: It was absolutely deliberate.

Mr. KING: Undoubtedly the phenomenal price of wool, coupled with the excessive expenditure of borrowed money, has saved Queensland.

I see some reference in the Governor's Speech to the forming of a Royal Commission to deal with local government boundaries. While recognising the need for this Commission, I regret that a consolidating local government measure has been postponed, and I see no reason for that postponement. When the Government are constituting the personnel of that Commission I stress the importance of appointing a representative from the Local Authorities' Association, and I strongly urge the Commission to visit every area concerned, and see at first-hand what is necessary in the way of alteration of those boundaries. Furthermore, I trust that the Commission will not start off with any preconceived notions as to what those boundaries should be.

Regarding the amendment of the arbitration laws by the creation of a Board of Trade and Arbitration, it appears manifest that this is for the purpose of finding a haven of rest for a good Government supporter. Probably a layman will be appointed—most likely a member of Parliament. But whether a layman or a legal man is appointed, we cannot hope that he will reach the high standard of excellence and sound logic set up by the late Chief Justice McCawley. The appointment of a lay member—especially a member of the Government—is not likely to inspire public confidence, as that member would be a prejudiced adjudicator. It is almost a reaction, going back to the old-time Wages Board, with this difference, that only the employee will be represented; consequently, it will be a class tribunal.

I would like to make some reference now to childhood endowment. This proposed legislation is the crest of the wave on which the Government hope to win the next general election; there is no doubt about that. They hope to gull the electors to vote for them, but I do not think it is going to be the popular cry that they think it is. There is no objection on general principles to child endowment, provided that the worker recognises that he is also under some obligation to assist. Mr. Piddington in “The Next Step” expresses the doctrine of the basic wage thus—

“It is the duty of employers to provide out of the products of industry such an amount as will enable all employees and their families to live according to current human standards of reasonable comfort.”

No one for a moment will deny that the worker is entitled to a wage sufficient to enable him to have a reasonable standard of comfort, but it is also the duty of the employee to give that efficient service that will enable the employer to make the product of his industry bring about the desired result.

*Mr. King.]*

It will be remembered that the Basic Wage Commission in 1920 recommended a basic wage of £5 16s. That was for the typical family of a man, wife, and three children. This was fixed on prices prevailing in November, 1920, and was subject to variations of prices. The late Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. Knibbs, on a reference being made to him, stated—

“Such a wage cannot be paid to all adult employees, because the whole produced wealth of the country, including all that portion of produced wealth which now goes in the shape of profit to employers, would not, if divided up equally amongst employees, yield the necessary weekly amount.”

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

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I have listened very attentively to the speeches delivered by hon. members opposite, and I cannot say that I am very much wiser than I was before they delivered their speeches. I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on the able manner in which they carried out their duties, and I think in a very short space of time they will be able to hold their own amongst the ablest debaters in this House. (Hear, hear!)

On the question of the appointment of State Governors, I want to be quite clear. I have always taken up the attitude I am going to take up this afternoon. I am not here to criticise the present Governor, which I would not hesitate to do if he deserved criticism, because I claim that the representatives of the people at all times are ever and above the Governor. But we are here to affirm what we believe, as a Labour party, is a right principle. We do not as a party believe in Imperially-appointed Governors. What we believe in to-day is the appointment of local Governors. I am well aware that a few years ago we stood for the abolition of State Governors. Personally, I would have much preferred that position to-day, but, like a good soldier, I have to fall into line with the Labour party's programme which was adopted at the Emu Park Convention in favour of the appointment of local Governors. Not that I think that is going to be the solution of the working class movement. The reason I am supporting it is because it is a step in advance in connection with the government of this State. We have a right to say who shall be the Governor of this State—not the Imperial authorities, but the people living in Queensland. If we are to have Governors in the future—which I have no doubt we shall have for some time yet, because the mass of the people are conservative—if we are to have them, let us hope that the day is not far distant when they will be elected by a direct vote of the people. I am one of those who believe that Governors do not fulfil any useful function, and we have to realise that in the age we are living in what might have been very well for our fathers and our grandfathers is not well for us. We are living in a different age altogether. I heard this morning the hon. member for Nundah quote an Englishman—the Right Honourable J. H. Thomas, a member of the House of Commons.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: A Labour man.

[*Mr. King.*

Mr. COLLINS: A Labour man; but I want to quote another Englishman in connection with this “flummery” that we see attached to the opening of Parliament, and also in connection with Governors in general—a far greater man than Mr. Thomas. That is Thomas Paine—one of the greatest men England ever produced. This is what he said—

“It is by distortedly exalting some men that others are distortedly debased. A vast mass of mankind are degradedly thrown into the background to bring forward with greater glare the puppet show of State and aristocracy.”

The utterance of Thomas Paine over 100 years ago is as true to-day as when it was uttered. That is in reply to the hon. member for Nundah, who quoted a living Englishman to-day, the Right Honourable J. H. Thomas. I am quoting a man who has a world-wide reputation, and so long as literature lasts in connection with the English language his name will live and will be among the immortals so far as Great Britain is concerned.

There are two or three paragraphs in the Governor's Speech which I intend to deal with this afternoon from my viewpoint—first, the paragraph which reads—

“It is now intended to amend the arbitration law and to extend and improve its authority by the creation of a court to be called the Board of Trade and Arbitration. This tribunal will have judicial and also administrative powers. As well as exercising the functions of an Arbitration Court, the Board will be charged with the duties of collecting statistics and of fully investigating all matters connected with labour and industry and economic and social problems.”

A very good paragraph, indeed! I remember full well the speech which I delivered in this House when the Industrial Arbitration Bill was introduced in 1915. It is to be found in “Hansard,” vol. cxx., page 817. At that time I said—

“We do not state—at least I do not—that this measure is the be-all and end-all of this great movement.”

I wanted to convey at that time that it was not the be-all and end-all of the great Labour movement. Further on, I said—

“After all, the Industrial Court under this Bill will be presided over by a judge.”

“I might here say that it all depends on that judge.” I have not altered my view in that respect at all. Arbitration depends upon the man who is the judge, and his decisions are more or less final. I remember that I recommended myself for the position if the workers were to get justice. I do not want hon. members to think for one moment that I am an applicant for the position as outlined in the Government's programme in regard to a layman being appointed to the bench. (Opposition laughter.) I have no hesitation in saying that much will depend upon that layman. If that layman has got the courage, which I hope he will have—whichever may be appointed—to see that justice is done to the mass of the people, and that justice will be done to the workers—because I remember saying in that same speech of mine that I did not have much faith in men who were paid large salaries such as we are paying our Arbitration Court judges to-day.

I am one of those who believe, after all, that while they may have the legal training mentioned by the deputy leader of the Opposition a few moments ago, they have not got the wisdom or experience, and know very little as a rule about the struggles and trials of the masses of the people. As I said a moment ago, much will depend upon the courage of the layman whom we may place upon the Arbitration Court bench. As a rule, the pendulum generally swings on the side of the capitalist class, and does not swing in our direction as well as, in my opinion, it ought to do. Hon. members will notice in the paragraph I have just quoted that the Board will be charged with the duty of collecting statistics. It is quite true that we had an Economic Commission not long ago, but, as a representative of the working class movement, I got very little useful statistics from its report. In fact, I have begun to doubt whether as working class representatives we are right in depending on learned professors to lead us towards the higher ideal which is the objective of the movement. Whilst in the collection of statistics the Board of Trade is all very well in its way, after all, we are the representatives of the people—that should be put in great capitals in “Hansard,” “THE PEOPLE”—and we who are the representatives of the people have the power to create both the Arbitration Court of judges and a Board of Trade.

Mr. MORGAN: You do not represent half of the people.

Mr. COLLINS: I am going to use a few statistics myself this afternoon for the benefit of what I shall call the Greater Board of Trade—that is, the people of Queensland; and I am going to draw attention to the position which exists in Queensland in regard to incomes. It may be argued that I am obsessed with this idea as to wealth production and who gets it. It is quite true that in 1911, when sitting in Opposition, I delivered a speech dealing with this phase of human progress, and I am not going to back down now, because I still believe that I am right. We heard figures quoted this morning in reference to wealth production. The figures I am going to quote are supplied to me by the Registrar-General, and if he is wrong, it is no fault of mine. They show that the value of wealth production in Queensland in 1922 was £260,841,865, and in 1923 £63,583,439, or an increase of £2,741,574. That is a very large increase, indeed, for one year, and it shows that we are not going backwards. The next question we have to ask ourselves when dealing with wealth production is, “Who gets the wealth?” I find from the income tax returns for 1923 that we had 2,332 persons with incomes of over £1,000, and a total taxable income of £5,511,191, and 449 companies with incomes of over £1,000, whose total taxable income was £6,395,723, or a total between the two classes of £11,896,914. Then, again, included in that number we had fifty-two persons with incomes above £10,000, whose total taxable income amounted to £950,430. And forty of these fifty-two were pastoralists with a taxable income of £764,080. The point I want to make and I emphasise it, in order to endeavour to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth, is: “Can society hope to continue for any length of time when 2,332 persons and 449 companies take a little over one-sixth of all the wealth produced in this State?” I appeal to that Greater Board of

Trade, the people of Queensland. They should know the true position. That is a system which brought about the decay of the ancient civilisation, and it will destroy our modern civilisation unless a remedy is found.

Mr. MORGAN: Even under a Labour Government?

Mr. COLLINS: I have told the House from time to time that we can only advance one step at a time. We have taken many steps, but there still remain many [2.30 p.m.] steps to be taken before we can reach our ideal. At any rate, we are going in that direction. I say once more, and my figures cannot be disputed, that in this State of Queensland we are following on exactly the same lines as they are following in the United Kingdom, the United States, and various portions of Europe, so far as the present capitalistic system is concerned. What we have got to aim at as a Labour party and as a Labour Government is to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth.

Mr. MORGAN: The same old parrot cry.

Mr. COLLINS: The Arbitration Court has not gone as far as it should have gone, and up to the present it has not taken into consideration the figures just quoted by me. I take it that in the future Arbitration Courts and Boards of Trade, following on the proposal to collect statistics as outlined in the Governor's Speech, will be able to prove our case better than those concerned have been able to do in the past. It is quite true that from time to time the Union advocates, when endeavouring to obtain better conditions for the employees, have pointed out the unjust position in Queensland. They have done their work fairly well; there is no getting away from that. As I said in my speech in 1915, and I am not going to alter it now, it depends upon the judge—whether he is a professional man or a layman. It is all very well to say that professional men are not biased, and that laymen will be biased. Most men are more or less biased. What we want to see is that the laymen who go on the bench understand the Labour movement, and are imbued with Labour ideals, and will endeavour to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth. I am not after the job. I have no intention of taking it, even if it is offered to me, although I have no hesitation in saying that I might be able to fill the position as well as any other representative who might sit upon the bench. The Governor in his Speech says—

“My advisers are of opinion, after a careful survey of the social needs and the resources of the State, that the time has come for inaugurating a scheme of child endowment to be paid to mothers. Our basic wage law does not adequately meet the human needs of the worker who has family obligations, and it is confidently expected that the measure in contemplation will do much to improve the social and economic conditions of the people.”

I am not in a position to outline the scheme in detail, but to the best of my ability I am going to point out what has led up to the introduction of this proposed measure of childhood endowment. I take it that, firstly, it is to give a child better opportunities than exist under the present state of society; and, secondly, I assume that it will have a tendency to increase the birth rate, or exercise some influence on the birth rate, not only in Queensland but in the different

*Mr. Collins.]*

countries of the world. It goes to show that ideas move very slowly—very slowly indeed. I have in my hand an essay written by the Rev. T. R. Malthus, entitled “The Principle of Population.” It was written in the year 1798. Some people will say, “What has Malthus got to do with childhood endowment?” But before I sit down I shall connect my remarks on childhood endowment up with Malthus. We are all aware that in France and some other countries companies are subsidising the earnings of men with families over and above those of the single men, but our Government, so far as I know, will be the first Government in the world to place upon the statute-book a measure of childhood endowment. Malthus pointed out that, in his opinion, it was necessary to impose a check on population. Any one who has read that great work of his—for, after all, it was a great work—knows that it was sneered at and jeered at for practically half a century. Later on we find that the principles expounded by Malthus, rightly or wrongly, have been adopted pretty well all over the civilised world. I am well aware that at that particular period we had a lot of brilliant men in the world, because it was just about the time of the French Revolution. England herself then produced some of the finest thinkers that have ever been seen. In opposition to Malthus, William Godwin, another brilliant man, wrote a book entitled “Political Justice” in contravention of the teachings laid down by Malthus. He enunciated in his “Political Justice” that spirit of equality that has filtered down since that time, and which has made possible the Labour movement to-day. The Labour party are to some extent endeavouring to bring about Godwin’s teaching of equality. It may take a long time to accomplish, but, in my opinion, it will finally be accomplished. The Reverend Malthus, for he was a reverend gentleman, talked about the means of subsistence not increasing at the same rate as the increase in population, and said that it was therefore necessary to check the growth of population. Godwin, in arguing to the contrary, used these words—

“In our present society it is the distribution, not the production, that is at fault.”

not the question of production that is at fault in this State, or in any other States of the Commonwealth; it is the question of getting a better distribution of the wealth that is produced. That is a problem that is occupying the attention of statesmen to-day—if we have any statesmen. It is a big problem. Godwin pointed out that it was a problem in his day—over 100 years ago—to men who sought to govern mankind. Later on, in 1879, Henry George in that splendid work of his entitled “Progress and Poverty” endeavoured to refute the teaching of Malthus. He pointed out that there was no need to restrict population as advocated by the Rev. Malthus. I have listened in this Chamber to hon. members quoting figures in reference to the birth rate. I am going to quote a few, because in reference to this discussion on childhood endowment it is necessary to do so. The remark of Victor Hugo—

“What Paris thinks to-day, France thinks to-morrow, and later all Europe,” might well be quoted to-day. Had he been living to-day he could have said—

“What we have established in regard to the restriction of population the world has adopted.”

[Mr. Collins,

I shall deal with the birthrate of Queensland and quote from the “ABC of Queensland Statistics” for 1925, page 184. Hon. members may turn the figures up themselves if they so desire—

VITAL STATISTICS—BIRTHS.

Queensland.

Rate per 1,000 mean population—

1861-70	...	...	43.61
1871-80	...	...	33.85
1925	...	...	24.89

My next figures are from the “Daily Mail Year Book” for 1925, page 116. They are for the—

United Kingdom.

Rate per 1,000 mean population—

1913	...	...	24.1
1922	...	...	20.7

The figures for 1922 are the latest that are given, and they show a decrease per 1,000 in Great Britain. Next we have the figures for the Commonwealth of Australia—

Commonwealth of Australia.

Rate per 1,000 mean population—

1925	...	...	23.78
------	-----	-----	-------

Those figures are taken from the “Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia.”

France.

Rate per 1,000 mean population—

1922	...	...	19.4
------	-----	-----	------

Next we have Germany, and there is a mistaken idea about Germany, whose birthrate has been decreasing for some time past. It is quite true that in 1870 and thereabouts Germany’s birthrate was as high as 40 per 1,000. The latest figures are—

Germany.

Rate per 1,000 mean population—

1921	...	...	26.1
------	-----	-----	------

It will therefore be seen that there has been a decrease in the countries mentioned in the birth rate.

I suppose some hon. members opposite are asking where this money for childhood endowment is to come from. Those hon. members need not worry. This party will tell them at the proper time where the money is to come from. Hon. members opposite never asked us that question when the war was on. We could get thousands of millions for the slaughter of human beings; therefore we have a right to say that we can get the necessary millions, if required, for the future citizens of this State. After all the children are the most valuable asset that the State can have, and the future of this State will depend on the training we give our children and the way we feed our children. No one will say that a man on the basic wage, with a wife and seven or eight children, is going to rear them in the lap of luxury, although I am willing to admit that even under the conditions existing to-day those people are much better off than were their equals in the days of my youth.

The necessary money could be found for the war, and the necessary money should be found for childhood endowment. What Queensland thinks to-day the Commonwealth thinks to-morrow. There are four other Labour Governments in Australia, and we are laying the foundation-stone for those four States. We are also providing a scheme

for the Commonwealth to take over the childhood endowment proposal at the right time, because I think they are the proper authority who should control childhood endowment. Every consideration should be given to the matter to see that the foundation-stone is well laid, so that the scheme may be copied not only by the other States of the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth itself, but by every civilised country in the world.

I can now pass from childhood endowment to some remarks that have been made about our secondary industries. It is quite true that we should have secondary industries in this State and in this Commonwealth. Why? Because we have practically a virgin country to develop as compared with some of the older countries of the world, which, to a large extent, are already developed, and we should have a market here for our primary products—that is, if we are going to expand as we ought to expand. At one time Great Britain was the workshop of the world. That day is past, and now nearly every country in the world is becoming a manufacturing country, and the people in Great Britain are up against one of the biggest problems they have ever had to deal with in the whole of their existence. But we are not so much concerned about Great Britain as we are concerned about the development of our own Commonwealth. Our Commonwealth, if it is to develop as it ought to develop, must start these secondary industries. We know the eloquent speech that was delivered by the Secretary for Mines in the Legislative Council in connection with the proposal to establish iron and steel works in Queensland. I suggest to him that he take that matter up with the present Cabinet and push it for all it is worth, and help us to establish the iron and steel works in Queensland.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: At Bowen.

Mr. COLLINS: Of course, at Bowen. Why not? Bowen has everything necessary for the establishment of iron and steel works, which should be one of the greatest industries in the Commonwealth. What are the Commonwealth doing in that direction? They are able to show a surplus each financial year. Where do they get that surplus? Their principal source of revenue to-day is from customs and excise. In other words, they have a revenue tariff—not a protectionist tariff, but a revenue tariff. Of course, they are lifting the taxation on the higher incomes of their friends—quite natural—and putting it upon the people under the guise of a revenue tariff. That is what they are doing. Is that statesmanship? Is that building up the Commonwealth as they ought to build it up? What is the use of talking about secondary industries being established if no effort is being made to establish them—if no effort is made by the Commonwealth to give the assistance that is necessary for the establishment of secondary industries? We should first of all stand for Queensland as Queenslanders; and secondly, we should stand for the Commonwealth as good Australians. That is what we have to stand for if the State and Commonwealth are to become great.

I will now pass on from secondary industries and deal with another paragraph in the Governor's Speech. That Speech is

very interesting if it is examined closely, and I thought the Opposition would have examined it much more closely than they did.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They are too tired.

Mr. COLLINS: If they are too tired, I suggest that they devote a little more time to public life and less time to private life. Now I come to another important paragraph in the Governor's Speech—

"The Commonwealth Government has recently entered into an agreement with the British Government for the settlement in Australia of increased numbers of assisted migrants, and for securing loan moneys at low rates of interest for that purpose. In order that suitable areas of land shall be made available for settlement, and that public works shall be undertaken for the development and expansion of settlement areas, and for increasing the capacity of already settled areas to carry greater population, as is contemplated by the agreement referred to, My Government has been asked to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government. The Prime Minister has therefore submitted a proposed form of agreement, the terms and conditions of which are now receiving the serious consideration of My Advisers."

What is the position in Great Britain? There is not sufficient work to go round in that country, with its population of 46,000,000. They are up against a stone wall, as it were: they are looking for an outlet for their people. Why should we get loan money from them? Who built up the wealth of Great Britain, with its millions of money—a country which was able during the war time to spend at the rate of £7,000,000 per day.

Mr. MORGAN: The Jews. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: What Great Britain ought to say to the people who will have to leave her shores is this: "We have here a surplus population. You have helped to build up the wealth of Great Britain. You defended her in her hour of trial. We are now giving to the Dominions millions of pounds to enable you to make a home in the Dominions." That is what they ought really to do. The workers of Great Britain built up the wealth of Great Britain, and when they leave her shores, surely having built up that wealth, they ought to be entitled to a share of it! But that is not the capitalist system of colonisation—that is not the system they believe in. What they practically say to us is this: "You are paying your interest regularly, and there may be a little credit in that, as you do not pay it like France is paying it at the present time." France is not paying it at all. If we had from the British Government or the British people the £600,000,000 odd lent to Russia—which they may never get back—and the £400,000,000 odd lent to France, or £1,000,000,000 altogether—if they had advanced that money to this Commonwealth of ours, then we could have talked about a migration policy; then we could have set out to develop this State of Queensland and this Commonwealth of ours with a big railway, road, and irrigation schemes. That is what should have been done. We are told by the Press that the French are practically snapping their

Mr. Collins.]

fingers in the face of the British Government to-day. And why is that? It is because they are a militarist nation, and owing to their numbers are able to snap their fingers at the British Government in regard to payment of interest on the money they have borrowed. We have never snapped our fingers at the British investor. We have met our interest bills right through the Commonwealth. No State in Australia has ever defaulted in the payment of its interest bill. They why should we not receive more consideration than we have received in the past? Why should we have to go down on our bended knees to the British investor asking him for a loan to develop a territory such as ours? As hon. members opposite say, we are a part of the British Empire. Why do not those at the fountain head come to our assistance by giving us the millions they are spending at the present time in keeping their people alive, knowing that we have got a virgin country which should be developed. The only way to develop it is for them to assist us, as outlined by me, instead of rushing to the assistance of some of the foreign countries in Europe.

I want to say a few words in connection with the sugar industry. To a large extent I am in agreement with my friend, the hon. member for South Brisbane, in regard to the position we find in the sugar industry, and in regard to that big monopoly known as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. We have been talking about the Colonial Sugar Refining Company for practically a generation under Conservative Governments and Labour Governments, but up to the present time no Government have been able to tackle the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and its enormous profits. I agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane that when there is over-production, as in this present year, the whole of the burden should not be placed on the sugar-grower, but the Colonial Sugar Refining Company should be made to carry a portion of it. Why should that great company be exempt? I hope that in the event of the Labour Government occupying the Federal Treasury benches—

Mr. BRAND: Your Government allows it.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member stands behind the Colonial Sugar Refining Company every time, so we can expect no assistance from him. I hope that, when the next Federal election comes round, we shall find a Labour Government occupying the Treasury benches, and that they will set out to clip the wings of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, and see that justice is done to the sugar growers of Queensland. The speech of the hon. member for South Brisbane ought to be circulated throughout the sugar districts of Queensland; and it is a reflection on the Nationalist members sitting in the Federal Parliament, whether they call themselves Nationalists or Country-Progressives, that they have not raised their voices against the enormous profits—because they are enormous—that are made by the company in the refining of sugar. At any rate, in this industry the Labour Government have done good work. They passed the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act, which enables the grower to get good results from his labour, and I hope that, as occasion arises, they will continue to pass the legislation necessary to enable him to continue to get as nearly as possible the product of his labour,

[Mr. Collins.

after taking other factors into consideration. If I had had time, I was going to deal with the flotation in New York of that large loan by the Commonwealth, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Oxley is not present, because hon. members will remember that in a speech here, when we went to America for money, he denounced the Queensland Government for borrowing from what he termed "German Jews." Where does that hon. member stand to-day? His remarks are to be found in "Hansard" for 1921, pages 1336 and 1337, and if hon. members refer to them they will see that I am perfectly fair.

Mr. TAYLOR: Don't look so hard at me!

Mr. COLLINS: I am not too sure that the hon. member for Windsor was not in the same boat. (Laughter.) Events have only proved, as I say, that what Queensland thinks to-day Australia thinks to-morrow.

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

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*): After hearing the remarks which have fallen from hon. members opposite on the Address in Reply, and particularly the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down, one might imagine that the Government whom they have the privilege of sitting behind were "Simon Pures."

They would try to create the impression that they would not lend themselves to any tactics having for their object the obtaining of votes from the electors and a promise that they would be compensated in a certain way in return. It has been made per-

[3 p.m.] fectly clear by some hon. members opposite in their speeches both in the House and on the hustings that the Willowburn works at Toowoomba would be completed. The ex-Premier made a definite statement to that effect. It is perfectly clear that some hon. members opposite have lent themselves to tactics having for their object the obtaining of votes, and that is abundantly proved by the commencement of the Willowburn works prior to the elections and the cessation of work after the elections. I am not attributing this to the present hon. member for Toowoomba, but just prior to the by-election work was recommenced on the Willowburn works. I do not blame the hon. member for Toowoomba for obtaining all he possibly can for his electorate, but I do object, and object most seriously, to any Government lending itself to such tactics as have been adopted by the Government of Queensland. Not only were the Willowburn works recommenced prior to the by-election, but the Home Secretary visited Toowoomba and addressed the people somewhat to this effect—

"Ladies and gentlemen, it is my intention to give you a maternity hospital. The people need a maternity hospital. It is absolutely necessary."

Mr. LEWELYN: That is not true.

Mr. MAXWELL: I have the newspaper extract with respect to the matter.

Mr. LEWELYN: The Home Secretary had already given his consent to the loan.

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes. It is a most peculiar thing his consent was given at election time. No Government should attempt to buy popularity. When the election was on they should have said to the

people. "We have not the money to continue the work at Willowburn, but we have £20,000 which we will lend you for the purpose of erecting a maternity hospital." I want to make my position clear in connection with maternity hospitals. I have no objection whatever to their being erected, because I think they are an absolute necessity, but I do object to the tactics adopted by this Government. The late Premier, Mr. Theodore, was reported in the "Darling Downs Gazette" of 28th April, 1923, as stating—

"With regard to Toowoomba the Government have never been niggardly. The Government have always been prepared to do the fair thing for the metropolis of the Downs. Mr. Brennan had always been on the doorstep asking for something for Toowoomba, and he always had a sound case. Now that the works of Willowburn have been commenced some foolish people have said that this was an election stunt, but I give you my word as head of the Government that the work is going on to completion."

That was in 1923, and the hon. member for Toowoomba knows that it was only the other day that a few men were put on to continue that work.

Mr. CARTER: Why not?

Mr. MAXWELL: There is another election in the air, and the Government are trying by subterfuge to secure the votes of those people. If that is not buying votes and holding out the usual bunch of carrots, I want to know what it means. The hon. member for East Toowoomba, in speaking on the matter of railway construction with reference to Toowoomba, is thus reported in "Hansard" for 1923—

"In the matter of building railways and of loan money, I wish to call attention to the way in which the Government juggled with the Loan Fund. That is one of the methods which is answerable for the result of the elections. I will cite two instances. We have seen where they juggled in the spending of money on railway construction work. At Toowoomba we have work going on known as the Willowburn works. What is the position? I have to recognise that the hon. member for Toowoomba, the Hon. P. T. Brennan, has done his best to get this work pushed on, but this is what he said in 1920—

'He (Mr. Brennan) had promised two things—luncher shops and railway engine sheds. Regarding engine sheds he (Mr. Brennan) told Mr. Fihelly he would not stand again for Toowoomba unless the engine sheds were gone on with. Subsequently he (Mr. Brennan) received a letter and the works went on.'

That was what the hon. gentleman said at Toowoomba prior to the elections in 1920, and we know those works did go on. We know also that shortly after the elections they were closed down, and, as a result of that closing down, Queensland has lost some thousands of pounds through the damage done to the work which was then left unfinished. As I pointed out a few nights ago, last year we asked that this work might be recommenced, and we were told that

there was no money available; but, when the elections came on unexpectedly, this work was immediately started, and I was somewhat concerned as to how these things were brought about. I saw works being commenced in many places; consequently I have gone to the trouble during the last few weeks to make some inquiries. The Estimates for the current year were tabled the other night, and I notice in those Estimates that there are sums of money to be voted for railway construction works in various centres. The sum of £20,000 is set down on the Estimates for the engine shed at Toowoomba. Seeing that we have £20,000 on the Estimates for that work, one would think there would be no need for the Assistant Home Secretary, the hon. member for Toowoomba, to address the men at Willowburn works as he addressed them last Tuesday to show them that he had done all that he could to get them continued in their employment and the job pushed along to completion. He said, however, that, owing to the shortage of loan money and the urgent necessity for proceeding with work in the Burnett district, the work could not be completed. Evidently a number of these men have to be put out of employment. How is the hon. gentleman going to square that statement with the statement he made in 1920? If he could influence the Treasurer of the day, Mr. Fihelly, to start those works in 1920 for electioneering purposes, as I claim, and then start them again just before the election in 1923, and then see that £20,000 are placed on the Estimates this year for these works, how is it that these works cannot be continued? The reason that they cannot be continued is that the money was spent prior to the elections; consequently I am justified in saying that those works were recommenced to try and buy that electorate for the Government."

Then we find the Home Secretary going to Toowoomba and, as I have pointed out, pledging the Government to erect a maternity hospital at Toowoomba.

Mr. LEWELYN: He did not.

Mr. MAXWELL: I say he did, and the hon. member can say what he likes. During the election the "Telegraph" of 27th March, 1925, said—

"The Home Secretary (Mr. J. Stopford), explaining the maternity hospital scheme of the Government, said that the Government not only desired a place like Toowoomba to build a maternity hospital, where ordinary cases of maternity would be housed and treated, but aimed at attaching to hospitals like Toowoomba, Cairns, Townsville, and Rockhampton a proper department of research where every disease peculiar to women would be thoroughly considered by medical men, and where everything that science could bring to bear as a possible solution would be at the disposal of medical men."

Mr. WINSTANLEY: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MAXWELL: There is nothing wrong with it, only the infernal impudence of the

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

Government to put this sop up to the electors to get votes for the Government.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Didn't your party, when in power, do the same thing?

Mr. MAXWELL: No. Someone said to me the other day, "Unless you can get right down to the tactics of the Labour party and promise the electors everything, whether you are able to give it to them or not, you will get nowhere." (Government laughter.) I will never pledge anything unless I can see a fair chance of its being accomplished.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Tell us why you left the United party?

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Buranda in seconding the motion for the Address in Reply said he did not believe in Governors coming from overseas. Like my friend the hon. member for Logan, I think it is a very fine thing to have such men appointed. It has a tendency to do good and link us up with the Motherland, although there is a section within the Commonwealth who would cut away from it. Such appointments also tend to link us closer and closer to the Motherland. After all, we are only a part of a great Empire. We are the children of the Motherland, and naturally I do not believe in this talk that is going on amongst a section of hon. members opposite that they do not believe in this pomp and ceremony, in the rattling of the sabre, or the firing of the gun, or the dress of the Governor. Yet the very first thing that some of these hon. members do, when they get into a suitable position—I am not finding fault with the act but with their inconsistency—and when they are invited to a function, is to buy a dinner suit.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: And why not? (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: I have no objection; but surely that is part of the pomp and ceremony of the land. Does the hon. member who raised this question object to our good friend, the Secretary for Mines, dressing in a frock coat and spats when he visits Wembley? (Laughter.) I think the hon. member's statement is the most hypocritical I have ever heard. The hon. member and his colleagues do not believe in pomp and ceremony until they get the opportunity to participate in it.

Then the hon. member for Buranda, with a more seriously hypocritical turn of mind, questioned the Bruce-Page pact for sending home the contract for the building of cruisers for Australia. Why did not the hon. gentleman deal it out to his own party when they sent contracts to England for the building of bridges across the Johnstone, Kolan, and Yandaran Rivers? Hon. members opposite talk in a most hypocritical way about the work that can be done in Australia by Australian men and then send it out of the State. They know that they are talking hypocritical nonsense. Hon. gentlemen opposite went through the New South Wales elections talking about what Mr. Bruce did in connection with the cruiser contract, but the hon. gentlemen strictly avoided talking about their own Government doing precisely the same thing with those bridges.

Mr. WRIGHT: Where should they be built?

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Bulimba will have an opportunity of airing

[Mr. Maxwell.

his views later. There was one matter upon which I do agree with the hon. member for Buranda, and that is with regard to the compulsory employment of disabled men. Every effort should be made to take those men away from their existing environment and conditions, and place them in congenial positions. A deputation pointed out to the Premier that it may be necessary to have an Act of Parliament to deal with the matter. If so, so much the better. I venture to say that when the opportunity comes employers will respond most nobly to the call.

The hon. member for South Brisbane also went in for a bit of election propaganda, and pointed out that Mr. Bruce was responsible for the shipping strike, and that the strike was caused only for the purpose of having a Federal election. It may be as well to go into the matter. We know full well that the strike was due to the action of a couple of individuals who wanted to take control of the shipping industry, and who made no secret of their desire for job control. We find in a section of the daily Press that job control does not mean what hon. members on the other side of the House say it means.

Mr. WRIGHT: What does it mean?

Mr. MAXWELL: It means the control of industry. One New South Wales Labour Minister has said that now is the time to bring about the socialisation of industry, but Walsh and Jobansen—the latter being the man who forgot his name when before the Arbitration Court—said they were going to bring about absolute job control of the shipping industry. We should trace the matter back to the latter end of 1922, when the "Esperance Bay" trouble arose. We know full well the trouble that arose there, and the reason why the Bruce-Page Administration placed the Commonwealth ships upon the market. Simply because the men had made the position so tyrannical that it was impossible to run them. This was done by those two individuals.

Mr. COLLINS: Bosh!

Mr. MAXWELL: Of course, it is bosh. It is the most contemptible thing that ever occurred in a British community to allow two men like that to hold up the whole of the commercial community of this Commonwealth. Hon. members on the other side know it full well. Let me point out that it was not Mr. Bruce who was responsible for this. Mr. Bruce pointed out that the Commonwealth Shipping Board had been placed right outside the pale of Commonwealth politics, and had the right and privilege to control the ships themselves.

Mr. GLEDSON: Can you explain why he objected to them coming to an agreement with the seamen?

Mr. MAXWELL: I am finding no fault with them for coming to an agreement with the seamen.

Mr. GLEDSON: No; but he did.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am finding fault with them for allowing these men to dislocate the commerce of this State. Men on the other side of the House want to sidestep the position. Job control does not mean seeing that men get better conditions, because the Arbitration Court is there for that purpose—not to do as was done by Walsh and his retinue—defy the Arbitration Court, and hold

it up to public ridicule. That was done by Walsh and Johansen.

Mr. COLLINS: What would you do with Walsh?

Mr. MAXWELL: What would I do with him! Deport him! I certainly would deport him. Make no mistake about that. No man who is proud of his country and wants his country to progress need ever be afraid of the deportation law. In a British community just imagine a man, when asked his name, saying that he does not know his name. What would I do with him? I would give him a month to find out what his name was.

Mr. WEIR: It is like your political name. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: Either the Arbitration Court is right or it is wrong. If we have a law on the statute-book, that law has a right to be obeyed, and the person who does not obey the law has a perfect right to receive the punishment provided. In "Hansard" of 13th December, 1910, volume CVII., page 2767, my friend, the hon. member for Wynnum, who was then Secretary for Public Works, had something to say in regard to the Brisbane Tramways trouble. There had been a great amount of excitement, as some hon. members on the other side know, and the hon. member for Wynnum said—

"It is the hon. gentlemen on the other side who want to smash up that union. It is just as well to be plain in these matters. There are some men on the opposite side of the House who are never satisfied unless they are stirring up influences amongst the men.

"Mr. Barber: The glorious gospel of discontent, that is what we believe in.

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes): The hon. member for Bundaberg practically says 'Amen' to what I have said.

"Mr. Barber: Amen, brother!"

I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for Bundaberg is ill, and I sincerely and honestly hope that it will not be long before he is better and is able to take his place in this House again. (Hear, hear!) This is my point. In connection with what Mr. Bruce has done we have an admission from one of the oldest members of the Labour party that it is their function to preach the gospel of "glorious discontent." We can go further than that, and can read what is said—

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the toilers come together on the political field under the banner of a distinct revolutionary political party governed by the workers' class interests, and on the industrial field under the banner of one great industrial union to take and hold all means of production and distribution, and to run them for the benefit of all wealth producers."

Then we are told by these gentlemen that it is the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth who has lent himself to tactics such as those to hold up the business of the Commonwealth. If, as has been said about Mr. Bruce, he has to depend on Flinders Lane

for his living, is it at all reasonable that a business man is going to hold up the business of Australia and is going to strangle himself? Not at all. These men say, "We have nothing to lose; the capitalists are the people we want to get at." It does not always do to take the outside appearance of a man who is reported to have an accumulation of wealth. Sometimes it is necessary to go to the banks and see how much money has been borrowed for the purpose of giving employment to a number of workers. After all, to-day the employer is practically an employee of other people in carrying out certain work, and he has to work for a living.

The hon. member for Herbert was one of those gentlemen who toured the Northern Rivers, and he has the temerity to stand up in this House and say that he, with the Premier and others, were the means of getting a Labour man returned there. I am going to tell the hon. member that it was not the Labour men who returned Mr. Gillies, our Premier's brother. If it were so, how did it come about that he did not drag the other two Labour men in with him? It is well known that Mr. Gillies, the Premier's brother, is a man who is well respected in that district. He was the president of the local shire council, and I met any number of people whose views coincide with mine who voted for him. We can quite understand how contradictory are the statements of the hon. member for Herbert when we find him stating that he, with the Premier and Secretary for Public Works, had only to leave Queensland to realise what a wonderful place Queensland was. I knew what Queensland was, and I also knew the individuals who were governing it, and the great amount of trouble and worry caused through the unemployment existing in Queensland. The hon. member for Herbert made this statement—

"As regards the cry that the Queensland electorates had been juggled, a redistribution was overdue. Some city electorates contained over 15,000 voters, while others had dropped down to under 2,000. The Commissioner appointed to draw up the scheme of redistribution had consisted of Mr. Ferry (Chief Under Secretary), Mr. Carter (Under Secretary for Justice), and Mr. Dunlop (Police Magistrate at Chillagoe)."

"After the Commissioner's report was handed in, the only complaints made were from Labour members. There was not one from the Opposition. Mr. W. H. Barnes (ex-Treasurer) spoke in the House on the fairness of the redistribution."

That is typical of the dope that this gentleman gave the people on the Northern Rivers—absolute dope. All that is necessary to do is to turn to "Hansard" for 1921, vol. CXXXVII., where it will be found that on a want of confidence motion Mr. Vowles, Mr. Bebbington, Mr. Green, Mr. J. H. C. Roberts, Mr. Cattermull, Mr. Macgregor, and Mr. Appel protested against the redistribution of seats in a most emphatic way. My friend, the hon. member for Nundah—who, I am sorry, is not here just now—will bear me out in my statement that these remarks were made in Murwillumbah by the hon. member for Herbert, and that they differed from the statements that they make to-day. But those remarks were contradicted by us, and so impressed the people

*Mr. Maxwell* ]

of Murwillumbah that they sent the "S.O.S." signal to Brisbane, with the result that the Premier and the Secretary for Railways both rushed down and followed us by speaking there on the Friday night—the night before the election. Mr. Perdriau and myself addressed over 100 intelligent people in Murwillumbah.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: The Labour party had a bigger meeting.

Mr. MAXWELL: Let me tell the hon. member how the Labour men got their audience. Mr. Stewart, one of the candidates for the Northern Rivers, carrying a certain banner, had his meeting immediately after the Labour party had theirs, so that the candidates of the Labour party were really addressing an audience of about 230 persons, comprising the supporters of Mr. Stewart as well as their own supporters, and I am told there were more of Mr. Stewart's supporters than of the Labour party present.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Can you tell us who won the seat?

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Gillies won one, and Mr. Missingham and Mr. Stewart the others—they are not Labour men.

Now let us take the remarks of the hon. member for Herbert in this House and compare them with the statements made by him on the Northern Rivers. Why did we have to speak during that campaign in the manner we did? We found that Ministers and other members were going down making statements not in accordance with facts. The Secretary for Public Works went down and told them, "Why, the people of Brisbane are better fed and better clothed than the people here. You ought to see the girls! They all wear silk stockings and silk dresses, and everybody has a motor-car." (Laughter.) If that is so, I want to know how it comes about that in 1921 £40,869 was spent in outdoor relief, and that in 1923-24 a sum of £165,243 was spent in unemployment insurance payments? Then again, today the hon. member for Kurilpa asked the Minister administering the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act—

"What is the total amount of money disbursed under the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act of 1922 up to and including the 30th June, 1925?"

and the answer was £337,120 12s. 2d. Yet we find the Premier standing up in this House to-day and telling the people of Queensland and of the other States that this is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth. If it is necessary to pay out such a huge sum, how can we say that Queensland is in a state of prosperity?

How does it come that Mount [3.30 p.m.] Morgan to-day and previously is being, and has been, subsidised by the Government? How is it that a place like Chillagoe is being financially assisted? Hon. members opposite are continually indulging in electioneering propaganda with a view to gulling the public. During the New South Wales elections the Secretary for Public Works from Queensland, in addressing a meeting on the Northern Rivers, said that the women and girls of Brisbane were better dressed than they were in Sydney. He said that they wore silk dresses and silk stockings, and everybody had a motor-car.

[Mr. Maxwell.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MAXWELL: After that remark the hon. gentleman will say anything. We were perfectly justified in refuting that statement. When 2,000 men presented themselves for work on the South Brisbane-Kyogle-Grafton railway only 200 were needed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Where did those men come from? From New South Wales.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Secretary for Public Works during his electioneering tour in New South Wales said that the whole of the unemployed of Victoria and the whole of the unemployed of New South Wales and other people were flocking to Queensland.

Mr. GLEDSON: Not the whole of them.

Mr. MAXWELL: A big proportion of them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Stick to the truth.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is claimed that the greatest compliment that could be paid to the Labour Government is that in this State there is an Unemployment Insurance Fund from which the unemployed workers have received in one year £166,000. It is a disgrace to any community, more particularly in a young country like our own, is a standing disgrace to find that £165,650 is paid in one year under the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act, and £40,000 in outdoor relief, or a sum of £330,000 under the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act since the inception of that scheme. The fact that such a large sum of money is expended in that direction is no reference as to good character or as to the qualification of a State. We were twitted with indulging in statements about Bolsheviki ideas.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Quote what you said about the Bolsheviki.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Sydney "Labour Daily" had this to say—

"There are complaints all over Australia in connection with unemployment. No complaint, says Mr. Carey, comes from Queensland."

It is a disgrace to any British community to have a procession like we had some time ago with Ministers of the Crown, with the Federal Labour leader at the head. Hon. members opposite have already read the remarks concerning that procession, and I do not intend to go into the matter again. They know full well what banners and flags were carried in the procession that day.

The hon. member for South Brisbane also stated that the Commonwealth Government had practically brought the Italians into Queensland for the purpose of reducing wages. We all know perfectly well what the hon. member for Chillagoe said in connection with that matter, as his remarks are now ancient history. We also know that the Labour Convention sitting in Brisbane in 1921 passed the following resolution:—

"That organised Labour oppose all further assisted immigration, and that no Government shall make further arrangements with regard to immigration without having first secured the approval of organised Labour."

It is hypocrisy for the Government to say that Labour is in favour of immigration, when that party has opposed it at every turn, and when we are aware of the articles on the question that have appeared in the "Daily Standard." If the Government were sincere in their desire to put a stop to aliens settling down in North Queensland, they would immediately apply sections 3 and 4 of the Sugar Growers Act of 1914. Under that Act the State Government can exclude any alien from the sugar industry, whether as an employer or an employee, by the application of the dictation test. If that is true, and the Government are in earnest on this question, why did they not take those steps? Why do they seek to blame the Commonwealth Government for these aliens coming here?

Mr. THEODORE: Because the Commonwealth Government passed regulations exempting the Italians from the operations of that Act.

Mr. MAXWELL: According to the "Courier" of 8th April last, the hon. member for Chillagoe, speaking on the question of Italian immigration, said—

"The Italians who were arriving here were coming of their own volition, and were, apparently, paying their full passages. The matter of their admission was for the Commonwealth to decide: it was not a State matter. The State had not the power to exclude anyone—and he did not know that it was desirable to exclude Italians. The Italians almost invariably were proceeding North to engage in the sugar industry, and had been coming to Queensland for that purpose for years past."

Why, then, all this hypocrisy of hon. members opposite?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why the hypocrisy of hon. members on your side?

Mr. MAXWELL: There are the quotations. I have given exactly what has been stated. Not only do a section of the Labour party agree with these people coming here, but they are actually boosting them. Perhaps some Italians are in their electorates. I noticed when the hon. member for Herbert was speaking that he was particularly silent about the Italian question.

Mr. PEASE: I was not.

Mr. MAXWELL: My contention is, and always has been, that, before bringing these people into Australia or Queensland, we have a right first to bring our own people. I say that undoubtedly our people should have the preference, and on another question I will give some instances of what is occurring in connection with this matter.

Mr. PEASE: After your speech no one will come to Queensland—not after the way you have painted this State in connection with its unemployed, and everything else.

Mr. MAXWELL: The question of childhood endowment looms very largely in the Governor's Speech, and I might here say that I regret exceedingly the intended departure from Queensland of our excellent friend, Sir Matthew Nathan. I only hope that our next Governor will be half as good as His Excellency. We have no information as to the scheme for childhood endowment. Personally, I approve on principle of childhood

endowment, but I want to know if hon. members opposite propose to found the Bill in accordance with the resolution that was passed at the Trades Hall on 10th October, 1921, which read—

"That this conference endorse the principle of endowment of motherhood and childhood, thereby recognising the service rendered to the community by the mother in the care and nurture of the child—such payment to be a charge on the whole community, and be recognised as an individual right, and not associated in any way with the economic circumstances of the husband and father."

If the Government intend making it a charge on the whole community in accordance with that resolution, I do not think any one can find fault with the scheme; but if, as has been stated by a section of the Labour party, it is going to be a charge upon industry, there will be serious trouble. The Government have gone far enough, and they cannot go much further. Hon. members opposite should remember that the man with the money can stand it longer than the man on the bottom rung of the ladder, and, if any trouble occurs, it is not going to be overcome by the issuing of coupon tickets by the Trades Hall as in the 1912 strike.

Mr. GLEDSON: Don't make threats.

Mr. MAXWELL: The way to overcome the difficulty is through a better understanding: let us come together and reason the matter out—(Government interjections and laughter.) It is well to view this childhood endowment scheme from another standpoint. In his Speech His Excellency the Governor said—

"Our basic wage law does not adequately meet the human needs of the worker who has family obligations, and it is confidently expected that the measure in contemplation will do much to improve the social and economic conditions of the people."

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

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): Before making a few remarks upon the Speech of His Excellency the Governor I desire to add my congratulations to those of other hon. members on this side of the House to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. As new members they have faced the ordeal of addressing this House for the first occasion with merit, and have shown that they are well up to the standard of the hon. members who have been here for some time. When they become accustomed to the environment of the House they will hold their own with the best of us here.

The hon. member for Buranda struck a note of advice with regard to the appointment of future Governors of Queensland from among the citizens of the State. A good deal has been said upon the matter, and I should only be reiterating the remarks of other hon. members on this side if I were to dwell upon the subject. However, I take the opportunity of stating that I am fully in accord with the sentiments that have been expressed from this side of the Chamber. It is a ridiculous thing that after so many years of constitutional Government, and in view of the fact that this Government is looked upon as an adherent of constitutional methods, it should

Mr. Foley.]

be found necessary for the Imperial Government to send Governors to this State when just as able men are available locally.

It is generally agreed that during Sir Matthew Nathan's term of office he has given of his best, travelled extensively, and tried to gain a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the people of this State. I feel sure that on His Excellency's return to England he will embrace every opportunity to place the information he has gathered before His Majesty's Ministers and before the people of England generally.

At 3.45 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Pollock, Gregory) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. FOLEY: In looking through His Excellency's Speech one cannot help but be struck with two outstanding features. Again this session, as in previous sessions since Labour came into power, the Government are concerned mostly with two great and important sections of the community—the workers and the farmers. Nearly eleven years ago Labour came into office, and, although hampered for a considerable time by an antagonistic Legislative Council, during the few years that they have had full control they have put up a record as regards ameliorative legislation that no other Government in the world can boast of. That is generally agreed. Yet again this session the Government intend making history by the enactment of a Childhood Endowment Bill. I say they intend making history because of the fact that, although other Governments have had better opportunities of introducing a similar measure, they have not done so, and it has been left to a Labour Government to lead the way in this respect.

Mr. KERR: The Commonwealth Government are doing it now.

Mr. FOLEY: It is quite a noticeable fact that during this debate most of the members of the Opposition who have referred to childhood endowment have referred to it with their tongues in their cheeks.

Mr. FRY: That is not true; and you know it is not true.

Mr. FOLEY: They have given many hints as to how the scheme should operate. A further opportunity will be presented to us to discuss this important proposition, but I should like to foreshadow some of the arguments that will be used by the Opposition against this measure when it is introduced. They have already argued that we should have waited until the Federal Government made childhood endowment universal. Secondly, they will object to industry bearing the cost of the scheme.

Mr. FRY: Not a bit.

Mr. FOLEY: Thirdly, they will attempt to coerce the Government into agreeing to load the cost on to the single man by reducing his standard of living to enable a saving to be effected in the wages bill so that the cost of the scheme may be borne in that manner.

Mr. FRY: All "tommy-rot."

Mr. FOLEY: Had we waited for the anti-Labour Federal Government who are in power at the present time to make childhood endowment universal, we would have waited till doomsday. That is to say, if they were in power till then. I claim that

[Mr. Foley.

we have taken up quite a right attitude in making a start with childhood endowment, as it will act as a spur to the Federal Government, whether it be Labour or anti-Labour in the future, to introduce a similar measure and make childhood endowment universal throughout Australia.

Dealing with their second charge, although at this stage I am not in a position to state definitely what will be the Government's method of allocating the costs of this scheme, in my opinion the only method the Government should adopt is to make the scheme a charge upon industry, and adopt a new slogan for the future that industry shall treat every worker according to his needs, and not as in the past strike an average between large and small families and give them a wage accordingly. The third objection which is sure to be raised—it has already been raised by the deputy leader of the Opposition—is that the single men of Queensland should pay some of the cost of this scheme. I for one will object to the cost of the scheme being imposed on the single men in a similar manner to the Federal Government's employees' scheme which is in operation at the present time. Although Mr. Piddington has advocated a scheme which is equivalent to reducing the present basic standard of wages in Queensland, so that a saving can be shown in the aggregate yearly wage, I consider that industry can safely bear the burden of the whole scheme without in any way interfering with the basic standard existing in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If conscription were carried, they would have a nice bill to foot.

Mr. FOLEY: I was dealing with the Federal scheme, which is no credit to the Federal Government, which introduced childhood endowment for its employees. What they did was to reduce the minimum of the salaries paid to public servants, and, as a result of a huge saving on each employee per year, they were able to apply that money to childhood endowment, whereas otherwise they would have had to pay it in a straight-out way. That is the position which was adopted by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. WARREN: That is not right; you have not got a grip of the subject.

Mr. FOLEY: In the monthly paper of the Federal public service organisation the whole thing was thrashed out thoroughly in a reply given to correspondents who had been sending letters in for a considerable time, and who were of opinion that the public servants in the Commonwealth sphere had paid for the childhood endowment scheme which is in operation. We do not want any hybrid scheme of that nature introduced by a Labour Government in Queensland. In my opinion, industry can bear the burden, and, furthermore, I think that, when the scheme is in operation and the purchasing power of mothers is increased by the grant which is to be given, a number of industries in this State will meet with increased prosperity, instead of the doom which many hon. members opposite have predicted.

Mr. MORGAN: Not in this State?

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, in this State. In illustration, I will quote an instance. If every mother in receipt of the childhood endowment with her increased purchasing power were to turn round and purchase an extra

apple a day for every child throughout Queensland the result would be that somewhere in the vicinity of 52,573,600 extra apples would be needed to meet the demands of the 147,000 children that I hope will come under this childhood endowment scheme. One does not need an imagination above the ordinary to apply a similar calculation to boots and shoes, clothing generally, food, and other necessaries of life, to get some idea of what this extra purchasing power will mean in the way of increased prosperity.

I would like to refer now to the paragraph in the Speech, in which it is said—

“It is now intended to amend the arbitration law, and to extend and improve its authority by the creation of a court to be called the Board of Trade and Arbitration. This tribunal will have judicial and also administrative powers. As well as exercising the functions of an Arbitration Court, the Board will be charged with the duties of collecting statistics, and of fully investigating all matters connected with labour and industry, and economic and social problems.”

I am pleased to see that some action is being taken in the direction outlined. During the debate on the Industrial Arbitration Court Estimates in September, 1922, I suggested the establishment of a research bureau to collect information regarding industries dealt with by the Court, because I had noticed that very often in Arbitration Courts which I have attended the judges were in a dilemma in sifting the information, very often prejudiced, which has been given by both sides in a case. In the future, with the statistics which will be gathered as a result of this scheme, the judges should have a much better chance of arriving at a proper decision. Much has been said by the Opposition with regard to the appointment of a layman to this new Court. They are of the opinion that nobody can function on an Arbitration Court unless he has a thorough legal training, and wears the old-time adornment which it is customary for our judges to wear. I am of a different opinion, and I feel sure that the introduction of a layman into the Arbitration Court environment will offer a very big chance of changing that environment for the better. I join with the hon. member for Bowen in suggesting that, when the appointment is being made, care be taken that a man thoroughly versed in the principles of the Labour movement, and with a knowledge of the industrial movement, be appointed.

It is also the Government's intention to amend the Workers' Compensation Acts to include all industrial diseases, instead of a number of them, as has been the case in the past. When this measure is going through

I sincerely trust that the Minister [4 p.m.] in charge will endeavour to make provision for many bush workers who do not come within the scope of the Act at the present time. I have already made representations in that respect, and I have an idea that the Treasurer will sympathetically consider it. I desire legislation particularly with respect to timber-carriers and timber-getters, a great number of whom are working in various parts of the State. If a teamster in performing the preliminary duty of a day's work in mustering his horses, or a timber-getter in performing a preliminary duty to his day's work of running in his saddle-horse meets with an accident, he is

legally not entitled to any compensation. I desire to quote a case that was brought under my notice quite recently. I refer to the case of Vivian Johnstone, of Biringan, in my electorate, a lad working as a timber-getter. He found it unsuitable to camp right out at the spot where he was procuring his timber, and he came into the mill in the centre of the township where his timber was handled and resided with his parents. One morning he borrowed a horse to run up his horse and his mate's horse so that they could proceed to their work, but before he had proceeded 150 yards he met with an accident that resulted in his death. Although this lad's parents had moral claim for compensation because of the fact that he was just about to perform a duty preliminary to his day's work, legally he was not entitled to one penny of compensation.

Mr. ROBERTS: What was said against the claim?

Mr. FOLEY: The Commissioner said that, if the boy had caught his horse and had been proceeding to his work, he would have been legally entitled to compensation. The Act did not provide for the case of a person performing a duty preliminary to his day's work, with the result that all this lad's parents got was an *ex gratia* payment sympathetically granted by the Treasurer to the mother. When the measure is going through I hope that steps will be taken by the Treasurer to make provision for such cases.

Coming to the question of legislation for farmers, I notice that the most important piece of legislation concerning farmers of this State to be introduced will be an amendment of the Primary Producers' Organisation Act. I understand that the legislation is intended to give power to the farmers to organise on a commodity basis instead of on a district basis, as has been done in the past. I understand that that does not mean that the different primary industries will be split up into narrow sections. Although the method of organisation will be different, the industries will still be all linked up with the Council of Agriculture. Notwithstanding the fact that many representatives of the farmers sitting opposite are against the Council of Agriculture, my advice to the farmers of this State is to grasp this organisation with both hands, because no one can deny the fact that only by organisation can they hope to obtain stability of prices and consequent stability of industry. The disorganisation advocated by many hon. members on the benches opposite can lead to nothing but anarchy, gluts, and consequent loss, which has really been the experience of farmers in the past, and which led to the introduction of the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill.

Mr. CLAYTON: Under a Labour Government?

Mr. COLLINS: Of course, you had to wait until a Labour Government got into power before you got anything.

Mr. CLAYTON: They are held down by them.

Mr. FOLEY: Most hon. members opposite during this debate have referred to the same old hardy annuals which have been used and thrashed out over and over again in this Chamber. One of those arguments was in reference to the alleged maladministration of the Government. That, combined with high taxation, was the main point of the speech of the hon. member for Aubigny.

*Mr. Foley.]*

We have also heard the losses on State stations quoted; we were told that the policy of the Government has prevented the development of the State, and a number of bogies that have been used continually and refuted over and over again in this House were raised. Notwithstanding this alleged bad administration, Queensland is in a fairly prosperous condition to-day.

Mr. MORGAN: Not as compared with the other States.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You should go back to Victoria and stay there.

Mr. MORGAN: I will sell you a farm cheap.

Mr. FOLEY: The Government have always been ready to admit any mistakes made, and have endeavoured to rectify them. The chief point that is continually raised by hon. members opposite is in regard to the high taxation in this State. No hon. member on this side has ever tried to argue that taxation on the higher incomes earned in this State is low as compared with other States in the Commonwealth, but we do argue that on the low incomes earned in this State taxation is lower than in any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. ROBERTS: That was disproved this morning.

Mr. FOLEY: That cannot be disproved unless you take certain incomes and fake the figures a little, in which case you can disprove anything. Generally speaking, the average working man in receipt of the basic wage in this State pays no income tax. No hon. member opposite can refute that statement. We find that much of the revenue derived by other States of the Commonwealth comes from the smaller income earner. In proof of that fact one has only to peruse the reports of the various Commissioners of Taxes. The adoption of that system of incidence of taxation is to relieve the burden on the higher income earners and thus show a better comparison than this State can. We do not wish to resort to those tactics to get our revenue. We claim—and it is a proper maxim to stick to—that those who are most able to pay towards the upkeep and the carrying on of the services of the State should do so, and not those who only receive a bare living wage for their labour.

Losses on State stations was another issue raised by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member practically suggested that what we should have done long before this was to sell the State stations. Such a suggestion coming from a leader of the Opposition, who is supposed to be a reflex of the intelligence of the bulk of the members of the Opposition, seems to be bordering on the ridiculous when we consider that you practically could not give a cattle station away during the past few years. I also point out that the slurs of the leader of the Opposition on State enterprises were based on a misconstruction of the real position. The bulk of the losses on State enterprises are a result of the failure of State cattle stations. I emphasise the fact that such a state of affairs does not apply only to State stations, but it applies to practically every cattle proposition in the State. Probably in the next year or two those cattle properties throughout the State will be showing a profit.

I desire to emphasise one particular point that hon. members of the Opposition failed

[Mr. Foley.

to point out when criticising the Government. Notwithstanding that they are lineal descendants of parliamentary parties that had control of this State for fifty years prior to the advent of the Labour Administration, it was left to a Labour Government to introduce such a great amount of ameliorative legislation as has been passed since Labour occupied the Treasury benches. Hon. members opposite do not emphasise the type of legislation introduced by this Government since coming into power, and it is only fair that someone should take the opportunity of doing so. For this session we are promised, under the heading of "Industrial"—

A Childhood Endowment Bill;

A Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Acts;

A Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Acts;

A State Children Act Amendment Bill.

On the other side of the ledger, as it were, for the man on the land and the settler, we are promised—

Mr. CLAYTON: Hospital taxes.

Mr. FOLEY:

A Bill to amend the Primary Producers' Organisation Acts;

A Mining Act Amendment Bill;

A Bill to amend the Primary Products Pools Acts;

A Graziers and Settlers' Protection Bill;

An Irrigation and Water Supply Bill.

I have compiled a list of other measures that have been dealt with by the Labour Administration both for the industrial workers of this State and for the man on the land, all ameliorative in character and all having a tendency to benefit those sections. It is rather too long a list to read, and, with the permission of the House, I would like to have it inserted in "Hansard," so that the people of this State may have these facts brought under their notice and realise what has been done for their benefit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that last session I ruled that it was not wise or in order to have extracts inserted in "Hansard" without being read.

Mr. FOLEY: This is not an extract: it is a list I have compiled of work done and legislation passed by the Labour Administration since coming into power in 1915.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member will have to read the list.

Mr. FOLEY: I thought its insertion in "Hansard" without being read would save the time of the House, but, as you rule otherwise, I will go through it.

At 4.15 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. FOLEY: The list comprises—

Workers' Compensation Act, 1915;

Workers' Compensation Diseases Act, 1916;

Workers' Accommodation, 1915;

Labour Exchange Act, 1915;

Inspection of Machinery, 1915;

Inspection of Scaffolding, 1915;

Industrial Arbitration Act, 1916;

Factories and Shops Further Amendment Acts, 1916 and 1920;  
 Wages Act, 1918;  
 Workers' Homes, 1919;  
 Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1920;  
 Fair Rents Act, 1920;  
 Public Curator's Act, 1915;  
 Profiteering Prevention Act, 1920;  
 Brisbane Tramway Purchase Act, 1920;  
 State Enterprises Act, 1921;  
 Infant Life Protection Act, 1921;  
 Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Act, 1921;  
 Workers' Accommodation Amendment Act, 1921;  
 Contractors and Workmen's Lien Act, 1921;  
 Mount Mulligan Relief Funds Act, 1921;  
 Clermont Relief Act, 1916;  
 Maternity Act, 1922.

We skip out a few and get down to—

Industrial Arbitration Act of 1924;  
 Weights and Measures Act of 1924;  
 Local Authorities Act;  
 Income Tax Act Amendment Act of 1924 (exempting average workers).

Then under the heading "Legislation for Farmer and Man on the Land" we have—

Diseases in Plant Act, 1916;  
 Fertilisers Act Amendment, 1916;  
 Fruit Case Act Amendment, 1916;  
 Farm Produce Agent Act, 1917;  
 Farm Produce Agency Act, 1917;  
 Diseases in Stock Act, 1915;  
 Brands Act, 1915;  
 Dingo and Marsupial Act, 1918;  
 Co-operative Agricultural Production Act, 1919;  
 Co-operative Amendment, 1920;  
 Stock Foods Act, 1919;  
 Agricultural Settlers' Relief Act, 1915;  
 Agricultural Settlers' Relief Act Amendment, 1917;  
 Agricultural Bank Amendment Act, 1915;  
 Land Act Amendments, 1916-17.  
 Land Act, 1918;  
 Land Act, 1920;  
 Railway Act Amendment (Repeal of Guarantee Provision), 1915;  
 Discharged Soldier Settlement Relief Act, 1915, and Amendment, 1920;  
 Dairy Produce Act, 1920;  
 Banana Industry Preservation Act, 1921;  
 Regulation of Cane Prices Act Amendment Act, 1921;  
 Animals and Birds Act, 1921 (amended 1924);  
 Wheat Advances Agreement Ratifications Act, 1921;  
 Cheese Pool Act, 1921;  
 Main Roads Act, 1922;  
 Irrigation Act (Dawson Valley), 1922;  
 Sugar Works Act, 1922;  
 Railway Accessories (carriage of stock and fodder);  
 Babinda Sugar Works Act, 1924;  
 Primary Producers' Organisation Act, 1923;  
 Legislation enacted at request of Agricultural Council;  
 The Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act;  
 Agricultural Bank Act;  
 Cotton Industry Act;  
 Meat Industry Encouragement Act;  
 Fruit Marketing Organisation Act;  
 Stallions Registration Act;  
 Amendments to Primary Producers' Organisation Act;

Diseases in Poultry Act;  
 Amendment to Dingo and Marsupial Act;  
 Amendment to Sugar Experimental Stations Act;  
 Primary Producers' Pools Act.

And so on until we come to the Primary Products Pools Acts. I might mention that a number of pools have been established under that Act, such as the Egg Pool, Atherton Tableland Maize Pool, Atherton Tableland Pig Pool, the Arrowroot Pool, the Peanut Pool, and the Canary Seed Pool.

I have purposely outlined these measures that have been passed by Labour because of the important fact that in all their discussions members of the Opposition have failed to point out the amount of ameliorative legislation passed by the Labour Government since coming into power. One could fill "Hansard" if he felt so disposed in quoting the important legislation that we have passed since coming into power. In spite of all the criticism that has been levelled against the Government during this debate in regard to the prosperity of Queensland, I would like to point out that, notwithstanding all the legislation that we have passed for the assistance of the industrial workers, farmers, and settlers throughout the State, production in this State has not been retarded.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: You know that is not true.

Mr. FOLEY: I know what I am talking about, and will prove what I say in a few minutes. If all this legislation and the administration of this Government were as bad as the Opposition claim, surely it would be reflected in the production figures of this State. Yet we find the value of agricultural, pastoral, dairying, poultry, bee farming, forestry, fisheries, mining, and manufactures in 1915, when we took charge, amounted to a total of £33,329,000, while in 1924—the latest figures available—the value amounted to £66,945,000; that is nearly double the value in 1915.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Give the difference in the value of money.

Mr. FOLEY: These figures speak for themselves. On top of that important fact we have to remember that taxation on the lower income earners is the lowest of any State in the Commonwealth, the cost of living is less, wages are higher on the average, the hours of labour are less, childhood mortality is less, and the length of life is greater for the average man in Queensland. There is less unemployment, and the educational facilities are equal to those in any State in the Commonwealth, and, as a matter of fact, equal to those in any part of the world. Queensland stocks on the English stock exchange are more sought after than the stocks of the anti-Labour Governments of the Commonwealth. Another important feature is that, notwithstanding all our legislation and bad administration, as alleged by the Opposition, we do not see as many bankruptcies in Queensland as there are in the other States of the Commonwealth.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat read out a very long list of amending legislation which has been passed by the present Government, and I notice in connection with the forecast for this session that of twenty-one measures which have been put forward sixteen are amendments of previous Acts.

*Mr. Roberts.*]

There are two in particular that happen to be last on the list, but I trust they will not be shelved. I hope that the Government will deal with those two measures in particular. One is the Prevention of Cruelty Act Amendment Bill. We have to recognise that that Act is very old, and there is need for better protection of humanity and dumb animals, and it should be made more up-to-date. Then there is the Bill to amend the Insanity Act.

With reference to the first measure on the list, the Childhood Endowment Bill, I do not anticipate that the Opposition will advance any adverse argument against the claim that some assistance should be given to people with families. The concern on this side will be as to how the money is to be raised. We may differ as to that, but we recognise that the parents of a family are entitled to consideration from the State; and, if the wages are not sufficient, they should be brought into line in some respects.

I was struck with the address of the Premier this morning. I anticipated that, as this was the first occasion he had of addressing the country through the House as Premier, he would have devoted some time to the policy of his Government, and given an indication to the people of what was to be expected in the way of legislation and the management of affairs. He seemed, however, to occupy a considerable part of his time in connection with the want, as he called it, of criticism from this side of the House. Then, having got an extension of time, he abused the privileges of the House by devoting nearly the whole of that privileged time to quoting cuttings from the Press of this State, which I suppose the great bulk of the people who are interested had read, and which members on the Government side must certainly already have made themselves conversant with. I would point out in fairness to the Chamber that it is most unseemly for an hon. member occupying the position of Premier of this State so to abuse the privileges of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He told you the truth about the Opposition.

Mr. ROBERTS: I think that, when he reads his proof to-morrow, he will recognise that, if anyone has failed in the delivery of his speech this session, it is himself, and not anyone on this side of the Chamber. I am prepared to congratulate the mover of the Address in Reply. I have no fault to find with the gentleman whom the people of Toowoomba have returned, and I recognise that on his entry to this Chamber and in moving the motion we are discussing he did his best to do justice to the policy in which he believes.

One paragraph in His Excellency's Speech which interests me particularly is that in which he says—

“I shall be glad if I am able in future years to use for the country's benefit the information thus acquired.”

His Excellency is referring to his extended tour throughout Queensland. I have in mind the opportunity I had last November, as a member of the Royal Commission on Public Works, of going away into North Queensland into what are called the back blocks, and there coming into contact with many persons who, living vast distances away from big centres, appreciated these

[Mr. Roberts.

visits of the Governor very much. We must recognise that they have in their hearts a very warm spot for Sir Matthew Nathan, who has done remarkable work and has won their admiration and esteem during his stay amongst them. I am sure that when he leaves Australia one and all will gladly join in hoping that this paragraph which I have quoted really means something. Everybody recognises that, when His Excellency addresses a gathering on any question, he has given much thought to what he has to say. He always gives, as it were, a light to the people, and I am glad to think that when he goes across the seas and returns to his homeland he will be an advocate for Queensland and for Australia, where he has spent so many happy years.

Herein arises a point on which I take up a position on which I may differ from some men on my right. I do not think that Governors are necessary outside the Governor-General, but, if we are to have a Governor in Queensland, then I trust that the day will never come when we shall have a local Governor rather than one who forms, as it were, a link of Empire. I think there is something in the remark of the leader of the Opposition—that the respect which we pay to His Majesty is represented in the respect which we offer his nominee, the Governor—and I hope the day will not come when Governors will be appointed locally.

We have heard a good deal said on the Government side of the House against men who are in sympathy with the side on which I sit, and we have heard remarks on the other hand about the sugar industry and what it means to Queensland. We have to recognise that the Tory Government in Great Britain—or by whatever term you like to describe them—are prepared to pay, or rather the workers of Great Britain are prepared to pay, and have put on the statute-book a provision that they will pay a duty of £4 5s. 7d. per ton of sugar in order to give preference to other parts of the Empire. Compare that with the attitude of the Labour Government in Great Britain, the friends of the Labour party here, when they were in power. How did they help the sugar workers? They raised the question which was put before us by the hon. member for Oxley when speaking last session after his return from a trip across the seas. He said that there were two sides to the question. Now, our friends in Great Britain are prepared to tax themselves to the extent of £4 5s. 7d. a ton to help their own flesh and blood across the seas, as compared with £1 18s. 10d. offered by the Labour Government when they were in power.

Time and again we heard criticism hurled against the men who have a stake in the country, who are finding employment for other men.

We heard the Premier speak about the shipping strike. He was very anxious, like Mr. Lang, the Premier of New South Wales, to butt in and settle the shipping [4.30 p.m.] strike. They were desirous of putting into effect their policy of nationalisation. Just imagine the Premier of Queensland trying to settle the shipping strike! Does he not know that there is a strike on in his own State? Does he not know that in George street there is a strike

in connection with the erection of the radio station? One man was dismissed by the officer in charge. The carpenters on that job stated that the foreman was justified in putting that man off the job. That man had the right of appeal, and went to the Arbitration Court, where he was told that he was in the wrong. The matter was then taken to the Trades Hall, and nothing further was done. Should the men not have accepted the decision of the Arbitration Court? If they were loyal to the principle of arbitration, they should have accepted the decision, and the leaders should have sent them back to resume work. That was not done. What does the Premier of Queensland, who appeals to the Premiers of other States to settle the shipping strike, do in the matter? He quietly agrees with the Secretary for Public Works, and the job is closed down. I ask the Secretary for Public Works—particularly in view of the statement in the Press to-day in connection with the radio station—when the job is going to commence again, and when is employment going to be found for these men? It has been shown that the dismissed man was in the wrong. Even if we are going to have nationalisation of industry—God forbid it—it must be admitted that somebody has to be in control and say whether the work is being done rightly or wrongly. These are the tactics that are injuring Queensland's position to-day. We know that the legislation of the past few years has imposed great difficulties on the business men of this State. Can the business men follow the example of the Government, and when one "chucks" up a job, everybody else be compelled to cease work?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is not correct.

Mr. ROBERTS: That is the position, as I know it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. gentleman is wrong as usual.

Mr. ROBERTS: I do know that the job is stopped. Will the hon. gentleman deny that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No. That is the only correct statement the hon. gentleman has made with regard to the matter.

Mr. ROBERTS: Will the hon. gentleman deny that the Arbitration Court said that the dismissed worker was in the wrong?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS: Then the hon. gentleman holds an opinion contrary to that of the judge.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He did not say that at all. He recommended the men to go back to work.

Mr. ROBERTS: Of course, he did. He also said that the man was in the wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I challenge the hon. gentleman to quote that.

Mr. ROBERTS: I will quote it. I do not make any statement in this House that I am not prepared to back up. I will give the Minister every opportunity to test my statement. Quite apart from politics, it is time that we sat down to business as men desiring to help Queensland. We should sit down and consider whether we are doing the right thing in always pampering the workers. There are occasions when the worker is in the wrong, and there are occasions when he

is in the right. The other day the Premier was interviewed by railway men from Ipswich. I understand that they were asking for the restoration of the 5 per cent. deduction from their wages that had been made some time ago. I realise that strikes occur over small things—things that ought to be settled—but if the Government are honest and sincere, it should not be necessary for the men of Ipswich to demand an increase in salary for those receiving under £300 per annum. We are going to be paid in future for the full result of our labour, and under the Act of Parliament passed last session that 5 per cent. is to be returned to us in the future. There should, therefore, be no need with a Labour Government in power for the men engaged in the Ipswich workshops to have to appeal to the Premier.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Listen to the friends of the railway men!

Mr. ROBERTS: I was illustrating what was hanging up industry to-day. The other day I saw a building in the course of erection by day labour and under the control of the Government. A block and tackle were being used, and I saw a man hauling up six bricks at a time. I have seen—and I am glad that day has passed—when men have carried anything from ten to fourteen bricks on a hod up a ladder. Imagine a man with a block and tackle on a day-labour job hauling up six bricks! Then hon. members opposite ask why we condemn day labour.

Mr. CONROY: Do you believe in day labour?

Mr. ROBERTS: Of course I believe in day labour. The Government I belonged to introduced it.

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

Mr. ROBERTS: I believe in a fair day's work being given for what is paid. I believe in the man appointed to supervise a job getting a fair return for what he is paid. If he wants to victimise a man, an appeal can be made to the Secretary for Public Works, but he should have control of the job until it is proved that he is not doing a fair thing by the men employed. That is where I differ from the Government on this matter. It is the right of the man in charge of the work to say whether that work is being rightly or wrongly carried on. I am not afraid to meet any number of men to say that I believe in that principle, and the men would admire me for saying so. Honourable men believe in that principle, and the great bulk of our workmen are honourable. It is what one sees occasionally that damns the whole principle of day labour. It is most unfortunate. I was struck with the great big leader of Queensland who talked about settling the shipping strike, and then had himself to shut down on a job where trouble arose.

The Premier this morning talked about exports and imports, and quoted tables of millions of money in his attempt to show how much this State had progressed. I interjected at the time—and I want to say it definitely now without fear of contradiction—that those figures are quite worthless, so far as the products of our industries are concerned, to prove whether we have made advances or not. Why do I say that? Because it is quantity that counts; it is not value, because values have so much increased. I would remind hon. members

*Mr. Roberts.]*

again that what cost £1 in 1914 to-day costs 34s. Consequently under those conditions what is the use of inserting in "Hansard" a mass of figures to try to lead us to believe that this State is developing and progressing? Such figures for the purposes of comparison are not worth anything at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you say that the general prosperity of the State is not greater to-day than it was in 1914?

Mr. ROBERTS: I had a business a few years ago, and I know exactly what my output was. I also had a business during a certain period of the war; but what is the good of quoting my sales during 1914 as compared with my sales in 1917? I could not say that I was doing a bigger business in the latter year. The output is the thing that counts, not the value received; and that is the thing we have to justify when dealing with our exports to-day.

Mr. PEASE: We have doubled the quantity. How do you get over that?

Mr. ROBERTS: Comparing the value of the sovereign to-day with the value in 1914, the amounts required to purchase a given quantity of articles are 20s. and 34s. respectively; that brings me to the question of the wage-earner. We on this side of the House do not stand for low wages. I do not know any hon. member on this side of the House who stands for low wages.

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

Mr. ROBERTS: We recognise that wages must be higher than they were. A man who was getting £2 7s. in 1914 would have to receive £4 as an equivalent to-day. No one would cavil at that. Is there a man on the Government side who says that a man on £4 a week at the present time has anything left after paying for necessities? But we do declare that costs cannot come down if wages soar higher and higher. A favourite interjection of the Secretary for Public Works this session appears to be, "You cannot have it both ways." That is the position; you can not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The position is that you are trying to have it both ways.

Mr. ROBERTS: If a man was on 50s. a week in 1914 and is on £4 a week to-day, he is now in a worse position.

Mr. BULCOCK: Your representatives are opposing an increase to £4 10s. to-day.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am always pleased if anyone has a kind word to say for Toowoomba, and I am glad the hon. member for Toowoong made his remarks. The hon. member quoted certain statements that were made at Toowoomba prior to the recent by-election—I think they were made by the Home Secretary. I am not going to concern myself with them, but I had previously culled some remarks made by Mr. F. T. Brennan on 15th September, 1920. The ex-Premier, the hon. member for Chillagoe, was on the platform at the time. Mr. Fihelly was acting Premier at the time he wrote to Mr. Brennan, consequently some weight attaches to his remarks regarding the engine-sheds. Mr. Brennan said he had told Mr. Fihelly that he could not stand again unless those engine-sheds were gone on with. Subsequently he received a letter from Mr. Fihelly, and the work on the engine-sheds was proceeded with. That was Mr. Brennan's speech in 1920, and I quote it because I wish to supplement the

[Mr. Roberts.

remarks which the hon. member for Toowoong was good enough to quote in this House earlier in the debate. I am still of opinion that that was a political job. The work was necessary, and that is why I condemn the Government because they did not go on with the job. Ask the men at Toowoomba. Ask the men in the Railway Department—men who are paid high salaries to carry out the work of railway administration. Ask them if the work is not necessary for the better convenience in handling trains, and they will tell you, "Yes." Why is it not gone on with? Why is the money that is put on the Estimates not expended? We do know that certain moneys were put on the Estimates, but the Government did not spend those moneys. They just hold sufficient in hand so that, if anything unexpectedly happens, such as an election, they can go on with the job. The hon. member for Toowoong, in the remarks he quoted, showed that on one occasion, just prior to an election, they could actually go on with the job without money being voted at all. You cannot get away from that position.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: What about the Ipswich Railway Station?

Mr. ROBERTS: I will tell the hon. member about that presently. Immediately after the election, when Mr. Brennan was returned, the work was closed down. Then it was reopened in 1923, when Mr. Brennan was again a candidate, and immediately the election was over it was closed down again.

Mr. LLEWELYN: Was it closed down in 1923?

Mr. ROBERTS: After the 1923 election the job was closed down with the exception of eight men. There were eight men doing work of some sort.

Mr. LLEWELYN: Are you quite sure there were not more than eight men?

Mr. ROBERTS: From eight to thirteen.

Mr. LLEWELYN: You should be fair.

Mr. ROBERTS: When the hon. member has been longer in this House he will know that I am honest and that I am always fair. I gave the lowest number. That is the position. I am justified in the statement I have made that this job is used for electioneering purposes; £72,000 have been spent on the works, and we are paying interest on that money. Recognising that it is a job that requires to be done, quite apart from giving employment, is there any reason why it should not be gone on with? In reply to the hon. member for Bremer, I shall give the figures in regard to the Ipswich Railway Station. I looked this matter up to-day, because the hon. member for Ipswich, on 25th September, 1923, asked a question of the Secretary for Railways following on a question I had previously asked. I recognise that there again a very large sum of money was spent which was in no way revenue-producing. I asked a question on the matter, and the hon. member for Ipswich followed it up with another, and he was told that the total cost, including resumptions, etc., was £160,550, and that it was estimated that it would cost a further £65,000 to complete the job. The Minister said—

"No money is provided on the Estimates for the present financial year, but the work will probably be completed during the currency of the next financial year."

I said a few moments ago that I was honest, and I am. I am not doing this now for electioneering purposes. I want to remind

the people of Ipswich that here is a place where the Government have wasted their money, and they admit it. On 26th September, 1923, the Government, in answer to the hon. member who represents that electorate, stated that this large sum of money had been spent on that job and that it required another £63,000 to complete; and yet they talk about men being unemployed!

We have been told to-day that we have spent over £300,000 in unemployment relief—I will not use the word “dole,” as I do not want to say anything offensive. We have spent that money, and yet £63,000 is required to finish this job. Would it not have been better to give men some work and finish that job, and make it revenue-producing, and, what is more, a convenience to the travelling public? We admit that a new station would be an advantage. I go through that place twice every week, and I recognise that. When I see all this money bottled up, the work simply standing there with no benefit to the State, I feel that something should be done. These are points which show that the Government do not give the consideration they ought to give to the interests of Queensland.

Coming to the matter of secondary industries, we have had a lot of figures given to-day. So far as the secondary industries outside Brisbane are concerned, they are getting less and less. I had an example of that only last week when coming from Toowoomba. I met three men on the Ipswich station, one of whom indicated that for certain reasons he had taken up his abode in Brisbane. I asked him what had happened. He said, “Our job has gone; we cannot compete.” He was in the boot trade. These were three married men who had gone for the week-end to Toowoomba, and were returning to Brisbane to work.

Mr. HYNES: That is because of the Federal award.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is not a question of whether it is a Federal or a State award. There would be no difference so far as the south-eastern division is concerned whether it is because of a Federal or a State award. Under our system an award is made in Brisbane where all the facilities are. I would ask whether any man is going to open up a boot factory in the country under the conditions which are fixed in Brisbane, and are advantageous to Brisbane but which apply to a large area? Does it not stand to reason that the cheaper you can sell your boots the greater quantity you will sell, which will reduce your overhead expenses? As a result, you prevent employment in the country districts. Some consideration needs to be given to the country districts unless we desire that all industry shall be confined to the metropolitan area. This not only happens in Queensland, but in the whole of Australia. If we are not careful, except for small jobs, there will be nothing for the men in the country districts to do.

Mr. HYNES: You are interested in Toowoomba.

Mr. ROBERTS: I am interested in the matter because I recognise that, if we are going to populate Queensland, we must build up the country towns and provide employment there. We have numbers of boys every week looking for employment. I have said before, and I repeat, that if we

took a census of Queensland of lads between fifteen and nineteen years of age who cannot get a job in this State in order to earn a livelihood, but are simply dependent on their parents not only for food but for clothing, it would be a revelation. I wish that they could get work. If I had the power I would see that it was obtainable. I come into contact with them every day, and know the position. Women come to me and ask where they can get work for their boys. You say, “What is his age?” “Seventeen.” You say, “Go down to the Railway Department and tell them there that the boy’s age is seventeen.” Perhaps they go, and they see the railway officer shake his head, and say, “He is at a bad age.” Why is he at a bad age? The same thing applies at the other end, where the worker is told, “You are sixty-five. There is the old age pension—no work.” This is what the men do who are supposed to look after the workers of Queensland. They bring down a regulation which says, so far as their employees are concerned, “When you get to sixty-five there is the old age pension for you,” and they would have made it sixty if that had been the age at which payment of that pension commenced; but the Commonwealth Pensions Act fixes the payment of the pension at sixty-five years of age, and when you say anything about it they come along smiling, and say, “Oh, it will be all right; these old chaps will soon die off.” That is not in the interests of the workers of Queensland or of any other State.

Mr. DASH: What would you do?

Mr. ROBERTS: The thing is: Is he worth anything at all? Why should he be told to get the old age pension? Should he not have the right to earn something? Is he not of some value to the community? I would give him employment so long as he was able to do his job. If he was able to do his job for thirty or forty years, do you think I would put him off? No. Hon. members opposite talk about the profiteer. They say they stand for the working men, but, after thirty years of toil, they put him off and tell him that he can get the old age pension.

Mr. DASH: We are not the party who brought that in.

Mr. ROBERTS: Of course you are the party who brought it in by regulation. The Government which I supported said that so long as a man was able to do his work he should be employed. Under our Government a boy who wanted a job at fifteen was able to get work. To-day he cannot. On the one hand a boy from fifteen to nineteen cannot get employment, and on the other the man of sixty-five is put out of a job.

Mr. BULCOCK: What does the Federal Government do?

Mr. ROBERTS: Here is an honest endeavour by the hon. member for Barcoo to get some information, and he is entitled to an answer. If these men who call themselves Labour men had done what the Federal so-called Tory Government did, I would not be making a speech this afternoon. They provided pensions for the men they retired, and they did not provide pensions only for those who were entitled to them under their regulations. They saw that there was a large number of men who

*Mr. Roberts.]*

were not entitled to them under those conditions; but they considered it a fair thing that all men who were retired should have them, and by a special Bill introduced by the member for the Darling Downs, Sir Littleton Groom, they put on the statute-book an Act providing that their regulations should apply to all men who were retired, notwithstanding that they were over the age. I am glad of the question asked by the hon. member for Barcoo, and, if he has another one, he may put it now.

Mr. DASH: Do you know—

Mr. ROBERTS: I know much more that is worth knowing than the hon. member.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Becmer*): I would very much like to deal in detail with some of the remarks by the hon. member for East Toowoomba, but just for the [5 p.m.] moment I have some more important matters to deal with.

Given time and opportunity and the indulgence of the House, and not being led off by too many interjections, I may be able to get through the matter that I intend to deal with. I congratulate the hon. member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Buranda on the excellent speeches they made when introducing the motion that we are now discussing. I congratulate them because of the excellent work they did in preparation of their addresses, and I am sure that they are men who will do great honour to the Labour party and great honour to the Labour movement.

Mr. NOTT: There is plenty of room.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Yes, there is always plenty of room at the top. I also congratulate the Government on being able to fill vacancies in the party by men of the standing of the hon. member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Buranda. The advent of those gentlemen to this Chamber reminds me that we have won two by-elections recently. Once more the people of Queensland have stamped their approval upon Labour Administration, and they have repeatedly stamped their approval on Labour Administration since 1915. That is one of the most remarkable things in the history of Australia. A young country is everlastingly subject to change. New methods and new desires bring changes very rapidly. The Labour Government have entrenched themselves in the hearts of the people of Queensland, and that speaks volumes for the wonderful work they have done and the wonderful faith that the people of Queensland have in the Government.

I would like to join with other members who have expressed their regret at the departure of His Excellency the Governor. Personally, we are all sorry that he is going. He is a gentleman who has pleased us immensely. He has given all his time to his work, and he has, I am sure, studied Queensland and Queensland conditions in a way that no previous Governor did. I have been struck with the things he has said and the things he has done. On his very last appearance in Ipswich he spoke very highly of the activity of this Government in connection with education. I am going to quote his remarks, because I believe that they are worth recording. In speaking at the distribution of prizes won by the students of the Ipswich Technical College on 9th July last, he said—

“I was glad to notice Mr. Wilson’s recent statement that the Government was considering a later school-leaving

age. This will be in accordance with the policy they have consistently followed of raising the standard of education in Queensland.”

In case some one might doubt His Excellency’s ability to speak upon the subject, I will quote further from His Excellency’s remarks. He said—

“I have personally noted it in the last five or six years. I claim that from coming into contact as I have done through my advice being asked by mothers, with the correspondence classes carried on for children in the out-back, from visiting a great number of primary and many secondary schools, from being fairly familiar with the work of technical colleges, and from occupying a post in the University, from which I can judge the assistance given to it by the Government, I am in a position to pay the tribute.”

His Excellency pointed out that he was not afraid of being charged with trespassing upon political subjects, because every member of the community—he did not use these exact words—and even the Opposition in Parliament were of the same opinion as he was on the matter—that the Queensland Government had done quite a lot to advance education. I am pleased to use that quotation because of its justice and the clarity of it, and because it gives the exact impression of His Excellency. It discloses his clear reasoning and his ability to pick out good points.

Mr. CORSER: This Government only followed out what was commenced by a previous Government.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: How men do love to hang on to the tails of our coats! In all things that we have done the Opposition have said, “Oh, well, you could not help yourself. We gave you a start.” There is no doubt they would say that if they had not given us a start, they would have given us a start had they been given the opportunity. It is not a matter of giving them an opportunity, as the people of Queensland are sick and tired of the many changes of the political coats of the party opposite, and have not only swept them off the face of the political earth but intend to keep them off it. (Government laughter.) I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if you have ever been unfortunate enough to be out on the briny in a sailing vessel, to have seen it capsize, and to have seen the splutterings and gurglings of the incompetents in the attempt of those who were on the swamped boat to regain their former position. If you have, Sir, you will have some idea of the attitude of hon. members opposite in trying to secure possession of the political boat of Queensland. It is painful to watch their splutterings and gaspings; and, if any party was ever inept and unable to grasp the situation, it is that party. Some years ago I had occasion in this House to call attention to the one point, if there is one, that they are consistent in. That is their consistency in changing their name.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: There was once a time when they were known as the Tory party, but they did not care to own the name. Then they became the Liberal party, but they became tired of that name and became the P.P.L. party. I, in common with others, do not remember what exactly

[*Mr. Roberts.*]

those letters represent, but it was said at the time that they stood for "Pulling People's Legs." (Government laughter.) That is true. Then they became tired of that name and became the Nationalist party; then the United party; and, having become tired of that name, they are now to be known as the Country-Progressive party. The man at the street corner selling a sparrow for a canary by dyeing it yellow is not half as bad as the people who are always trying to foist themselves on the people of Queensland by changing their name. (Laughter.)

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** The lightning change artist at the Empire is not in it with them.

**MR. F. A. COOPER:** I believe that is so, and, although they are like this man continually dyeing his bird, methinks you can still see the old whiskers coming through the dye all the time, as they cannot keep dyeing themselves fast enough. (Government laughter.)

His Excellency has spent much of his time in his journeyings to and fro in Queensland. Like a famous man who lived many, many years ago, he can speak of his "journeyings oft and labours abundant." I believe that Sir Matthew Nathan, if the question of the appointment of Imperial Governors should become a burning question, will do a good turn to the people who believe earnestly, and support the bringing of Governors from overseas. But it is not a burning question, and there is not much in it. There is this in it from my standpoint: I cannot for the life of me see the necessity for bringing a man from overseas to do a job when his duties are laid down in the Constitution of this State. I cannot see why a local man cannot be appointed specifically to do that work. The hon. members opposite say that a local man cannot be appointed because of his political views—that he would be politically biased and would thus be unable to do the job. Yet these people have stood for the appointment to Chief Justiceships of such men as the late Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir William Irvine—both politicians—and also of Mr. James Blair as Chief Justice of this State, and he also was a politician! They have stood for the appointment of politicians in certain cases, and have believed that these men were unbiased. The hon. member for East Toowoomba a little while ago said that he had been watching the work of Mr. Frank Brennan as judge, and, as far as he was able to see, he was discharging his judicial duties well. Why, then, cannot we appoint the Chief Justice for this State as Governor to do the work as laid down in the Constitution? That is what we should do, and that is what we are aiming at. There is no idea held of appointing, as has been stated, a derelict politician to this high office, for he would be able to carry on the same as a man from overseas. There is no reform or advance in doing so.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** There is no gain at all.

**MR. F. A. COOPER:** That is so. It is simply playing a game of one set of men against another. There is no advantage in it. The ideals of the Labour party are for progress. If we cannot make any progress other than the substitution of a local Governor for a Governor from overseas, it will be no progress at all.

I notice that a number of speakers from the Opposition benches have drawn attention to the fact that the Governor's Speech consists largely of "a Bill to amend," and state that this is a weakness either in the drafting of Bills or in the way in which legislation has been passed. That is not at all the case. Hon. members opposite believe that a law once passed—particularly those laws passed 100 years ago—should be the law to-day. They are against progress, against amendments, against improvements. The Bills that are being dealt with are mostly Bills for the amendment of measures that have been found wanting in certain respects, although in many cases it has been found that we can improve on previous legislation. This party is one of change and progress, and the amendments will be found to be of benefit to the whole State. Last session the Government were taunted with keeping industrial legislation until the last session of a Parliament, so that they could make some favourable impression on the electors. This is not a time-serving party, but a party which believes in doing what is necessary. The present programme consists of four industrial, nine agricultural and pastoral matters, and seven measures dealing with matters of general concern to the people of the State—one particularly dealing with the State servants. If that is scheming, or doing things with an eye to the political future for the sake of extending the life of this party, I cannot see it. This party stands for the whole of the workers, whether working in a factory, on a farm, or in an office. Their programme this session will show by the time it is passed that it is perfecting the legislation of the past and making the laws better for the welfare of our workers in the future.

One of the most notable amendments contemplated is that of the Industrial Arbitration Act. A number of speakers have stressed the matter of the appointment of a lay judge. I think, if we were to express our honest opinions, that we should all be in accord with such a step, and would admit the necessity of a lay judge in the Arbitration Court. Matters which come before the Supreme Court, the High Court, and the Magistrates Courts are matters of law, and need legal men to preside over them. Arbitration matters are not matters of law but of industry, concerning the industrial conditions of this State, and who could be a better judge in these matters than a man grounded in industry, who has served his apprenticeship in industry, as has the Supreme Court judge in law? From the start arbitration judges should have been men well grounded in industrial matters. Fortunately for this State, the late Chief Justice McCawley was a man who had given much time and study to industrial matters, one who had his finger on the pulse of the industrial world as skilfully as any man. The late Chief Justice McCawley was extraordinarily well fitted to deal with the matters that came before him in the Arbitration Court. No man can be more competent to deal with such matters than one who has served his apprenticeship in the industrial field, and I hope the appointee will be a man who has gone through the mill and is well versed in such matters.

A much more important matter than the appointment of a lay judge will be the institution of a Research Bureau. That is going

*Mr. F. A. Cooper.]*

to do much more for the worker, much more for a better system of arbitration, than even the appointment of lay arbitration judges. After all, judges can only give judgment on the evidence that comes before them. The Research Bureau will collect data and evidence that will be of use to the advocates who come before the judges, and it will assist to give to the worker that share of industry that he is entitled to even under the bad system under which we are at present living. When we do get sufficiently along the line when the workers will control industry and own industry, we shall still need our courts of arbitration to decide what the various sections of industry are entitled to for the work they do for the community. We are forced to have courts of arbitration, and the Research Bureau that we intend establishing this session will be a big step in the way of getting the worker that share of industry to which he is unquestionably entitled. During the last session we amended the Industrial Arbitration Act in the matter of introducing the 44-hour week. That Act came into force on 1st July, and already we are beginning to see the results. It has created one or two anomalies, and I am earnestly asking the Government to give particular attention to the anomalies that have been created within the Government service by the institution of the 44-hour week.

I should like to advise the House of one or two things that have happened. In 1917, the Railway Commissioner found himself short of material, and particularly short of money because of the distressful financial position, not only that this State and the whole of Australia, but that the whole world was suffering from. He sent his representative to the Ipswich Railway Workshops and told the men there that it would be necessary, because of the shortage of material and shortage of money, to dismiss 100 employees, and immediately the employees put a counter proposal to him to the effect that the whole of the workers should go on short time rather than that 100 employees should be dismissed. The result was that the Saturday morning was cut out, and the workers in the Ipswich Workshops worked forty-three and three-quarter hours a week instead of forty-eight. That arrangement was continued for eleven months, and at the end of that period they applied to the Arbitration Court and asked for a 44-hour week, but the Commissioner opposed it, saying that he still wanted a 48-hour week although he could not guarantee a full week's work to the workers in the Ipswich Railway Workshops. His Honour asked the advocate for one big section of the combined union or federation, if they were strong for the 44-hour week although they knew that the increased wage was to be 1d. an hour. Mr. Carrell, who represented the trades unions on that occasion, said the workers would rather have a 44-hour week without any increase than a 48-hour week and an increase—or words to that effect. The Arbitration Court then fixed for the workers in the Ipswich Railway Workshops a 44-hour week, with the result that there was a considerable reduction in wages because the total wage paid for the 44-hour week was not equal to the wage that was previously paid for the 48-hour week. When the 44-hour week was made general the Government intimated that no workers who worked originally forty-eight hours and were reduced to forty-four hours would suffer any reduction in pay. That meant that men who were being paid a certain sum of money for

forty-eight hours' work were paid the same amount of money for forty-four hours' work. It did not mean any increase in the actual payment they received, but it did increase the hourly rate that they were engaged upon. That made some considerable alterations in the matter of seniority, because seniority depends to a great extent upon the amount of money that a man receives. Consequently the Government introduced a by-law upholding the seniority that was in force prior to the establishment of the 44-hour week generally; but that does not do away with the anomaly that had been created, and although I stand for every cog in the wheel getting the same amount of oil—although I stand for every worker who does necessary work in industry getting the same as any other worker who does necessary work, and while I believe that every cog that is useful is worth the same as every other cog—we still have the position that there are workers in the industrial field to-day who are getting more than others because of skill, because of scarcity of workers who are able to do the work, and for other reasons. Some people may be able to justify it, but I cannot justify it myself; none the less it is the custom and the law, and, being the law, I suppose it must be observed. I hope that the anomalies that have arisen because of the introduction of the 44-hour week will be rectified at the earliest possible moment by the Government.

I notice, although it is not included in the list of Bills, a reference in the Speech to the Salaries Act of 1922, which is to be repealed. We know that the effect of that repeal will be that public servants who have suffered a reduction of 5 per cent. will have that reduction restored to them. I have an extract from the Speech delivered by the Premier of the day which, as it is very important, I want to have inserted in "Hansard." In volume CXXXIX, for 1922, page 891, the late Premier made the following statement on the second reading of the Salaries Bill—

"Following on the decision of the Arbitration Court to reduce the wages and salaries of public servants, the Government have decided to reduce by means of this measure the salaries of those public servants in receipt of upwards of £300 per annum. That reduction has been made as general as possible, and will include members of Parliament, Ministers of the Crown, and other officers."

I consider that statement by the late Premier was of the utmost importance, because it stressed the fact that that reduction was being made because of the reduction made by the Arbitration Court. The reduction was made by the Arbitration Court because the Court believed it to be necessary. The reduction was made by the Government in the salaries of men over £300 a year because they believed the reduction was necessary. The Government of the day, having arrived at the opinion that there is no further need for the continuation of the Salaries Act, should certainly have arrived at the decision that there is no further need for the reduction made by the Arbitration Court. The man under £300 is a man much more in need of an increase than the man who is in receipt of over £300. Look at it as we may—say that it was an arbitrary action—it was done by the Government, and it must be restored by the Government. We cannot get away from the fact that the lowest paid man

was the man who suffered much more than the man who received a higher salary. If there is any justice to be done in the matter, the amount which was taken off by means of the Arbitration Court, at any rate, should be restored to the employees of the Government. I believe that can be done and ought to be done at the earliest possible moment. If we can see our way clear to give back to the people receiving over £300 the amount of money taken from them, surely we ought first and foremost to see our way to give it to the under-dog or the lower-paid man. I believe that the Government will so think. Roughly estimating the matter, I take it that there are about 12,000 men in the Railway Department who were subject to that reduction. An increase of 5 per cent. on their wages, as awarded by the Arbitration Court, will run into about £150,000. When you come to think of it, £150,000 is not a very great amount of money for the Railway Department in its present condition. Its present condition is by no means the best; but I want to draw the attention of the House to the position of the Railway Department. In 1920-21 the excess of revenue over expenditure was a matter of £239,914; for 1921-22 it was £344,168; for 1922-23 it was £706,138; for 1923-24 it was £723,287; and for 1924-25 it has jumped to the amount of £1,629,032. The railway employees of the State last year increased the earnings of the railways by nearly £1,000,000. They have done it because the opportunity was there to earn it. The seasons have been better; more stuff and more passengers have been carried; and, without any very great increase in the number of employees, they have increased the earnings of the Railway Department by practically £1,000,000. It will be a recognition of the work which the railway employees have done to give to them some little increase in the basic wage awarded by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. MORGAN: You must admit that freights and fares have gone up.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: They have gone up a little, but not to the extent of £1,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN: Sixty per cent. in many cases.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: But they have not gone up to the extent of £1,000,000. The employees of the Railway Department, given the opportunity, have earned another £1,000,000 for the department, and giving them 5 per cent. is simply giving them a little more than the basic wage. Surely the Government ought to be in a position to pay a wage which is something more than the basic wage! We complain because employers make the minimum wage the maximum, and surely to goodness the Government ought to be in a position to show an example to outside employers by making the wage of the railway workers a little more than that awarded by the Court! They have earned the money. They have put the State in the best financial position it has enjoyed for many years. That is what the railway employees have done during the last twelve months, and I am satisfied that the other workers of the State will not grudge to the railway employees in the slightest degree a little more than what outside employers are forced to give to their employees.

I have not much more time at my disposal, but I would like to refer to one or two remarks by the hon. member for To-

wong. He wanted to know something about why a Minister of the Crown and the leader of the Federal Labour party walked in a procession where there was a red flag. What is the red flag, when all is said and done?

Mr. MAXWELL: I was not talking about the red flag. I was referring to the Bolshevik statements.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am not concerned about the other statements, but in any case what is there in Bolshevik statements? Do we not all live in a country where freedom of speech and freedom of the Press are admitted principles; and surely every man is entitled to express his opinion, no matter what it may be! But these people want to go back to the dark ages. They say they do not believe in what we believe in, and want to "chuck out" all those who do not see eye to eye with them—these are people who do not believe in free speech or the freedom of the Press. They would suppress anything or anybody opposed to them politically. They have no time for anything they do not believe in, or for anything that would make for the betterment of the workers. The hon. member for East Toowoomba poses as a friend of the workers, and he criticises the party which has done its best in the past for the workers, and is doing its best now. These political troglodytes, who want to whitewash themselves and to "put themselves good" with the workers of this State really get themselves into a most remarkable position. They say, "See me! I have in my veins the good red blood of humanity; but I am up against every attempt to improve the conditions of humanity." Such an attitude stands for nothing but the attitude of a political troglodyte. The hon. member for East Toowoomba stands on the floor of this House with his tongue in his cheek, and if the workers of East Toowoomba can be gulled by that sort of thing they are welcome to the political representative they have. For my part, I cannot understand the point of view of the hon. member or of people who say that they have an objection to the red flag. The red flag is emblematic of the red blood of humanity that courses through the veins of all of us. It stands for liberty. It is the hope of better things. Wherever it flies there is still some hope for the workers of the world. It makes for equality of opportunity, the very thing that people on the other side of this Chamber have denied, and will continue to deny, to the workers so long as they have the power. They are against equality of opportunity. Their great desire is to uphold the oppressor, and to see that he is maintained in his position of power. I want to say that the red flag is the flag of the revolution which is slowly but surely leading the people from darkness to light; which is leading them from penury to plenty; which is delivering them from hatred, and all that hatred begets, into brotherhood and fellowship and a co-operative commonwealth. The hon. member for Toowoong—whose heart bleeds for the worker, who sweats great drops of blood whenever he meets anything in the nature of oppression, whose heart is one great wide open door for all of us—nevertheless stands for the political party which has its heel on the neck of the workers, and will keep it there so long as it has the power.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

*Mr. F. A. Cooper.]*