Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER 1925

TUESDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER, 1925.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of messages from His Excellency the Deputy Governor, assenting to the following Bills:—

Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment Bill;

Primary Products Pools Acts Amendment Bill;

Trust Accounts Act Amendment Bill;

Basic Wage Bill;

Primary Producers' Organisation Acts Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS.

STATE SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIPS IN GREATER BRISBANE AREA.

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

"1. What is the number of scholarship entries from each State school in the Greater Brisbane area for last scholarship examinations?

"2. What is the number that obtained scholarships in each State school in the said area?

"3. What is the percentage of increase in membership for each State school in the said area for last year?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. T. Wilson, *Fortitude Valley*) replied—

"(1 and 2.) Statement showing candidates for the April, 1925, State Scholarship Examination who sat and passed from State schools in the area of Greater Brisbane—

Schools.	Sat.	Passed.
Ascot	12	11
Ashgrove	1	..
Bald Hills	2	2
Breakfast Creek	6	6
Brisbane Central	22	16
Brisbane East	27	25
Brisbane South (Boys)	26	17
Brisbane South (Girls and Infants)	18	10
Bulimba	7	7
Buranda (Boys)	21	15
Buranda (Girls and Infants)	10	6
Cannon Hill	8	1
Coorparoo	25	19
Darra	6	6
Dutton Park (Boys)	18	12
Dutton Park (Girls and Infants)	18	12
Eagle Junction	80	67
Enoggera	15	11
Fortitude Valley (Boys)	8	2
Fortitude Valley (Girls and Infants)	7	..
Gap	2	2
Greenslopes	10	5
Hamilton	5	3
Hemmant	6	2
Indooroopilly	14	11
Ithaca Creek	11	9
Junction Park	23	5
Kangaroo Point (Boys)	8	4
Kangaroo Point (Girls)	12	11
Kelvin Grove (Boys)	24	18
Kelvin Grove (Girls)	25	23
Leichhardt Street (Girls)	4	3
Manly	23	12
Milton	25	18
New Farm	30	19
Norman Park	10	5
Nundah	34	20
Petrie Terrace (Boys)	10	7
Petrie Terrace (Girls and Infants)	14	8
Pinkenba	5	..
Sandgate	33	22
Sherwood	23	23
Taringa	51	41
Toowong	24	20
Virginia	11	10
West End (Boys)	17	12
West End (Girls)	8	7
Wilston	7	4
Windsor	46	39
Wooloowin	34	33
Wynnum Central	29	8
Wynnum North	6	1
Wynnum West	1	1
Yeronga	23	11
Zillmere	3	..

NOTE.—"Passing" the examination necessarily implies the gaining of a State Scholarship.

"(3.) Statement showing the percentage of increase or decrease in membership for each State school in the Greater Brisbane area for the year 1924—

Schools.	Average Attendance.		Percentage Membership (Average Attendance).	
	1923.	1924.	Increase	Decrease
Ascot	343	376	9·6	..
Ashgrove	145	154	6·2	..
Aspley	64	68	6·2	..
Auchenflower (Infants)	74	72	..	2·7
Bald Hills	113	98	..	13·3
Belmont	21	23	9·5	..
Boondall	School opened 1925			
Breakfast Creek	253	256	1·2	..
Brighton	50	55	10	..
Brisbane Central	378	411	8·7	..
Brookfield	19	19	..	..
Brookfield Upper	12	16	33	..
Bulimba	450	458	1·8	..
Buranda (Boys)	271	306	12·9	..
Buranda (Girls and Infants)	464	477	2·8	..
Cannon Hill	343	317	..	7·6
Carina	109	119	9·2	..
Chermside	106	107	·9	..
Coorparoo	699	787	12·6	..
Cooper's Plains	62	62	..	..
Cribb Island	27	39	44·4	..
Darra	124	130	4·8	..
Dutton Park (Boys)	329	360	9·4	..
Dutton Park (Girls and Infants)	594	624	5·1	..
Eagle Junction	1,057	1,112	5·2	..
East Brisbane	1,013	1,031	1·8	..
Eight-Mile Plains	49	51	4·1	..
Enoggera	289	312	7·9	..
Figtree Pocket	20	16	..	20
Fortitude Valley (Boys)	434	456	5·1	..
Fortitude Valley (Girls)	380	377	..	·8
Fortitude Valley (Infants)	270	242	..	10·4
Gap	63	56	..	11·1
Gold Creek	15	18	20	..
Greenslopes	545	552	1·3	..
Hamilton	246	239	..	2·8
Hemmant	140	164	17·1	..
Hendra	127	125	..	1·6
Indooroopilly	248	230	..	7·3
Ironsides	97	88	..	9·3
Ithaca Creek	596	603	1·2	..
Junction Park	918	955	4	..
Kangaroo Point (Boys)	201	201	..	..
Kangaroo Point (Girls)	234	231	..	1·3
Kangaroo Point (Infants)	150	168	12	..
Kedron Upper	14	13	..	7·1

Schools.	Average Attendance.		Percentage Membership (Average Attendance).	
	1923.	1924.	Increase	Decrease
Kelvin Grove (Boys)..	468	501	7·1	..
Kelvin Grove (Girls and Infants)	595	668	12·3	..
Kenmore	38	39	2·6	..
Leichhardt Street (Boys)	181	189	4·4	..
Leichhardt Street (Girls)	172	170	..	1·2
Leichhardt Street (Infants)	179	170	..	5·0
Manly	481	486	1	..
Milton	854	945	10·7	..
Mitchelton	140	162	15·7	..
Moggill..	38	36	..	5·3
Morningside	33	42	27·3	..
Mount Gravatt ..	135	148	9·6	..
Myrtletown	..	25	School opened	1 open-1924
New Farm	834	865	3·7	..
Newmarket	350	336	..	4
Norman Park ..	481	517	7·5	..
Nudgee	78	73	..	6·4
Oxley	123	132	7·3	..
Nundah	628	722	15·0	..
Petrie Terrace (Boys)..	300	317	5·7	..
Petrie Terrace (Girls and Infants)	539	596	10·6	..
Pinkenba	158	160	1·3	..
Pullen Vale	26	30	15·4	..
Rocklea	145	154	6·2	..
Runcorn	203	212	4·4	..
Salisbury	122	118	..	3·3
Seventeen-Mile Rocks	11	10	..	9·1
Sherwood	479	494	3·1	..
Sandgate	772	784	1·6	..
Shorncliffe (Infants) ..	121	126	4·1	..
South Brisbane (Boys)	255	258	1·2	..
South Brisbane (Girls and Infants)	314	319	1·6	..
Stafford	86	91	5·8	..
Taringa	572	597	4·4	..
Toowong	567	585	3·2	..
Virginia	296	335	13·2	..
West End (Boys) ..	404	418	3·5	..
West End (Girls) ..	389	408	4·9	..
West End (Infants) ..	251	240	..	4·4
Wilston	394	441	11·9	..
Windsor	1,040	1,111	6·8	..
Wooloowin	700	809	15·6	..
Wynnum Central ..	565	625	10·6	..
Wynnum North ..	229	229	..	..
Wynnum West ..	71	86	21·1	..
Yeronga	438	485	10·7	..
Zillmere	150	166	10·7	..

Maximum Wages and Overtime Paid by Railway Department.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), for Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*), asked the Secretary for Railways—

"What is the highest amount of wages (including overtime) paid by the Railway Department in the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, and July of this year, under the following employment:—(*a*) Engine-drivers; (*b*) firemen; (*c*) cleaners; (*d*) guards; (*e*) clerks; (*f*) conductors?"

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

"The information is being prepared."

Sales of Ratoon Cotton and Cotton Seed.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. What was the quantity of ratoon cotton sold in the Commonwealth by the B.A.C.A., Ltd., of the 1924-25 season's crop, and by whom was it purchased?

"2. What was the price per lb. of lint obtained?

"3. What was the price paid the grower per lb. for ratoon cotton in seed for the 1924-25 crop?

"4. Was any ratoon cotton exported overseas; if so, what price was obtained, and where was it shipped to?

"5. What was the weight of the cotton seed of the 1923-24 and 1924-25 crops sold to the B.A.C.A., Ltd.; and what price was received per ton for each season's seed?

"6. What was the amount of seed sold to other customers; and what was the price received?

"7. Under the existing agreement with the B.A.C.A., Ltd., what will be the price paid for cotton seed of the 1925-26 crop?

"8. What was the value of cotton seed in the British markets on the latest quotations received by the Government?"

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

"1. Three hundred and fourteen bales. The purchasers were Messrs. Geo. A. Bond and Co., Ltd., Overells' Ltd., McDonnell and East, Ltd., Carricks Ltd., Laycock, Littledike, and Co., and Richard Harding and Co., Ltd.

"2.—

No. of bales sold.	Selling Price. Pence per lb.
5	11.75
128	12
39	12.25
48	12.50
61	12.75
5	13
23	13.25
5	13.50
314	

"3. The payments made to date have been at the rates of 3d., 2¾d., and 2½d. per lb., according to grade.

"4. No ratoon cotton of the 1924-25 crop has been exported overseas for sale.

"5. The weight of cotton seed of the 1923-24 crop sold to the B.A.C.A., Ltd., was 4,053 tons 14 cwt. 1 qr. 10 lb. The price was £1 per ton. The quantity of cotton seed from the 1924-25 crop to be sold to the B.A.C.A., Ltd., cannot yet be ascertained. The price will be £1 per ton.

"6. All seed except requirements for planting was taken over by the B.A.C.A., Ltd. A charge of ½d. per lb. to cover expenses was made for seed for planting.

"7. £1 10s. per ton.

"8. The Government has no information as to the current value of cotton seed in the British markets."

Operations of Atherton Maize Pool.

Mr. LOGAN (*Lockyer*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. What did it cost per bushel to handle the maize that passed through the Maize Pool at Atherton last year?

"2. Was the price of the bags used by the farmers to carry their maize to

the silos included in the amount mentioned by him when replying to Mr. Edwards's question relative to the Atherton Maize Pool?

"3. If not, can he say what the extra bags actually cost the farmers?"

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

"1. 11d. per bushel, including administrative charges, preliminary expenses, cost of bags, local freights, cartage, etc.

"2. Yes.

"3. See answers to Nos. 1 and 2."

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane for 1924.

Annual Report of the Director, State Children Department, for the year 1924.

Report upon the operations of the Subdepartments of Aboriginals, Dunwich Benevolent Asylum, Inebriates Institution (Dunwich), Jubilee Sanatorium for Consumptives (Dalby), Westwood Sanatorium, Government Relief, Home for Epileptics (Willowburn), Prisons, Queensland Blind, Deaf, and Dumb Institution, and Diamantina Hospital for Chronic Diseases (South Brisbane).

Regulations under the Charitable Institutions Management Act of 1885 and the Blind, Deaf, and Dumb Children Instruction Act of 1924, dated 15th July, 1925.

Forty-ninth Report of the Secretary for Public Instruction for the year 1924.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

HON. T. DUNSTAN (*Gympie*): 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 Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1923, in certain particulars.

Question put and passed.

MAIN ROADS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

IPSWICH TRADES AND LABOUR HALL LAND PERPETUAL LEASE BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

SALARIES ACTS OF 1922 AND 1923 REPEAL BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

WORKERS' HOMES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. M. J. Kirwan, *Brisbane*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

MINING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

BANK OF NEW SOUTH WALES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*): I beg to move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Bank of New South Wales Act Amendment Act of 1864, and for other incidental purposes."

This is a short Bill of three clauses, and does not introduce any new principles. Its purpose is to define more clearly and in language more suitable to modern requirements the business of the bank, so as to make it clear that these powers and functions are equal to those enjoyed by other financial institutions of the same kind operating within Australia. The powers asked for are no greater or wider than any company registered under the Companies Act can assume for itself under its articles of association. I will explain the Bill more fully during the second reading stage.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*) presented the Bill, and moved—

"That the Bill be now read a first time."

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

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

Question stated—

"That there be granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1925-1926, a sum not exceeding £300 to defray the salary of the Aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor."

* Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): When the House rose on Friday I was dealing with the wanderings of the hon. member for Herbert in his political fairyland, where most certainly his imagination seemed to have got him bushed. He quoted an extract from a report of the chairman of directors of Bonds, Limited, New South Wales. He also stated that that firm was still waiting for protection. Apparently the hon. member does not read, or he would know that just prior to the time he made that statement the tariff was being dealt with by the Commonwealth Parliament.

On this subject of protection, I have here an extract from the weekly edition of the Melbourne "Leader," the chief protectionist journal in Australia. The article states—

"The Government"—

That is, the Bruce-Page Government, which was denounced by the hon. member for Herbert for not doing this—

"must be given credit for having made an honest attempt to abolish many of the existing anomalies, and to give adequate protection to Australian industries. The revised schedule, introduced in the House of Representatives last week, will undoubtedly be exceedingly beneficial; the measure of the benefits, however, can only be gauged by the experience of time. In forty-seven cases reductions of duty have been made; increases have been made in fifty-three instances, and there are thirteen readjustments. The aim apparently has been to wipe out many purely revenue duties, and to furnish increased protection to industries which have suffered in competition with cheap-labour countries, whilst at the same time furnishing means for the establishment of new industries for which the Commonwealth possesses the raw materials and the labour. The Minister of Customs has estimated that the revised schedule will mean the provision of employment for 25,000 to 30,000 workers within the next two years."

Yet the hon. member said that the Commonwealth Government are doing nothing in this matter.

Again, on the question of secondary industries, employment, and so on, I find that the hon. member makes the following astounding statement on page 542 of "Hansard":—

"The following indicate the percentage of increase or decrease in the number of factory employees during the four years from 1920 to 1923:—

New South Wales (decrease) ...	10.94
Victoria (decrease)	6.23
Queensland (increase)	2.97

So that we show an increase of practically 3 per cent. in factory employees, whereas New South Wales shows a decrease of practically 11 per cent., and Victoria has lost practically 7 per cent."

These statements of the hon. gentleman are entirely at variance with facts. He misquoted the figures. I have here the last "Official Year Book of the Commonwealth" dealing with the years he mentioned. I find from that publication that in the year 1919-1920 there was an increase in the number of factory employees in New South Wales of 13.22 per cent.; that the year 1920-1921 showed an increase of .39 per cent.; the year 1921-1922 an increase of 2.67 per cent.; and the year 1922-1923 showed an increase of 2.28 per cent.

He also said that the figures for Victoria in this connection show a decrease, but I find that the figures for 1919-1920 show that the number of factories in Victoria increased by 11.58 per cent.; that in the year 1920-1921 there was an increase of 3.39 per cent.; that in the year 1921-1922 there was an increase of 2.94 per cent.; and that for the year 1922-1923 there was an increase of 5.25 per cent. Yet the hon. gentleman distinctly says that both those States show a decrease.

Coming to Queensland, I find that the very first year he quotes shows a decrease, yet he says it shows an increase. The figures for 1919-1920 show that the number of factory employees in Queensland decreased by .24 per cent.; that in 1920-1921 there was an increase of 5.64 per cent.; that in 1921-1922 there was a decrease of 2.20 per cent.; and that for 1922-1923 there was an increase of 2.73 per cent.—two decreases in Queensland and none in the other States during the years he mentions. It will be observed by the Committee that the statements of the hon. gentleman are distinctly at variance with facts, and therefore are unreliable. The general results showed an increase in the number of employees engaged in factories in the various States, and further, show that Queensland, rich as it is in all the needs of the manufacturer—rich as it is in coal and wool—cannot be compared under this Government with the other States which are not so fortunate in that regard. Furthermore, I notice that the hon. member for Herbert has been very careful in his choice of years. I shall give a more comprehensive treatment of similar figures. Quoting from the "Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia," I shall deal with—

AVERAGE NUMBER OF FACTORY EMPLOYEES.

New South Wales.

1919-1920	144,454
1922-1923	152,266
An increase of ...	7,812

Victoria.

1919-1920	136,522
1922-1923	152,625
An increase of ...	16,103

Queensland.

1919-1920	40,891
1922-1923	43,408
An increase of only	2,517

Included in those Queensland figures are 5,589 sugar-mill employees for the year 1922-1923 and 4,098 sugar-mill employees for the year 1919-1920, the record showing an increase of 1,491 in that regard. If the sugar-mill employees are excluded from the Queensland figures, the increase in the number of factory employees is reduced to 1,021.

While dealing with the figures of the hon. member for Herbert I wish to point out how he selects his years. The hon. member carefully confined his figures to the years from 1919-1920 onwards. If the figures of the previous year are tabulated with those he quotes the comparison becomes infinitely worse in the Queensland record. I shall quote records over a longer term of years—practically the term of years during which the present Government have been in office. I shall quote figures from the year 1914-1915 to the year 1922-1923—

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF FACTORY EMPLOYEES, 1914-1915 TO 1922-1923.

New South Wales ...	43,063
Victoria	37,763
Queensland	1,666 only.

I could quote the figures for South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania, but they would only make the position worse for Queensland, and I have not the necessary time. Coming back to the proportionate increase or decrease—and that is the most important matter—this is what we find—

FACTORY EMPLOYEES PER 10,000 OF MEAN POPULATION.

	1914.	1923.
Victoria	832	960
New South Wales ...	626	701
South Australia ...	611	676
Tasmania	450	481
Western Australia ...	545	562
Queensland	641	556

Roughly, these figures cover the period during which the present Government have been in office, and the figures actually show a decrease so far as Queensland is concerned.

[11 a.m.]

Then let us take the actual figures for the various States during the nine years prior to this Government coming into office and during the nine years that they have been in office—

	1905 to 1914. Per cent.	1914 to 1923. Per cent.
Victoria, inc. ...	60	inc. 128
New South Wales, inc.	52	inc. 75
South Australia, dec.	45	inc. 65
Tasmania, dec. ...	53	inc. 31
Western Australia, inc.	58	inc. 17
Queensland, inc. ...	123	dec. 75

Queensland, instead of being first on the list as regards increase as it was during the nine years prior to this Government taking office, now shows an actual decrease of 75 per cent. during the nine years that the present Government have been in office. These figures entirely disprove all the statements made by hon. members on the other side regarding the progress made in Queensland in secondary industry; they rather indicate retrogression than progress.

Now let us take woollen mills. At the present time, of the only two woollen mills we have in Ipswich the larger, which employed between 200 and 300 hands, is out of action. Only the smaller one employing from eighty to ninety hands is at present working; yet hon. gentlemen opposite blame the Commonwealth Government because 40 per cent. of the woollen mills in Australia are out of action at the present time. If that is so, then Queensland is in a worse position in that regard than the rest of Australia, because 50 per cent. of the woollen mills in Queensland are out of action at the present time, while about 75 per cent. of the workers employed in woollen mills in Queensland are out of work. I have a clipping taken from a paper in New South Wales, published during this month, which shows that Queensland does not compare with the rest of Australia in this regard, as new mills and factories are being started in other States—

> "The Orange, New South Wales, woollen mills will be ready for the reception of the spinning and weaving machinery in about a month's time. The main spinning room, which has a floor space of 5,000 square feet, is almost complete, and the manager, an expert from Bradford (England), will arrive shortly to supervise the erection of the machinery. When the mills are in full operation it is expected that 500 persons will be employed."

Then again, the Sydney "Bulletin" of 30th July of this year has this advertisement in regard to motor-body works in South Australia—

> "Progress of motor-body building in Australia.
>
> "Great oaks from little acorns grow.
>
> "Holden's growth of output from 12 bodies to 35,000 per annum in seven years.
>
> "Australia's benefit in employment and production.
>
> "Capital, 1919, £25,000; 1924-1925, £492,500.
>
> "Floor space, 1917, 11,872 square feet; 1924-1925, 40 acres.
>
> "Total number employees, 1917, 19; 1924-1925, 2,600.
>
> "Value of annual wages paid, 1917, £3,706; 1924-1925, £491,000.
>
> "Bodies produced, 1918, 617; 1924-1925, 35,000.
>
> "Value of output, 1917, £9,617; 1924-1925, £2,000,000."

Yet we know that in Brisbane that particular industry has gone down. I was travelling recently with a member of a firm here which takes large contracts for motor bodies, and he told me that his firm had reduced the number of its employees from 150 to 40, and there were no jobs ahead. In the face of this information we are told by the cheerful optimists opposite that everything is all right and things are going ahead; but the figures I have quoted show that the opposite is the case. One of the reasons for this is the burden of taxation. I find that a firm making a profit of £10,000 a year in Victoria pays £348 19s. 2d. income tax, while in Queensland the tax on such a profit is £1,680. A man with an income of £600 pays £19 10s. 2d. in Queensland, while in Victoria he only pays £10 8s. 4d. On an income of £425 in Victoria he would only pay £2 16s. 3d., while in Queensland he would pay £7 3s. 7d. That is why secondary industries, which are so necessary to solve the unemployment problem, are going down. Another reason is harsh, restrictive industrial legislation. The hon. member for Herbert stressed the huge debt liability that had been accumulated by the Commonwealth Government, and which he asserted had nothing to do with the war. I find that the present indebtedness

of the Commonwealth is £410,995,000, which is brought about as follows:—

Purchase of properties from States	11,000,000
War loans	332,134,694
War gratuities	19,508,481
Loans raised on behalf of States	16,750,000
War debt	9,000,000
	388,393,175

Yet, when the hon. member for Windsor interjected that the vast expenditure was in connection with the war, the hon. member for Herbert would not acknowledge it.

Also, it will be noticed what good work the Commonwealth is doing for the States. I have here an extract from a paper published this month, which reads—

> "The Minister for Roads and Railways (Mr. Hill) told Mr. Mackay in the House of Representatives last week that 2,655 miles of road work had been carried out under the Main Roads Development Act. He gave the commitments in New South Wales as £235,057, and the expenditure £110,000; Victoria, £146,216 and £127,345; Queensland, £171,314 and £111,280; South Australia, £111,000 and £67,500; Western Australia, £192,000 and £173,114; Tasmania, £22,953 and £10,500; total, £918,540 and £599,739."

Yet the hon. member for Herbert endeavoured to make out that the whole of this loan expenditure—which he incorrectly said had not originated with the Labour Government—had been incurred for selfish purposes throughout the Commonwealth, quite apart from war expenditure or State needs. He also made this astounding statement—

> "The increased annual burden every year on the people of Australia by the anti-Labour Government—the same sort of Government as the Opposition, with the same bosses, and elected by the same people—is £18,541,586."

I have here a statement of the Commonwealth expenditure from revenue for the last six years, taken from "The Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia," showing the increases or decreases in each year—

Year.	Expenditure.	Increase or Decrease
1918-19 ..	£45,119,680	
1919-20 ..	£50,581,354	Increase £5,461,674
1920-21 ..	£64,624,087	,, £14,042,733
1921-22 ..	£65,106,949	,, £482,862
1922-23 ..	£63,700,485	Decrease £1,406,464
1923-24 ..	£68,345,774	Increase £4,645,289

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*): Although I have recently received what one might call another set-down politically, I have received so many in my time that I take them philosophically. I view the position somewhat in this light—that I have received so many bumps that another little bump will not do me any harm. I had cherished the hope that I would be a candidate again at the ensuing Federal election. I made some inquiries from the only source from which I could make inquiries—that is, from my leader, and those hopes were swept aside, and naturally I am very disappointed. I would have liked to be a candidate in the ensuing Federal election. I have been very unhappy here during the past five years, and I believe that there has been a feeling against me owing to the fact that I was the first man in Australia to oppose conscription. Strange as it may seem, that seems to me to have been the result. At any rate, I am firmly of that opinion. Senator Gardiner, when he came to Brisbane in 1919 to assist in the elections at which I was then a candidate—at the time I was up North—spoke in Market Square, and paid me the compliment of saying some things about me which, in the language of the day, would be regarded as a "boom." I contend that Senator Gardiner's well-intentioned remarks—which I had not the remotest idea he was going to make—have rendered me a great disservice, and have been my undoing. You, Mr. Pollock, were in this Chamber at the time, and I invite those of you Ministers and members who think that perhaps I am not speaking correctly and say that perhaps I am claiming too much when I say that I was the first public man in Australia to stand up against conscription, I invite you to go to the top library and look up the files of the "Daily Standard" when the "Daily Standard" asked the 48 members of the Legislative Assembly and the 23 members of the Legislative Council to express their views, and see what you said then, if you said anything. I am speaking to no one in particular, I am speaking to our party. Again, I ask you to refresh your memories by looking up the files of the "Daily Standard" and see what you said then, if you said anything.

I do not want these little introductory remarks of mine to be taken as an indication of any soreness against a gentleman who defeated me in a plebiscite, because nothing is further from my mind. I assure you, Mr. Pollock, that Mr. Theodore and I personally are very good friends. I have not the remotest suspicion of any soreness against him, and, so far as I can judge, I do not think he has any reason to have anything against me. I have differed from him. We have expressed opposing views on many subjects, but I admire him, and this is where my admiration of him comes in. During his captaincy of this party, during the time he was directing its affairs, my admiration went out to him because he had not only the Cabinet, not only the officers of the party, not only the members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, in the palm of his hand, but he also had the members of the Queensland Central Executive and the members of the Executive of the A.W.U. in the palm of his hand. He toyed with them, he played with them, and he did with them what he liked. I say, "Good luck to him!" and I have said so to his face. He is a man who has achieved what Mr. Fisher never desired or attempted to achieve, and in my opinion what Mr. Hughes was not capable of achieving. He had the great Labour movement, with all its responsibilities, in the palm of his hand. He had it to do what he liked with it. He toyed with it, he played with it, and so my admiration goes out to him. Who can gainsay that not only the Cabinet and the officers of the party, but the whole party practically—

Mr. COLLINS: No, no. (Laughter.)

Mr. FERRICKS: I mean the majority of the party, the Queensland Central Executive, and the Executive of the A.W.U. were there to be dictated to and directed by him. I say all power to Mr. Theodore, and good luck to him! Wherever he may go and wherever he may finish, he has my good wishes in that regard. He knows my views on that point, because I have said, "Good luck!" to him even in the midst of our fights. I have had an opportunity of judging Mr. Theodore. I have seen his bigness—and he can be big—and he can also be small.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: As one who has judged his bigness and has been subject to his paltriness, I am in a position to judge from an unbiased attitude, and I do say that quite unconcernedly and to the world for all who desire to hear. Our movement is a great and glorious movement, and I have never had any disillusion about it, because before my entry into active politics I took the philosophical view that a man who comes into the Labour movement actively and thinks he is going to get more halfpence than kicks is making a mistake. I am not disillusioned in that regard, although I might be somewhat disillusioned at not having had the opportunity to return to Federal politics. The great multitude outside who laud you to-day will kick you into the gutter to-morrow. I had that experience in 1912 and again in 1919, and I am prepared to receive that experience at any old time to come. This movement is too great and glorious a movement to get into the hands of any one individual, whether it be Mr. Fisher, Mr. Hughes, the late respected Mr. Bowman, the late respected Mr. Ryan, Mr. Theodore, Mr. McCormack, or Mr. Gillies.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: It is not in the interests of the movement for its destinies to be guided or influenced inside, which may not be to the best advantage of its component parts outside. I hope, Mr. Pollock, you will forgive me for this little self-glorification, because sometimes I get an inward satisfaction which no man can explain, but which we all at times feel even if the world appears to be against us, of having endeavoured to do the right thing. May I emphasise that by pointing out and stressing that on the Sunday morning in October, 1916, when the result of the first conscription referendum gave a victory for "No conscription," I did not care afterwards if I had died. I felt satisfied at having done what I did, and I have since been more convinced that I did the right thing then.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: I felt satisfied then at having set the pace for the people to vote against conscription, and I am sorry that since my re-entry into the State Parliament that work has operated against me.

Hon. members opposite must agree now with the remarks I made in the course of my speech on the Address in Reply—that the visit of Dr. Earle Page to Queensland and his delivery of a policy speech at Gympie on 22th May—was the opening of the Federal campaign. When I made that statement there were loud cries of dissent from hon. members opposite.

Mr. BRAND: Their three years are up now.

Mr. FERRICKS: The term of the Federal Parliament will not expire until December, and the Bruce-Page Government need not have gone to the country until March or April next.

Mr. CLAYTON: You have been sorry ever since the dissolution was announced.

Mr. FERRICKS: The portent of the visit of Dr. Earle Page then was very plain, and I endeavoured to point that out. I also endeavoured to point out then that the Bruce-Page Government were absolutely bereft of policy, and were so bankrupt in performance that they must endeavour to obtain some excuse on which to go to the country. The result, in my opinion, was that they endeavoured to bring about the deregistration of the Seamen's Union through the Arbitration Court, and when the Seamen's Union—quite rightly, in my opinion—said, "If you want to deregister us, deregister us, and we will then be forced back on direct action," the composite Federal Government forced the Seamen's Union back upon direct action. When they went on strike an agreement was arrived at behind the back of the Prime Minister, and he raved because that agreement was arrived at. Then he fell back further on the question of deportation. He seized upon the names of two men, Walsh and Johnson——

Mr. MAXWELL: Johannsen.

Mr. FERRICKS: The hon. member may have it that way if he wishes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: At any rate, he is a fellow-countryman of Queen Alexandra of England. There is nothing wrong with that. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FERRICKS: He seized upon the names of those two men. I want hon. members opposite to realise, if they can, that they misjudge human nature, that they do not know humanity, and certainly they do not know the workers if they think that any two men—Walsh and Johnson or anybody else—can sway thousands into striking. Do you think, Mr. Pollock—of course, I know you do not—with your great industrial experience you know better—do hon. members opposite think men go on strike and knock off work for the fun of the thing—for the play of the thing? They do not. Going on strike is a very serious matter, and the workers realise that. Before they go on strike they always have very good reasons for so doing. Consequently I say it is idle for hon. members opposite or the party which they represent to endeavour to attach to Walsh, Johnson, or anybody else the responsibility for the British seamen's strike. It had to come. It is an aftermath of the war. The workers of some countries learnt too much during the war, and now hon. members opposite and their fellows are trying to stem the tide which they see flowing during those years. Is there any hon. member opposite who, after having listened to the speeches of the hon. members for Fitzroy and Kennedy on Friday last on this question, will get up and say that he thinks the men are unreasonable in objecting to a further reduction of £1 per month in their wages? That further reduction of £1 came upon previous reductions which occurred during the war, and which totalled somewhere in the vicinity of £5 per month. These men are British seamen. They would not strike without good cause. They are the men who braved greater dangers than our soldiers during war time.

They are men who carried their lives in their hands every moment they were at work during those four years of war. They were heroes then, and, as the hon. member for Kennedy said the other day, they are criminals now. I say it is too bad. Then we have the bluff put up that preference is shown to foreign vessels carrying crews of Lascars, Japs, and Javanese to the detriment of British boats manned by British seamen. Do hon. members opposite not know that the shipping capitalistic world is just as international as the armament manufacturing world? Do they not know—I have put it on record in "Hansard" here and elsewhere—that in the active years of the war the high British-sounding firm name of Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., Ltd., had amongst its shareholders Americans, Japanese, Germans, Britishers, Austrians, Italians, Frenchmen, and Russians? During the currency of the war, Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company were carrying out naval and armament contracts for the Allied Governments, and amongst their shareholders were included Germans, Austrians, Americans, Japanese, and representatives of every other nationality. Capitalism knows no country! It knows no bounds! How do Inchcape and [11.30 a.m.] company view the fact that their ships are tied up here in Australia? It is all right; the trade is going to the ships manned by Japs, Lascars, or Chinese, who are paid a penny a day—we will say—and the profits are going to Inchcape and company just the same. In fact, bigger profits, as I am reminded. They do not care if the seamen tie up the whole of the British ships, as they will get the trade and commerce of the world carried by ships of their combine manned by Lascars, Chinese, Japanese, and Javanese, and the profits find the same old coffers. So where does the patriotism of hon. members opposite come in? Where does their claim about Britishers come in when they see that the Japs, the Lascars, the Javanese who man these ships are earning dividends for the very same people who own the ships that are tied up here in Australia? Hon. members opposite cannot get away from that position. Capitalism is international; and, when they talk about deporting people, I say it is contrary to the Australian spirit. It is contrary to the Australian sentiment. That is one more reason why I regret I have not the opportunity of appealing on this question to the electors of Queensland or any section of the electors of Queensland during the coming Federal election. I think it is an awful shame to talk about deportation. What did I see about deportation under big headings only in yesterday's "Courier?"—

"TURKS' ATROCITY.

"LEAGUE INVESTIGATION.

"*Deportation of Christians.*

"(Australian Press Association and Reuter.)

"London, September 24.

"The Council of the League of Nations has resolved to despatch at the earliest convenience a representative of the League to investigate on the spot the alleged deportations of Christians from Mosul."

I say the Turks are taking a very wrong attitude in deporting Christians from their territory; but they view Christians as being undesirable, and they say there is only one way to deal with these people, and that is to deport them. Now the Bruce-Page Government take exactly the same attitude, and are on exactly the same plane as the Turkish Government. I thought we were a bit more advanced than that. Honestly I did! The "Telegraph" of 24th September rather enlarges on that phase of the question—

"CHRISTIANS DEPORTED.

"VIOLATION OF LAUSANNE TREATY.

"*British Note to League.*

(Reuter.)

"Geneva, September 22.

"The British delegation has requested the Council of the League of Nations to meet at the earliest moment to consider correspondence in regard to the deportations of Christians from districts adjacent to the Brussels line and Mosul. The delegation states that in view of the Turkish denial . . ."

The Turks denied that this was taking place.

"the League should forthwith send a representative to the locality of the Brussels line to investigate and report immediately to the Council. In the event of a similar occurrence in the future the British and Iraq Governments would welcome the presence of such a representative on their side of the Brussels line, and they would afford him every assistance to fulfil his task.

You know what the task is. The recent experience of the war forces upon us the realisation of what this task will be. If there is any forcible deportation of Christians from Turkey, then the good old guns have got to come to the rescue. Australia is falling very low when it descends to the level of Turkish methods. Christians are undesirable in Turkey, hence the laws of Turkey deal with the Christians. I say the laws of Australia should deal with anybody who infringes those laws. When I was a big growing boy there was an arch-criminal going round Australia whose name was Deeming. There was never any mention of deporting Deeming; he could be dealt with here.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: So he was.

Mr. FERRICKS: Why not deal with anybody else by Australian laws? Why load them on the good old Motherland? If they are such sour people, such undesirables, where is the patriotism in unloading them on the good old Motherland? I say that the Commonwealth Government are lacking; they are inconsistent.

Mr. SIZER: They may not go to the good old Motherland.

Mr. FERRICKS: So much the worse for the Government which the hon. member supports to say that they will "shanghai" people away from Australia without any mention of their destination. I know something of the intolerance of people myself. During the currency of the war, probably the hon. member—and he and I personally are the best of friends—agreed with the sentiments which were expressed about my deportation in 1919, notwithstanding the fact that my people came to Queensland before Separation, and while it was still

Moreton Bay. Yet we know that "Johnny Hop-ins" who had not been here more than twenty-four hours stood on the public platform and advocated my deportation. Unless hon. members are prepared to take a stand on this question of deportation, they are only aiding and abetting the spirit of intolerance. Therefore we have to advise hon. members opposite to give to their supporters and advisers something approaching a true presentment of the case. When they get up and talk about their newfound desire, or their new gospel of fostering secondary industries, that the hon. member for Mirani talks about, do they not realise that the very party they are supporting in the approaching Federal campaign, led by the Prime Minister—who is first an Imperialist; secondly, an Englishman; thirdly, an Australian; and, lastly, a Queenslander—does the hon. member for Mirani not realise that when he is supporting that party he is aiding and abetting the very party that does not want secondary industries to be established in Australia? As I pointed out in the debate on the Address in Reply, they are prepared to give us preference, but they want our sugar-mill machinery and everything else built in England.

Mr. SWAYNE: That is not true.

Mr. FERRICKS: That is in "Hansard." They want Australia to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Secretary for Mines has told us that, when he was in London and addressing public meetings, it was all right so long as he told them about the great wealth production of Australia with regard to raw materials, such as wool, meat, hides, and minerals, but as soon as he got on to the question of secondary industries they cried him off. The Secretary for Mines was asked, "Do you really believe that Australia one day will endeavour to establish herself as a manufacturing nation?" and, of course, the hon. gentleman expressed that hope and that belief. "But," say his questioners, "that is entirely wrong. Australia should not do that." If hon. members opposite say that their party believes in the establishment of secondary industries, let me quote what Mr. Stewart said. Mr. Stewart was in the Federal Ministry, but, because he believed the interests of the Country party were being sacrificed to the pressure of Nationalism, he withdrew from it. As reported in the "Daily Standard" of 16th March, 1925, he said—

> "Protests had been made by the 'Country' party members against the dumping duty on wire-netting. His own personal conviction was that wire-netting should be provided at the cheapest possible price. It would be in the interests of all settlers in Australia to scrap the wire-netting factories here."

They do not want Australian industries. They are freetraders for themselves and protectionists for their opponents. I have not time to deal with that point at any greater length, but I am very anxious—not from a party point of view; not from a personal point of view; not even from a Queensland point of view; but from an Australian point of view—to touch on matters which have not been dealt with during this debate.

I was interested in listening to the hon. member for Burke when he spoke about the discrepancy which exists between the rental of large areas of land in the Northern Territory and the prices which are charged to small settlers. The hon. member quite rightly argued that the idea that £50,000,000 should be spent in the Northern Territory was rather unsound, inasmuch as before that proposal was made some of the big pastoralists—or rather, big pastoral companies—had secured extensions of their leases up to thirty or forty years. They got those extensions up to forty years, and then the proposal was made for the creation of a new northern State and the expenditure of £50,000,000 on railways. I had the opportunity in 1918 of going to Port Darwin, and, although I saw only a portion of the Northern Territory, I was very greatly impressed with it, and the trip whetted my appetite to see more of that Territory owned by the Commonwealth Government. I decided that at the first opportunity I would go back, but the electors in December, 1919, decided against my return to the Federal Parliament, and they deprived me of the opportunity. However, I have been interested ever since in the Northern Territory and in Papua or New Guinea. The condition of Papua—and this is an entirely Australian subject, and is very important to Queensland—shows up the financial and business laxity of the members of the Bruce Government. Papua, or British New Guinea, has an area of about 90,000 square miles, German New Guinea about 74,000 square miles, and Dutch New Guinea a somewhat similar area. As is well known, Mr. H. M. Chester, in April, 1883, acting under instructions from Sir Thomas McIlwraith, the then Premier of Queensland, went to Port Moresby and hoisted the British flag, and only about a month ago an account of that expedition appeared in General Spencer Browne's "Memories of a Journalist" in Saturday's "Courier." Strange to say, the British Government would not agree to that annexation by Queensland. Why? The Secretary for Public Works interjected something about relations of Queen Alexandra.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What I said was that Queen Alexandra was a fellow countrywoman of Johnson, but that there was no objection to her.

Mr. FERRICKS: The German influence on the British Court was so great that the then Secretary of State for the Colonies refused to allow the British Government to agree to the annexation of New Guinea. Gladstone was Prime Minister and Earl Derby was Colonial Secretary, as the office then was, but the German pressure on the British Court was so strong that the annexation was not ratified, and so the thing went on until about 1886. Annexation was then agreed to, but the German flag was hoisted on the northern portion first. As soon as this portion of New Guinea was annexed by Germany the British Government—Earl Derby still at the helm—in the interests of the British Crown agreed to the annexation by Queensland. This is rather interesting. Let me give the dates. The German flag was hoisted over the northern portion and the adjacent islands in December, 1884, and the Queensland annexation was ratified in 1886. I am not going into the rights or wrongs or the wisdom or otherwise of Queensland annexing New Guinea. During four or five years of the war period I expressed my opinion about the spread of territory and the desire to extend your

claws for more territory. This is where the interest comes in: Australia has a big responsibility financially and commercially over that territory, and, as a result of the British New Guinea Act, passed in 1887. Queensland undertook to finance the administration of that territory to the extent of £15,000 per annum. Then in 1901 on the inception of Federation the Federal Government took over Papua as territory of the Commonwealth, and under the Papua Act of 1905 agreed to contribute £20,000 per annum to carry on the administration of that territory. That £20,000 per annum has been increased to £30,000, and now the Commonwealth of Australia is paying £50,000 per annum for carrying on the administration of Papua. The Commonwealth is paying virtually £1,000 a week, and it is endless thousands of pounds behind in financing what are known as the New Guinea Mandated Territories. They are endless thousands of pounds out, which in my opinion the Commonwealth will never be able to recover. This is where I say we have responsibilities, even as members of Parliament in Queensland, to say nothing of the members of Parliaments throughout the Commonwealth. We have had eight Nationalist representatives in the House of Representatives and six Nationalist Senators representing Queensland for the last six years, and, as one who follows Federal debates and discussions pretty closely, I have not seen any one occasion where one of those members has raised his voice in the interests of Queensland and Australia on this question. Perhaps it may be due to the fact that men get out of touch with this sort of thing. Instead of the Commonwealth subsidising New Guinea to the extent of £50,000 per annum and being endless thousands of pounds behind in carrying on the administration of the Mandated Territories, I think better use could be made financially and commercially of that responsibility. This is how they endeavour to carry on the trade with New Guinea. Burns, Philp, and Company have a contract with the Federal Government to run a steamer from Port Moresby to Sydney once a month, for which they are paid £1,000 a month. I could never understand the necessity for those steamers going all the way to Sydney. Let me illustrate what this means. Port Moresby is 42 hours' sail from Cairns, five days' sail from Brisbane, and eight days' sail from Sydney. Notwithstanding that fact, the Commonwealth Government have paid Burns, Philp, and Company £1,000 a month for a steamer to run to Cairns and then eight days to Sydney. Why the long eight days down to Sydney and the eight days back? I take the view that that boat should run to Cairns or Townsville. Townsville is the commercial port of North Queensland or Northern Australia. There is no warrant for that boat spending five days in coming to Brisbane, or eight days in going to Sydney. Do hon. members see what this means? Do they not see that we as an Australian Commonwealth are contributing £50,000 a year to develop the country, and are losing endless thousands of pounds in an endeavour to develop the Mandated Territories—for what? Copra is the main industry. Copra has a great variety of uses. This is where Australia stands to lose. The output of copra from these Territories is now shipped to Sydney. Port Moresby is midway between Sydney and Singapore. When the copra is taken to Burns, Philp's wharves in Sydney it is then transported to the wharf of another overseas company. The charges mount up all the time, and are becoming burdensome on the producer, with the result that an agitation has arisen for the repeal of certain sections of the Navigation Act. There is no justification for carrying the freight of Papua to Sydney and half way round the world again in order that it might pass on to Singapore and the East. Our fear as Australians is that, while we are carrying the baby and footing the bill to develop these Territories, as soon as they are on their legs the trade will be diverted to the other side of the world and we shall not get one hap'orth of it. The Government should make representations to the Federal Government to endeavour to get them, not to subsidise Burns, Philp, and Company's steamers—by the way, the agreement has not been signed yet—to run to Sydney, but to make Cairns or Townsville their terminal port. The mails and goods brought by those steamers could then be carried over the Queensland railways. The following extract from the "North Queensland Register" is copied from the "Papuan Courier":—

> "Before the Commonwealth came into being Townsville did a very large business with Papua which is practically all lost to this port and district to the loss of Townsville and great inconvenience and loss to Papua owing to the conditions of the existing contract, which it is understood provides a subsidy of £1,000 a trip for twelve trips—Samarai-Sydney—focussing a very large percentage of the business with Sydney."

Why does that business go to Sydney? I am not a parochialist; I am an Australian; but I cannot tolerate what the hon. member for Kennedy the other day rightly called inefficiency and waste. Why should that trade go to Sydney when it could be supplied from Townsville or Cairns, and when our Queensland railways could carry it? Our Commonwealth anti-Labour Government is subsidising a company to carry on on those lines.

There is a chamber of commerce in Port Moresby, and the following is a resolution it passed on 4th May, 1925:—

> "The chamber considers that Townsville should be included as a port of call under the contract, provided that such call does not reduce the time the vessels stay in Sydney to less than seven clear days."

All that the Townsville commercial people have risen to is to advocate that Townsville should be made a port of call. The Port Moresby Chamber of Commerce has no objection to that so long as the vessels have seven clear days in Sydney. I can quite understand their point of view. They want the necessary time for their orders to be filled; but I am surprised at men like Mr. Green, the editor of the "Townsville Bulletin" and the "North Queensland Register," being prepared to sit down under a thing like that. The most the Townsville people can rise to is to advocate that Townsville should be made a port of call, allowing the vessels to be dragged right down to Sydney, when Townsville could supply everything that Port Moresby or any portion of the Mandated Territories required. Australia is carrying that responsibility, and is contributing £50,000 a year, and is also spending

endless thousands of pounds in keeping the Mandated Territories. So soon as those places establish their trade it goes to the other side of the world. Hon. members must recollect the case of the s.s. "Pruth." On 31st December, 1923, that ship was loaded with copra. She was to be an experimental ship and take that load direct from the Mandated Territories to the other side of the world, with the object of cutting out Australia altogether. The elements were in favour of Australia or something else, and the s.s. "Pruth" went on to a reef, and she is still there. That was the end of the experiment. In the meantime we are carrying the baby.

I have spoken on this matter elsewhere, and objected to the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into this question, because one of the Commissioners was the manager of Burns, Philp, and Co., Ltd. Do hon. members not see that Australia is bearing the whole of the financial burden and is getting all of the odium—and there is a good deal of odium attaching to the employment of native labour—and when the time is ripe, as the good old Tory saying goes, Australia can go to the devil and those people will ship their copra direct to the other side of the world. What efforts are hon. members opposite going to make in the matter? Are they going to support the Tory candidates for the Federal Government without stipulating that it is only a fair thing for the Commonwealth Government, seeing that they have so many ships lying idle, to run some of their boats on a fortnightly service, not only to Port Moresby——

Mr. KERR: There would be a strike.

Mr. FERRICKS: There would be no strike, because the stipulated Australian wages and conditions would be observed, and there would be no infringement of the Navigation Act. Those boats could visit Cairns, Port Moresby, and Rabaul, taking in Townsville as the base. That action would save the Commonwealth Government £1,000 a month, and would conserve whatever trade there is for North Queensland, and it amounts to about £500,000 a year. I say the policy of sending that freight to Sydney is totally unsound, and I am taking a broad Australian view and not a parochial view when I say that I see no reason why the trade of North Queensland should go to Sydney or even come to Brisbane. If certain things are unprocurable in North Queensland, get them in Brisbane, but if you cannot get them in Brisbane, in my opinion, you cannot get them in any part of the world.

[12 noon.]

I hope that my reference to this matter will be remembered by hon. members opposite; that they will take into consideration also that, if Mr. Bruce desires to settle any of the present maritime disputes or struggles, he can take up an attitude that will tend to do so, instead of doing nothing but making futile speeches. I just raise this question about the trade with New Guinea and Papua to impress upon the Chamber the wilful waste of continuing the policy of subsidising a boat to run from Moresby to Sydney when it could run from Moresby to Cairns and Townsville and give two trips a month instead of one.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I think hon. members will agree that the hon. member for South Brisbane has put into words the intense nervousness that is being felt by the Labour party to-day owing to the Commonwealth elections being at hand. I venture to say that, if there ever was a chance of the Labour party, or rather of the Socialist party, in Australia getting into power, it is a foregone conclusion that they will never get into power in the face of the stand they are taking to-day in regard to the amendment of the Immigration Act passed by the Commonwealth Government. I want to make this position very clear. It is the right of every nation—and Australia is a nation—to determine who shall enter its territory; and it is the right of every people to determine in a democratic way who shall remain in that territory. Every civilised nation in the world has exactly the same legislation on its statute-book as the Commonwealth Government recently placed on the statute-book of Australia.

Mr. COLLINS: That does not say it is right.

Mr. KERR: It does not say it is right; but it is the right of any nation to determine whether any person shall enter its territory and communicate diseases of a socialistic nature to the minds of the people. The hon. member for South Brisbane stated that Mr. Theodore, the late Premier, held the whole Labour party in the palm of his hand.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That may be his opinion.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member said that the late Premier, as one man, held every officer of the party inside Parliament and also the higher officials of the Queensland Central Executive and the Australian Workers' Union in the palm of his hand. Certainly the hon. member for Bowen disagreed with him, but I did not hear any dissent from any Minister of the Crown. Mob psychology is such that one man, such as Mr. Rymer in the recent strike, could lead thousands of men. Mr. Walsh has been a menace to industry in Australia. He has come into our midst and is upsetting the industries of our country. He will not bow down to the laws of the country. He will not take the oath of allegiance to any country—a Communist knows no country, and Mr. Walsh is a self-styled Communist. If these men come into our midst and dislocate our industries by causing strikes, we as a nation have the right to say who shall enter and who shall be permitted to stay in our country. Australia is a young and rising nation with a wonderful outlook, and we should not allow men to come to this country and spread these insidious doctrines.

Mr. COLLINS: It is a reflection on the native-born Australian.

Mr. KERR: From what I have heard recently, it is time that we took note of some of the doings at unionist meetings. A resolution of a socialistic nature, I am credibly informed, was placed before one union meeting, and in putting the resolution the chairman said, "Scabs to the left, and all in favour to the right." That is the Trades Hall method of doing business to-day. I am told that that is the way in which unionism is being conducted to-day. We know that in 1916 and 1917 some of the best unionists in Australia were away fighting for democracy and for the nation. While they were away what happened in our midst? Men who could not speak the English language took control at the Trades Hall, and those men are still dominating Labour politics to-day.

Mr. HYNES: That is untrue.

Mr. KERR: We talk about the marvellous growth and development of the Labour movement, but it is not worth a snap of the fingers as it stands to-day. A man in our midst like Mr. Rymer is a menace when he dictates to the Government what is to be done. In my opinion, the railway men would never have contemplated striking against the law on the statute-book had they not been forced into the position of having to do so. It is men such as these who are sowing the seeds of disruption in the minds of the people. Men come from other countries and see the better conditions which exist in Australia. They are confused with the good conditions and cannot get a proper grip of the situation, and, instead of enjoying the good things, they want to break the present conditions to pieces without caring what may happen. Our industrial affairs in Australia are controlled by arbitration laws, which were not brought about by the Labour Government only, but by all the Governments that have been in office in Australia. Under those laws there is every provision necessary for the proper running of the country, but the Queensland Government bowed down to a man like Mr. Rymer and sacrificed their own law. The question of whether the claims of the railway men were justified or not does not enter into the matter. The point is, that there is a law which should have been obeyed. I do not blame the men at all, but I blame Mr. Rymer who led them astray; and I say that hon. members on the opposite side of the House by knuckling down to such a man as that have brought our parliamentary institutions into the gutter. Men to-day are talking about this matter. At every public function one attends where the toast of "Parliament" is proposed, it is said that Parliament has become merely a registering body. Surely Parliament is more than that! Surely it is something more than a body to put into effect what Mr. Rymer or the Strike Committee decides! Yet not one word of protest is made. We on this side pointed out the difficulty that would follow the action of the Government, but in their unwisdom they have seen fit to carry out the dictates of a body outside Parliament which has nothing behind it other than, as I have said, a diseased mind. We tackle diseases of the body, and these are some of the things we ought to tackle also—communism, and every other "ism" of the kind.

Mr. COLLINS: What is Mr. Rymer's nationality?

Mr. KERR: I do not know what his nationality is; it does not concern me. If hon. members opposite are sincere in their statements in regard to this influence in our midst, they should show that they have the courage of their convictions. The Premier said that his party would have to choose, and that there was only one way to deal with this policy, and that was to wipe it out. But whom is he going to deport from his party? In Western Australia the Labour party expelled one of the executive officers of the Seamen's Union by eighty votes to forty. They threw this member out of their party because he was a Communist. He is hounded from pillar to post. The Commonwealth Government say, "We have taken action. Where you threatened, we have done something." That is the difference between the two parties, and that is the difference between the party opposite who attempt to remain in power under any circumstances and the Federal Government, who are appealing to the better sentiments of the democracy of Australia and to the common sense of the electors, who will settle between them at the next Federal election.

At 12.13 p.m.,

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

Mr. KERR: The Premier, when as Treasurer he reviewed the figures for 1924-1925, expressed the view that the Government were to be commended for the manner in which the finances of the State had been handled. In my opinion, the hon. gentleman was not entitled to make any such comment, as is disclosed when the position is examined. In Western Australia a Royal Commission has been appointed to investigate the affairs of the State under a Labour Government. It may not be necessary to do the same thing in Queensland, because the position is so obvious that a mere child can realise it. At the present time the finances of Queensland are in a deplorable condition, and there is not one member of Parliament who can avoid taking cognisance of the fact that some drastic action is required to place them on a better footing. Certainly the Treasurer in his Statement, which may be regarded as the national balance-sheet, was able to show a surplus of £16,967. After taking into consideration the fact that the Government have wiped off £800,000 from the debt on State enterprises, and after taking into consideration the fact that they have set aside £350,000 for the purpose of reducing the accumulated deficits, there is this year a greater deficit than has been experienced since the drought year of 1902.

Mr. DASH: Rot!

Mr. KERR: After giving the Government credit for everything they have done, we find that that is the result.

Mr. DASH: You can handle finance all right.

Mr. KERR: That is a clear statement of fact, and, if the hon. member will delve into the matter, he will find that my statement is absolutely correct. It is fortunate for Queensland that Australia adopted Federation. It is a good thing for the State to have the Commonwealth Government standing behind it to-day. It is a good thing to know that we have financial stability in our Australian Parliament. We would be in a disastrous position if we had not that Parliament standing behind us. The Commonwealth Treasurer's Budget Speech alone is sufficient reason why the Commonwealth Government should be returned at the next election.

Mr. BULCOCK: No greater political mendacity was ever issued by any Treasurer.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman may say so, but let me quote some figures with reference to the finances of the Commonwealth. Where Queensland has been rapidly going to the bad in connection with its national debt, the Commonwealth Government have been steadily and systematically reducing their public debt by sinking fund payments and contributions from surplus revenue. On 30th June, 1925, the public debt of the Commonwealth stood at £430,000,000, of which the war debt is £311,000,000. The amount advanced

as loans to the various States was £68,000,000 and other debts £15,000,000. During the last three years the Commonwealth Government have been able to reduce their public debt by £22,000,000 Can you imagine Queensland at this stage of its career showing the public debt less now than it was three years ago?

Mr. BULCOCK: What about the indirect form of taxation in Customs duty?

Mr. KERR: I quite realise that aspect. Although the revenue of the Commonwealth amounts to something like £65,000,000, the hon. gentleman must remember that 50 per cent. of that amount is absorbed in payments for pensions, etc., on account of the war. He must also recognise that the Commonwealth has undertaken the defence of Australia, and that the expenditure on behalf of the Post Office is about £11,000,000 and on main roads about £1,000,000. Then there is the upkeep of ports and lighthouses, and the expense necessary in attending to health matters in Australia. Again, we must not forget the expenditure necessitated by old-age pensions, which have been increased from time to time by the Federal Government. We cannot cavil at the way one penny has been spent by the Commonwealth Government. Can the hon. member for Barcoo tell me where in one instance money has been misspent by the Commonwealth Government? I can quote instances where millions of pounds have been misspent by the Queensland Government.

Recently I asked for a return of those railways which have cost the State hundreds of thousands of pounds on which work has been suspended, and where grass is now growing. Hon. members cannot quote one instance where the funds of the Commonwealth have been wasted in such a way. The assets of the Post Office were computed last year at £11,000,000, and only a couple of millions of loan money has been expended on that department That shows that the Commonwealth Government are using their revenue for the purpose of paying for this service, and by doing so are not inflicting unnecessary taxation on the people.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is no basis of comparison at all.

Mr. KERR: Before the present Government assumed office school and public buildings were erected out of revenue; these were not a tax on the people, but to-day those buildings are constructed out of loan money. The hon. gentleman adopted that policy when he was in the Works Department.

Mr. HYNES: Why didn't you call upon Kidman to pay his income tax?

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows perfectly well that those charges which were levelled by his colleagues in the Federal Parliament have all gone up in the air, and consequently have no force in them. What is the use of the hon. member attempting to sidetrack the issue? The Commonwealth Government have assisted both the primary and the secondary industries.

Mr. HYNES: Does their revenue tariff assist secondary industries?

Mr. KERR: If he contends that the tariff is merely a revenue-producing tariff and not a protective tariff, I hope that the hon. member will never enter the Federal Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They get a revenue of £17,000,000 from it.

Mr. KERR: Revenue may come from the tariff, nevertheless it is a protective tariff. Would hon. members opposite throw that revenue into the sea? The revenue is being used to good purpose in developing this nation. Not a single hon. member opposite can tell me of an instance where that money has not been used wisely and in the interests and for the welfare of the whole community. I commend the Federal Budget to hon. members opposite. If they read it closely, I venture to say they will not find in it one statement that is wrong. Why should the Federal Treasurer make a statement which is not correct?

Mr. HYNES: You are one-eyed and cannot see.

Mr. BULCOCK: Give us something in regard to Queensland.

Mr. KERR: I would like to tell the hon. member that the money invested in our public works is not returning 50 per cent. of the interest charges.

The Government collect from the taxpayer no less than £3,914,161 in direct taxation in order to meet the interest charges on these works. Last year they increased the fares and freights on our railways by £394,000. They also searched all other possible avenues for the purpose of securing increased revenue. They have relieved themselves of their share in the cost of the maintenance of hospitals, and are now taxing the ratepayers through the local authorities for their upkeep. The expenditure has kept pace with the income, and that while we have been experiencing the most favourable seasons that we have had for a long time. When the seasons are so good, and while our revenue exceeds the anticipated revenue by hundreds of thousands of pounds, opportunity should be taken to pay some of that money to the trustees of our public debt, to reduce that debt. In 1914-15 our taxation amounted to £1 8s. 2d. per head of our population, while in 1924-25, owing to the fact that our public money has been going into wrong channels, our taxation has increased to £4 13s. 9d. per head. It is a pretty big thing to ask about 800,000 people to spend £24,000,000 a year, and no one can say that that expenditure has made Queensland progress as it should have done. Thirty million acres have gone out of occupation, and our secondary industries have not progressed as they should have done.

Mr. HYNES: Owing to the Commonwealth revenue tariff.

Mr. KERR: Does the hon. member seriously believe that?

Mr. HYNES: Absolutely.

Mr. KERR: Then can the hon. member tell me why New South Wales and Victoria have gone ahead while Queensland has gone back?

Mr. HYNES: Are they not always squealing about taxation?

Mr. KERR: Those States are labouring under exactly the same Commonwealth tariff as is Queensland, yet they are progressing while we are retrogressing. The argument relating to the condition of our industries and the number of employees engaged therein is the only comparative argument which can be used in this Chamber.

Mr. HYNES: There is more lucrative investment in this State in primary industry than in any other State. That is shown by the fact that our exports exceed our imports.

Mr. KERR: One of the most outstanding features in regard to investments is the deposits paid into the associated banks and drawn out of those banks on loan to private enterprises. Perhaps the hon. member for Townsville will be glad to know that the deposits placed in our associated banks in Queensland are far greater than the advances made by those banks to private enterprises in Queensland. That shows that a considerable proportion of the deposits placed in our associated banks in Queensland is going to the Southern States for investment. I could quote figures to show that state of affairs. That indicates that, while very large deposits may be made owing to the success of our primary products, sugar and wool, that money is not being loaned to Queensland industry but is being invested in other States through the headquarters of the associated banks. That is the reason why New South Wales and Victoria are progressing more than Queensland in regard to secondary industries.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is not so.

Mr. HYNES: There is a boycott.

Mr. KERR: I am glad the hon. member for Townsville interjects. If the legislation of the country cannot be trusted, there is a natural boycott, and it must be so. No matter how much we regret the fact that there is a boycott, we must attribute that boycott to the legislation of the present State Government. If the hon. member and his friends declare they intend to socialise industry in this State and to control it through men nominated by the Labour organisation, is it any wonder that capital will not come into the State to develop secondary industries? So long as the socialistic principles prevail with hon. members opposite, so long will that boycott exist. As I have already pointed out, the bank deposits in New South Wales and Victoria are less than the advances made in those States, and the balance is made up by the surplus from the Queensland banks. That is a position that never existed prior to the last few years. In 1914 the headquarters of the Associated Banks in Sydney and Melbourne sent the deposits up to the Queensland branches for investment. I could quote figures, taken from the Statement issued by the Federal Treasurer in regard to the banking returns, showing that the banks in the Southern States to-day are not sending any money up to Queensland but are taking away money from the Queensland banks. Last session I pointed out these figures to Mr. Theodore and told him the position, but I do not think that prior to that he realises what was happening. What happened last year is happening to-day, but to a greater extent.

[12.30 p.m.]

Mr. BULCOCK: You know that the whole question is bound up in the exportable surplus from Queensland.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows that is not correct. The needs of one State are met from the resources of the other. I know that perfectly well. Our exports, prior to last year, were just as great as during the war period.

Mr. BULCOCK: The exchange problem was the trouble.

Mr. KERR: The exchange problem was pretty severe until it was overcome by the Bruce-Page Government. That Government has been one of the soundest and greatest Governments that Australia has ever seen. It has placed Australia on a sound and very firm footing.

Mr. HYNES: What party established the Commonwealth Bank?

Mr. KERR: What party established the rural credit scheme?

While the State revenue account has not been all that is desired, the expenditure from Trust Funds last year amounted to £6,413,122 while the revenue was only £6,320,066. There is a deficiency there of £93,056. It is stated in the Financial Statement that this will be adjusted—that the trust accounts are in a sound financial position. That statement is not right either, because there is a debit balance in connection with trust accounts of £632,229. How can any account, more especially a trust account, be said to be in a sound position when you have such a debit balance as that? I understand that this year the appropriation is going to be over £7,500,000, and in the meantime the debit balance is being carried by loan money bearing interest at the rate of 5½ per cent. or 6 per cent. The Trust Funds are in a hopeless position, and there is no possibility of those accounts righting themselves. The State stations are absorbing £208,000; the Chillagoe smelters £240,000; and the State coal mines £139,000, which is all more or less taken from the Trust Funds. All that money has gone into these ventures, and there is very little chance of a return sufficient to pay interest on the money invested. We know that there are dead-losses to the extent of many thousands of pounds in connection with these enterprises, also there is an amount of £164,962 representing unemployment insurance taxation which has been used for these purposes. All these amounts I have mentioned have been expended in wild-cat schemes by the Government, and that practice should not be continued. I contended when these amounts were taken from the Trust Funds and from the Unemployment Insurance Fund that it was a very unwise procedure, and I still think so. My opinion is that these funds should be kept separate from each other, and any credit balance should be utilised in connection with our State bonds or loaned out to local authorities. The Public Service Superannuation Fund has been used to the extent of £522,344, the Main Roads Fund to the extent of £126,000, Commonwealth Bank Deposit receipts to the extent of £1,394,000, and the Real Property Assurance Fund to the extent of £140,000. Those funds have been amalgamated and invested in unwise channels. That is the reason why to-day we have deficits of more than £500,000 in these particular accounts. We have to ask ourselves where those losses have gone. We find the following debits:—

	£
Chillagoe State Smelters ...	498,342
Cotton Trading Account ...	425,663
Inkerman Irrigation ...	10,528
Inkerman State Treatment Works	9,964
State Coal Mines	28,530
State Enterprises	16,000

The Loan Fund again carries the baby. That condition of things should stop. The

Trust Funds should be self-supporting. We should not use loan money to carry the Trust Funds and pay 6 per cent. interest on loan money advanced to the Trust Funds, when these are losing propositions. Surely the time has arrived when we should go into these accounts and put them in a proper condition instead of being the jumble they are at the present time. Our public debt is not in a sound condition. We have had all the losses I have shown in our various State activities. There is no sinking fund provided to liquidate our debt, except to an infinitesimal extent, and we have suspended the payments to the sinking fund for quite a number of years. The interest on our public debt has grown to such large proportions that the people have to take cognisance of the position. Taxation has piled up to such an extent that it has become an intolerable burden. The Government have been hauled over the coals, and rightly so. Mr. Theodore, the ex-Premier, has stated that taxation has reached its limit, but the Government go on borrowing £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 every year. What chance have we of raising additional money in any other way? There is only one way to raise more revenue, and that is by increasing the income tax and the rentals on leasehold properties. The amount of rentals has gone up from £700,000 to over £1,000,000 under this Government; hence the land has gone out of cultivation to some extent, and it is having a disastrous effect on secondary industries also. I cannot see any loophole of escape from increased taxation.

The Treasurer in his Financial Statement said that the increase in the basic wage would cost nearly a quarter of a million pounds, but that he would not make any statement as to where the money was to come from till the amount was definitely ascertained. Possibly there will be an imposition of fresh taxation. Hon. members opposite have to realise that simultaneously with all this taxation which they have imposed they have also relieved themselves of their liability for expenditure in regard to quite a number of things. They have relieved themselves of the necessity to pay doles to the unemployed; they are making the employer pay them. Previously we were asked to find large sums for the upkeep of hospitals. To-day the Government are not asking us to provide anything like that, because under the Hospitals Act they have compelled the ratepayers to take over the liability. All these responsibilities of the Government are being gradually removed.

Mr. W. COOPER: What would you do?

Mr. KERR: I make no bones about it. There is only one way to end it. There is no man in the community who minds paying income tax for the upkeep of the blind, deaf, and dumb: for the gaols or for the enforcement of the laws of the country, for our law courts or for our hospitals.

Mr. W. COOPER: Or education.

Mr. KERR: Or of education. No man minds paying taxation for these purposes. In 1914 we had to restrict ourselves to a certain revenue, and, if we had continued to restrict ourselves in that way, our taxation now would possibly have been about £2 5s. a head instead of £4 13s. 9d. But we did not do so, and our taxation is continually going up. Our ordinary revenues, with a little taxation, were more or less sufficient for our expenditure.

Mr. W. COOPER: We are spending far more in education than your Government did.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member has not got the right viewpoint. The value of money is a consideration, and taking a pound as being worth 20s. in 1914, to-day you have to spend something like 30s. to get the same value. There is at least that difference. Salaries and everything else have risen, but not to the extent to which the expenditure has risen. There is no question that the proper function of a Government is to govern and not to trade, and even at this late stage I would like to see the Government realise the seriousness of the state of things. If they wipe out many of the undertakings which are absorbing taxation by means of interest on loan money and are also losing the State money in the shape of taxation which otherwise would be paid by private enterprise, and if we left legitimate taxation to be imposed for the maintenance of our hospitals and asylums, our gaols, our educational system—all legitimate objects of governmental expenditure—our position would be greatly improved. Instead, the Government with one stroke of the pen write off a sum of £800,000 from the capitalisation of one enterprise—£800,000 of our State money which has been invested and has been giving no return whatever to the people! These are things which must be considered by any Government who attempt to govern a country. I claim that the Government should administer such things as I have mentioned, if they are really a Government, instead of letting their ministers become mere managers, as it were, engaged in trade and commerce, and so altogether getting away from the functions of government. I realise the handicap under which hon. members opposite are suffering. They cannot do anything else. Their policy is Socialism, so that they will be ready when the time arrives. Perhaps the Assistant Minister is in charge of State enterprises so that he may get a little tuition as to how to run a business, and when he has had six months' experience another man will be put in his place, so that, when the Socialistic scheme is put into operation, we shall have a body of men willing and allegedly able to take control. It is absolutely ridiculous, yet hon. members ask why capital is going out of this country! If I had my way in regard to these State enterprises—and it is better to say in plain language what you mean—I would wipe some of them out.

At 12.45 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. HYNES: Where is the evidence that capital is leaving Queensland?

Mr. KERR: I have been giving the evidence for the last half hour. The Government have imposed heavy land taxes and super taxes, and there has been a reduction in the acreage under cultivation. They have increased their fees, licenses, and stamp duties, and have increased taxation in every conceivable direction. In nine cases out of ten they are hitting the same men and the same businesses.

Mr. HYNES: The men who can afford to pay.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that that argument is dead. He knows perfectly well that, if a special tax was put on breweries, there would be an increase in the price of beer. We saw in this morning's paper where the Commonwealth Government by means of tariff are extending

protection to the whisky distilleries of Australia. We notice that because of this indirect taxation in New South Wales whisky is to be increased from 8d. to 9d. a "nip." The cost is always passed on. Why all this nonsense about the cost being borne by those best able to pay? The hon. member for Maryborough will bear me out when I say that provision is made in the profit and loss account for the amount paid in taxation. That is done to keep up the selling price.

Mr. WEIR: That is not right.

Mr. KERR: Taxation is taken into account and the same percentage of net profit is maintained.

Mr. WEIR: No; you want to study a bit more.

Mr. KERR: The same percentage of profit on the turnover is maintained.

Mr. BULCOCK: Then why are they squealing about the limitation of profits?

Mr. KERR: That is where the hon. gentleman fails dismally to see beyond his political nose. He knows very well that the higher the price the smaller the turnover, because the people are not able to pay the increased price. As a result of this increased taxation the industries in Queensland are unable successfully to compete with the Southern States. With free trade between the States as we have it here there should be no difficulty; but taxation is the poisonous core that must be withdrawn from our industrial activities. At an early date there is to be a Commonwealth election, and I sincerely hope that, when Government members take the platform, they will endeavour to make Australia what it always was intended to be.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: A free country.

Mr. KERR: A country with its own ideals and responsible to its own people—a free country——

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: A country that is entitled to say who shall enter it, and a country that is entitled to say who shall remain. Our ideals will not permit us to allow any wasters to remain in our community to take advantage of mob psychology.

Mr. FARRELL: Name them.

Mr. KERR: I have named some of them this morning. I make no bones about naming them. I hope hon. members opposite will view matters from an Australian point of view, and forget for a little while the intolerable position of party politics when national issues are at stake.

Mr. HYNES (*Townsville*): I have listened with a good deal of interest to the debate, and I have come to the conclusion that it is rather regrettable that hon. members opposite should have used the latitude given them for the purpose of carrying on political propaganda in connection with the Federal elections. The whole of the speeches delivered and the criticism levelled at this side during the debate have been so much political propaganda. Not one constructive idea or logical piece of criticism has been offered by hon. members opposite. Metaphorically speaking, they have stood in their places, poked their tongues out, and called "Bolshevik." With respect to the position that has arisen in connection with the seamen's strike and the Federal elections that have been brought on by Mr. Bruce, the people who are doing the propaganda work for the anti-Labour forces are endeavouring to get the great mass of the electors to believe that the Australian Labour movement in some way is going "red."

Mr. FRY: Do you read the "Daily Mail"?

Mr. HYNES: They imply that people from overseas imbued with Bolshevistic ideas have come to Australia, entered the industrial organisations, and as a consequence both the political and industrial wings of the movement are going "red," or, in other words, Communistic. I have been connected with the industrial movement since boyhood. I have taken a prominent part in industrial fights and in direct action and strikes, and I know considerably more of the state of the industrial organisations than hon. members opposite. The Australian Labour party stands for Socialism. That is the antithesis of Communism and the antithesis of the doctrine that is preached by members of the old I.W.W., who believe in direct action and revolutionary action. We believe we can obtain our objective by evolution—by gradual change. That is the policy we subscribe to. No mention has been made from this side of the Chamber during the debate of this party having anything to do with Communism.

Mr. BRAND: Do you believe in Communism?

Mr. HYNES: If I believed in Communism, I would not be eligible for membership of the Australian Labour party. In proof of that I would like to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that at the last Federal convention of the Australian Labour party held in Melbourne there was carried a definite resolution dissociating the party from the Communistic party. The official report of the proceedings of that convention on page 35 contains the following:—

> "Mr. Painter (Victoria) moved an amendment, 'That conference declares itself against the affiliation of the Communist party, as a party, with the Australian Labour party.'"

Mr. Theodore, the ex-Premier of this State, who represented Queensland at the convention, is reported as follows:—

> "Mr. Theodore (Queensland) said he was in agreement with Mr. Painter's amendment, but thought the amendment should go further, and, therefore, he would move a further amendment—'That no member of the Communist party shall be eligible to become a member of the Australian Labour party.'"

The report further states—

> "It was agreed that Mr. Painter's amendment and Mr. Theodore's further amendment should be combined in the following form:—'The conference declares itself against the affiliation of the Communist party with the Australian Labour party, and declares ineligible for membership avowed Communists.'"

The above motion was carried, the voting being thirty for, six against.

Mr. BRAND: Why are you supporting Walsh?

Mr. HYNES: I will deal with that presently. On page 42 of the report of the convention, after the resolution arrived at had been put into a concise form, I find the following:—

> "PROPOSED RULE RE COMMUNISTS.
>
> "COMMITTEE'S REPORT.
>
> "1. Neither the Communist party nor

a branch thereof may be or become affiliated with the Australian Labour party.

"2. No member of the Communist party may be or become a member of the Australian Labour party.

"In reply to a query, the chairman ruled that the discussion and report were in accordance with Rule 8."

That gives the lie direct to hon. members opposite who say we are associated with the Communist party in the Commonwealth of Australia. For the edification of hon. members opposite, for the purpose of spiking their guns and of interfering with the pernicious propaganda they are disseminating, I shall read the pledge every man must take before he is allowed to become a member of the Australian Labour party—

"I hereby pledge myself to the principles of the Australian Labour party, State, and Federal and Local Government platforms and to any alterations thereto made by a duly constituted Labour Convention.

"I also pledge myself to do everything in my power to further the objects of the party as set forth in its constitution and general rules. I hereby declare that I am not a member of a Communist organisation or party or of any political party having objects and methods in any way opposed to the Australian Labour party."

The reason I rose is that almost every hon. member on the other side who has addressed the Chamber has made the statement, either by innuendo or straightout, that we are connected with the Communistic party. The doctrine of Communism is based upon the doctrine of despair. We say there is no occasion for revolution; that we can achieve our objective by evolutionary methods, in accordance with the platform set out in the report I have just quoted.

I am connected with the largest industrial union in the Commonwealth, the Australian Workers' Union. I am a vice-president and am on the executive of the Queensland branch of that organisation. To indicate how vast are the ramifications of that organisation, I wish to state that in Queensland we have a membership of 50,000, embracing employees in all kinds of industry. As to this twaddle about people from overseas—Bolshevists—getting into and controlling our executive, I point out there are ten members on the Queensland Executive of the Australian Workers' Union, and every one of those ten is Australian born. We have something like thirty organisers in Queensland, and all are Australians. At the annual convention of the Australian Workers' Union in Melbourne in February of this year every delegate I met, so far as I could ascertain, was an Australian. Where, then, does all this rot come in about people from Moscow undermining our organisations? Communism only thrives under suppression and oppression, and that being so the Labour party, owing to [2 p.m.] its methods and policy, is better calculated to deal with Communism than hon. members opposite with their policy. The reason why Communism took hold in Russia was on account of the manner in which the rulers of Russia dealt with the great masses of the people of that country. It was owing to the suppression and oppression of the rulers that the people revolted. Communism only thrives in those countries which have bad economic and industrial conditions for the working classes. We stand for a high standard of living for the working class and for the under-dog, and as a consequence there is less danger of any strides being made in Communistic propaganda in this country than there is in any other country in the world. Here in Queensland we have had a Labour Administration for the last ten years, and the standard of living of the workers is much higher than it is in any other part of the world. The nominal and effective wage of the workers in Queensland is higher than it is in any of the States of the Commonwealth. The hours worked by the workers in Queensland are less per week than in any part of the world. Taking these things into consideration, and taking also into consideration the fact that the depositors in the Savings Bank in Queensland number 365,000, and that, according to the last returns available, 66.41 per cent. of the people occupying houses in Queensland own their own houses, I say it is mere twaddle to talk about a bloody revolution in this country. It is simply propaganda put forward to stampede the timid electors into winning the elections for Mr. Bruce and his capitalistic friends. There is more danger of Communism becoming favoured by the workers of Australia if Mr. Bruce is allowed to continue his despotic actions, such as his actions towards the organised workers in connection with the seamen's strike, than if the Labour party is returned to power.

While I am dealing with that I wish to make some reference to the strike that is in existence at the present time. The deportation of Walsh and Johnson is not going to bring about industrial peace in this country, and no one knows that better than hon. members opposite or than the Prime Minister of Australia. If these two men are deported, certainly there will be other men to take their places. It is rather singular that there have been strikes going on in the Commonwealth ever since the present party has been in power in the Commonwealth Parliament. The workers all over the world are resorting to direct action, and it is logical to assume that, if Mr. Bruce is returned to power—I do not think that he will be—strikes will still continue. There is more danger of Communism becoming popular under an anti-Labour Administration than under a Labour Administration, because a majority of the workers are reasonable people and people who can sum up the position logically, and, if they can obtain their objective by peaceful means and evolutionary effort, they are not going to embrace any policy or doctrine that means bloody revolution.

In this State—and I suppose we can accept that as being indicative of what obtains in other States—we have a population of approximately 800,000, of whom 365,000 have bank accounts, and 66½ per cent. of the people are occupying their own houses. To talk about a revolution under these circumstances is simply childish twaddle. I am satisfied that when members of this party and other Labour protagonists have an opportunity of stating these things from the hustings, the Labour party will sweep into power in the Commonwealth. I admit that there are Communists in Australia, but the great

mass of the people do not believe in Communism. They attach their hope to the policy which has been propounded by the Australian Labour party. The best evidence of that is that one of the high priests of Communism in Australia contested an industrial electorate as a Communist candidate in Sydney at the last New South Wales election. There were 60,000 people on the roll, most of whom were industrialists, and he only secured 400 votes out of the 60,000. That is evidence that the workers do not attach any faith at all to the doctrine preached by Communists. When the hon. members opposite endeavour to fasten the Communist organisation on to this party, they are saying something which they know is positively untrue. Hon. members opposite know full well that this party is not associated with the Communist party.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is not Mr. Garden the secretary of the New South Wales Trades and Labour Council?

Mr. HYNES: The big industrial organisations are in sympathy with the seamen in their fight for better conditions. They understand that the men are entitled to something better than £9 a month. They understand that these men during the war period were spoken of as heroes: to-day they are spoken of as criminals. If there are any persons who are guilty of criminal action in connection with the present dispute, it is the people who control that great world-wide shipping combine—the Inchcape group. These people have arbitrarily taken £1 out of the paltry wage paid to these men, who have had no say as to whether it should be retained or not. When the ships left their home port these men were receiving £10 a month, and when they came here it was reduced to £9 a month. The Inchcape shipping group is not a British organisation; it is an international organisation of capitalism. In describing the Inchcape shipping group I would use the words of Upton Sinclair, when describing the great Meat Trust. In his celebrated work, "The Jungle," he said—

> "It is the spirit of capitalism made flesh; the incarnation of blind and insatiate greed upon the ocean of commerce; it sails as a pirate ship, and has hoisted the black flag and declared war against civilisation."

Those words are particularly applicable to the Inchcape group—the great shipping combine who are fighting the seamen to-day. I am not surprised that hon. members opposite have taken up the cudgels on behalf of the Inchcape group as opposed to the seamen. They have always been on the side of the oppressors, always on the side of the capitalist, and they are true to their type. I am not complaining about that, but, with their tongues in their cheeks, they get up and say that they are appealing to the reasonable members of the working class. Their trouble about the working class! Here we have them sympathising with the Inchcape group—a body of capitalists who have reduced the wages of their already underpaid servants by 10 per cent. What does the reduction of £1 a month mean to the seamen? It means that their dependents, who were in receipt of £6 a month out of their paltry £10 a month, will now get less. It will mean less butter on the children's bread, probably less coals to warm them in winter, and perhaps more scanty clothing to shield them from the winter elements. What does it mean if the shipping combine succeed in breaking the strike? Only more profits; more dividends for the combine; more motor cars; more money to spend in the fashionable resorts of Europe; more champagne! On the one hand it means bread and butter for the children of the seamen; on the other enhanced profits for the capitalists who have shares in the Inchcape group. That is the position as it appears to me, and I hope that the seamen win.

Mr. BRAND: You did not express that hope to the railway men.

Mr. HYNES: That is the desire of every decent worker in this country. We hope that they will win. I know that there is a tough fight ahead of them, but I hope that the spirit of solidarity which they are displaying will assist them in winning out.

Mr. BRAND: You know they will not win.

Mr. HYNES: I know that they are going to put up a good fight, and that is the main point.

The railway strike was settled in a manner which was compatible with the aims and ideals of the Labour party. We subscribed to the policy of arbitration, and we settled the strike in eight days—and, mark you, I believe that the Bruce Administration could have done something to bring this seamen's strike to a termination if they wished. Only recently the Press informed us that, with a view to terminating the seamen's strike, the Prime Minister of New Zealand is endeavouring to adopt the same methods which we adopted in the railway strike. The Prime Minister of Australia is taking up the "strong man" attitude—he is going to break the strike with the mailed fist by deporting citizens of Australia. Contrast the action of his Government with that of the Labour Government here! I believe that if hon. members opposite were in power in this State they would have tried to break up the railway strike with the mailed fist, and probably that would have meant a protracted struggle. I believe that the railway employees are sufficiently organised to put up a big struggle, and the result would have been that we would have had civil war, and the whole of the primary and secondary industries would have been ruined because they could not get their produce to market.

Some hon. member opposite quoted figures to prove that the workers of this State were receiving a lower effective wage than the workers were getting in other parts of the Commonwealth. I have gone to the trouble of looking up statistics which must be accepted as being authentic. They are taken from the "Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics, Bulletin No. 99," published in March, 1925. On page 66 will be found the following table:—

> "Wages—Adult Males—Weighted average nominal weekly rates payable and weekly hours of labour."

	Weekly wage.	Working hours.
	s. d.	
New South Wales	93 6	47.75
Victoria	95 5	46.99
Queensland ...	95 9	45.40
South Australia ...	91 10	46.98
Western Australia	94 8	46.52
Tasmania	92 6	47.26
Australia	94 3	46.66

The figures relating to Queensland were given before the passing of legislation enacting a 44-hour week. It will be noticed that the nominal wage in Queensland is higher and the weekly hours of work lower than in any other State. Hon. members opposite are continually saying that, while nominal wages have been increased, the effective wage is no better than it was in 1914. They also state that the effective wage is higher in other parts of the Commonwealth than in Queensland. I have taken some figures from the same authority that I have quoted to show the purchasing power of money. These figures show what it costs to purchase in each capital city that which cost £1 in 1911—

	Housing accommodation		Food, groceries, and housing.	
	s.	*d.*	*s.*	*d.*
Sydney ...	37	5	35	7
Melbourne ...	31	11	33	1
Brisbane ...	23	3	29	7
Adelaide ...	31	4	34	5
Perth	26	8	34	7
Hobart ...	34	11	35	5

The weighted average of six capital cities throughout the Commonwealth is 32s. 11d. for housing accommodation and 34s. for food, groceries, and housing. I have already stated that there has been a considerable reduction in hours since the figures in the first table were compiled. The latest figures available from the Commonwealth Statistician are dealt with in the report from which I have just quoted. The point I want to make is this: After ten years of Labour administration the purchasing power of money is greater in this State than it is in any other State; after ten years of Labour administration the average hours of work in Queensland are less than in any other State; after ten years of Labour administration the nominal wage for the workers in Queensland to-day is higher than in any other State of the Commonwealth. We take great credit for those three important factors. Legislation dealing with the construction of workers' homes has had such a beneficial effect that 66 per cent. of the people in Queensland are able to be their own landlords. By price-fixing legislation and by the introduction of a system of State retail butcher shops and other enterprises by this Government, we have been able to keep down the cost of living to the consumer. The result is that the purchasing power of money is higher to-day in Queensland than in any other part of the Commonwealth, the hours are shorter, and the nominal wages are also higher.

Mr. BRAND: They have always been so in Queensland.

Mr. HYNES: Some reference has been made in the course of the debate to what is termed the unemployment in Queensland. An Economic Commission was appointed this year to assist the Arbitration Court in connection with the revision of the basic wage, and page 54 of its report contains table No. 5, "Nominal effective wages in Queensland." It is a comprehensive table proving conclusively that unemployment has diminished in Queensland during the ten years that the Labour party has been in power. The report shows that in the year 1915 the average nominal rate of wages was 54s. 4d. and that the index number was 1064. The average rate of wages in 1924 was 94s. 11d. and the index number 1858. That is certainly a considerable increase. Taking 1000 as the basis in 1911, the index number of the retail prices in 1915 was 1270 as compared with 1646 in 1924. The index number of the effective wage in 1915 was 838 against 1129 in 1924. The percentage of unemployment in 1915—hon. members opposite should note this—was 13.5 as against 6.4 in 1924. The index employment figures in 1915 were 909 and in 1925 982. The index number of the effective wage, allowing for unemployment, for 1915 was 762, and for 1924 1109. This means that there has been an increase of 45.5 per cent. in the effective wage in Queensland during the ten years of office of the Labour party. That is borne out by the evidence compiled and contained in the report of the Economic Commission. The members of that Commission were not Labour men or propagandists for this party. They were experts appointed to do a definite job, and, as their job was to get this information, we must accept it as being authentic.

Mr. PETERSON: What about the increase in the cost of living to balance that increase in the effective wage?

Mr. HYNES: Hon. members opposite have been constantly throwing the gibe at hon. members on this side of the Chamber that we are under the dictation of an outside organisation.

Mr. SIZER: Quite right.

Mr. HYNES: I intend to prove that the party to which the hon. members opposite belong is under the dictation and domination of the National Union.

Mr. SIZER: There is no such body in Queensland.

Mr. HYNES: This organisation has been described by the Melbourne "Age" in these words—

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

I am not going to condemn hon. members opposite by my own opinion, but out of the mouths of their own Tory Press.

Commenting on a meeting held at Rockhampton and addressed by the deputy-leader of the Opposition on 3rd July last, the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin"—and it is not a Labour paper—of 4th July last had this to say—

> "The party which tries to give over the electors to the dominance of the National Union, throws out four men who endeavour to stand between the electors and that undemocratic outrage, and then explains as its reason for so doing that the four are business or middle men, can only be characterised as monumentally stupid."

Further on it said—

> "Another tale is overdue, as Messrs Barnes and Taylor, to whom the stigma of 'middlemen' has been applied, have their returns regulated by law, which lays down that no more than 7½ per cent. may be collected as commission on any produce they handle, while Mr. King, who is a solicitor is also a middleman between his client and the client of his opponent. Other members of the amazing new party who swallowed the National Union pill are

men of business, who in their capacity of distributors stand between the buyer and seller, and an explanation is needed to define how, or by what stretch of fevered reasoning, they are regarded as party assets, while the other four are held to be anathema."

That means that the "Bulletin" did not believe the explanation that the four members on the cross benches opposite were thrown out because they are middlemen. To pursue the argument further I shall read from the "Courier" of 31st July, 1925, reporting a meeting held at the Hamilton Town Hall. The hon. member for Windsor is quoted as saying—

"Never before in the history of Queensland politics had the Opposition been in such a chaotic muddle."

Again, there is the heading—

"Pawned to the National Union."

And then this is said—

"Mr. G. W. Shipley said that the Country Progressive party had been formed for the purpose of securing finance from the National Union. They now tell you the National Union is not behind them, but, if that is the case, from where are they getting their funds? It is evident they have pawned themselves to the National Union."

Mr. Shipley is not a Labour man; he is on the other side. Then the Brisbane "Courier" of 14th May last had this to say—

"Mr. Moore and Mr. King affirm that the new party is untrammelled by alliances or understandings. They probably thought that they were untrammelled when they made the agreement with the National Union in the first place, by which that coterie of privately selected representatives of financial interests in Melbourne could financially dominate the political destinies of anti-socialism in Queensland. . . . Democracy is a futility, a howling farce in fact, if the electors are to be subservient to a coterie of representatives of the moneyed interests of Melbourne, such as the National Union is."

Mr. SIZER: Hear, hear!

Mr. HYNES: I am glad there are some hon. members opposite who are prepared to kick up a little trouble in their party in order to make things right. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. BRAND: No wonder your electors turned you down.

Mr. HYNES: They certainly would not tolerate "Little Hermie from Burrum."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. HYNES: "Little Hermie" keeps interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in referring to any hon. member by other than the name of his electorate.

Mr. HYNES: I mean the hon. member for Burrum. Mr. Fergus McMaster is reported as follows:—

"To state that an organisation such as the National Union, comprised apparently of self-appointed members, or nominees only of the largest and most influential commercial and financial institutions in Australia, is going to be content to simply fill the role of collecting funds, having no policy, imposing neither directly nor indirectly any conditions whatever upon those members and candidates accepting its financial support, is too ridiculous to be even misleading. 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."

[2.30 p.m.]

Mr. BRAND: What are you quoting from?

Mr. HYNES: I thought the hon. member was not listening. The Brisbane "Courier" of 27th May, 1925, said—

"Mr. King will require a lot of eloquence to convince the electors that he and his party is not dancing to the tune that is called by the National Union."

That is definite enough. Then John W. Henderson, of Bulimba, writing to the "Courier" of 18th June, 1925, re the disunity of the United party, said—

"Anyway, who is responsible for the present disunity? Can the member for Oxley tell us anything about it? Also can he or any other member tell who it was who once made a proposition that the National Union should pay a retainer of £500 per annum for supervising Bills going through the House and reporting to the said Union?"

Mr. BRAND: Do you believe what the "Courier" said about you?

Mr. HYNES: The "Courier" summed you up all right. (Interruption.) That is what contributors to the "Courier" said in the correspondence columns.

The "Courier" of 18th June, 1925, reporting a combined meeting of anti-Labour organisations, at which the "Rump" were present, said under the heading "A flank attack from National Union!"—

"Mr. W. Kelso, M.L.A., said that in October, 1923, the National Union notified the United party organisation that no more money would be supplied until unity on the floor of the House was obtained. Finding it impossible to starve out the United party organisation in this way, the National Union then endeavoured to defeat it by a flank attack. It offered to supply the leader of each of the parties in opposition with funds for organisation purposes. Each leader was to supply the individual members of their parties with funds for organising their electorates, and the various organisations were not to have any say but could assist in any way possible. The voting on that motion was nine in favour and seven against. A financial committee was formed and of the minority Mr. T. R. Roberts was elected on this committee.

"We four members who have been kept out of the new party, together with Messrs. Maxwell and Fry, said Mr. Kelso, constituted the remaining dissentients."

There hon. members opposite are condemned by the members of their own party. The hon. member for Nundah said plainly and distinctly in that statement to the Press that those four members have been kept out because they refused to be dominated by the National Union; that is, the group

of Melbourne capitalists who evidently have been paying funds to individual members of the party opposite.

Mr. SIZER: I rise to a point of order. I wish to state that there is no National Union in Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HYNES: That makes it all the worse.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like to ask the hon. member for Sandgate to refrain from raising frivolous points of order. He is merely abusing the privileges of this House in doing so, and I hope the hon. member will discontinue such conduct.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member is stating something that is not a fact.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. HYNES: The "Courier" of 14th May, 1925, said—

> "The reasons given for the exclusion of Messrs. C. Taylor, W. H. Barnes, G. P. Barnes, and W. Kelso, from the deliberations was their disloyalty to the party in not accepting the agreement with the National Union of 19th January, recognising it as the sole collecting body for the United party and the Country party."

That is definite and conclusive enough. Am I right in assuming that individual members opposite have taken sums of money from a body which is described as a group of capitalists who buy accommodating politicians? Am I right in assuming that?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No! No!

Mr. HYNES: If that is so, am I right in assuming that they are doing something which is inimical to the best interests of this country? Am I right in saying that two men were gaoled for doing something similar?

Mr. SIZER: No.

Mr. HYNES: The time has arrived when the people outside should be awake to the fact that there is a group of capitalists in this country who are endeavouring to bribe politicians, and that certain politicians have been in negotiations with that organisation for the purpose of getting funds for their election campaign. If that is true—and evidently there is some foundation for the belief—the people who should be deported under Mr. Bruce's Deportation Act are the group of capitalists who are endeavouring to bribe politicians to do their dirty work in Parliament. I have read out statements in the Press of hon. members opposite. If they have accepted money from that organisation, they are doing something which is inimical to the interests of this country and against the institutions of the State of Queensland.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): It is desirable in many directions to follow the hon. member for Townsville with the object of refuting, or at any rate making some attempt to put him right, regarding certain conclusions he has arrived at; but, although I might attempt briefly to do a little in that way, I have other fish to fry, and consequently will not spend much time in that direction.

With regard to the raising of the standard of living for the workers, I maintain that we on this side are out to do the best we can in that direction for those with whom we have to do. I speak with a sympathetic feeling, as I am in touch with workers and know their feelings. Dissatisfied service is no good to anyone. It is neither good to the State nor to employers generally. If we look at it merely from a selfish point of view, the employer, in his own interest, must be out to do the best he can for those who have to do with him in the carrying on of his business, and in that sense they are co-partners.

I am not sure that the hon. member for Townsville is quite right in his conclusions with regard to the cost of living. Considerable interest is being shown in connection with the Estimates we have before us in regard to providing for the higher cost of living. In connection with the Department of Justice, last year a sum of £2,100 was provided by way of allowance to meet the higher cost of living in connection with clerks of petty sessions, while £2,300 is put down this year for that object. It is interesting to follow the hon. member for Townsville in connection with the various strikes, and as to the relationship which he says does not exist between the Labour party and the Communists. He admits that there are Communists in Australia. Should not some heroic stand be taken by hon. members opposite to oust these gentlemen, who, by the way, we all remember were described by the Premier during his speech on that memorable day when he dealt with the strike as men who should be fired out? That is the attitude we take up. We say, "Fire them out!" In the interests of Labour and in the interests of patriotism as well, it would be well to get rid of the firebrands of society in order that there might be a chance of peace. I think everybody must regret that, immediately the great shipping strike took place and the extremists were being dealt with in New South Wales and were likely to be deported, we should lend a hand by expressing sympathy and by allowing the funds of Queensland to be used in litigation which is now proceeding. We should have washed our hands of that business. When the hon. member for Townsville made his remarks this afternoon about non-association with the Communists, I think he displayed optimism. I think there is a good deal of truth in the article which appeared in the "Daily Mail" of the 18th August, but, putting that aside altogether for the moment, we cannot overlook the sentiments expressed by Mr. Appleton and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald at home. They are sane men, and I think we should not forget what Mr. Appleton said on that occasion:—

> "The circumstances facing the union were that hundreds of ships were laid up, and many thousands of seafarers unemployed, 40 per cent. of shipyard workers were begging for work, and every other mercantile country was undercutting Britain in wages and conditions. If the intransigeant section of Australian Labour wants to improve the condition of seamen, let them start with Russian, German, Frenchmen, Dutchmen, and other nationalities, who are carrying merchandise and passengers under worse conditions than British ships . . . . . If they will not take my advice to mind their own business, it is fair on his side to assume that their present action is

dictated by malevolence and ignorance, and not regard for British trades unionists."

And then there was the cable from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. I prefer to take their opinions to the opinions of the hon. member.

The hon. member for Townsville referred also to the good work which he said had been done by the Government during the last ten years and to the fact that they had been in office for that period. It is just that period of office with which I wish to deal this afternoon. In view of their handling of the business affairs of the State, the wonder to me is that the Government still hold office, and that they have held it for ten years. Hon. members opposite undoubtedly have left their mark on the history of Queensland. It will take a mighty long time, even if they go out at the coming elections, to efface the mark they have left on the history of the land. After a ten years' term, and after looking over the position at the end of each financial year, it is difficult to account for the retention of confidence which the Government have received not only at the hands of the men behind them—that is a surprise—but also at the hands of the people. Their administration I maintain in no sense—facts undoubtedly prove my contention—justifies, and has not justified, the least degree of confidence or support. How the Labour Government are able to retain that confidence in the light of their management is a thing that baffles the sane people of the land. I cannot understand it. Members of Parliament on this side cannot understand how the Government continue to receive the support of the land when we know of the waste and the maladministration that is taking place. Every one of the one hundred and one happenings that we have seen would have driven any other Government out of office. It appears now that nothing at all short of bankruptcy in this State and nothing short of the abject need of the people is likely to disturb the standing of the Government. They can lose money right and left and still go on undisturbed and unmoved.

No one can deny the losses, because they stand out in clearly defined figures and facts. The great seriousness of the position is that we have had to pay heavily for the ten years of their management of the country's business. It is a thing that puzzles one's mind. I am not speaking extravagantly in this sense. No words at my command are sufficiently strong to express the condemnation which I feel and which this land should feel for the facts that stare us in the face. I want to put the case in the simplest way possible as it appears to me. In 1915 the people decided to change their Government. In other words, they appointed new managers to control and conduct their business. The Labour party, under the late Hon. T. J. Ryan, assumed control by taking the place of the Denham Government. The Labour party took the place of a political party that had managed the country's affairs for some fifty-six years. In business language, the business taken over was a good, healthy, going concern. It was one that was rather more than paying its way. When the Denham Government retired in 1915 and the Labour party assumed office, the public debt of Queensland after fifty-six years was £56,869,046.

The financial year in 1915 ended with a surplus, which had been the rule for many years, and aggregated altogether £576,076. Of the public debt at that time £37,638,727 was represented in the cost of 5,104 miles of railways. These railways for the year ended 30th June, 1915, as well as for many years previously, had paid working expenses. They had, in fact, shown a slight profit after paying interest. The balance of the public debt—£19,255,431—was represented in the cost of public buildings throughout the State—a very fine asset—loans to local authorities, harbour boards, amount spent on immigration, etc. Generally speaking, the State was in a most satisfactory and prosperous condition. The position of the people was reflected in the savings bank returns. That bank then was the appreciated property of the State. It is not now the property of the State. The further prosperity of the State was evidenced in the development going on on the land under various heads, including general agriculture, dairying, fruit, and poultry farming. There was abundant evidence that development was taking place. Prosperity, too, was evidenced in this sense, that Queensland had no land tax, and the amount received from direct taxation for the year totalled only £954,457. Queensland was then the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth, consequently that condition was reflected in many directions. It is very interesting to note from a perusal of Table C4, page 17, of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, that between the years 1905-1906 and 1914-15 the revenue per head of population increased only £2 0s. 8d. We have to remember that all revenue is direct taxation. Perusing the figures further we find that for the ten years which the Government have been in power the revenue per capita has increased by £7 4s. It is interesting also to note how the items are made up, and the amounts can be seen at a glance in the following table:—

	1914-15.				1924-25.		
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Amount received from Commonwealth ...	1	4	5	...	1	4	10
Taxation	1	8	2	...	4	13	9
Territorial revenue ...	1	9	2	...	1	15	2
Public works and services	5	12	1	...	8	8	11
Miscellaneous services	0	19	0	...	1	14	2

Further prosperity was seen in the growth of our industries, as a result of the encouragement due to the light taxation; also in the absence of unemployment, whilst the population had increased between 1907 and 1915 by 132,208, or approximately by 25 per cent. Much more could be said on this question—that the business was well and faithfully carried out; that there was complete absence of speculation; no risks whatever were taken; no State enterprises of any kind, apart from utility matters, were encouraged or introduced—in marked contrast to the enterprises and ventures indulged in later by this Government.

I now wish, in a similar brief way, to look at the position of things to-day, after ten years of socialistic mismanagement. The public debt is now £95,894,158, an increase over the 1915 figure of £39,025,112, approximately an increase of 70 per cent. What have the Government to show for this? That is where we need to study this matter very carefully. What have the Government to show for this huge expenditure of nearly £40,000,000? We know they have added 935 miles to our railway mileage, and the

extra charge against our railways is no less a sum than £12,782,287. That is not much of a mileage to represent those millions of pounds. They have also expended on—

	£
Public buildings, approximately	2,000,000
Local authority advances ...	4,646,483
Harbours	683,460
Land resumptions	365,503
State enterprises	2,506,863
Retirement of Treasury Bills	1,124,750

There is, also, of course, the usual statement made regarding unexpended balances. It will, therefore, be seen that a huge sum has been expended for which very little is to be seen, and in addition large sums of money have been advanced from Trust Funds. I agree with the hon. member for Enoggera, who spoke this morning, that a glance at that Trust Fund will furnish plenty of food for serious thought. It is a matter of conjecture how it is going to add up by and by, when we take into consideration the amounts which have been used from those funds in connection with various matters like the Chillagoe smelters. It can be made good eventually only by a transfer either to the Consolidated Revenue or to the Loan Fund Account.

I have said that the Government have increased the public debt in ten years by £39,025,112. It took their predecessors thirty years to increase the public debt by that amount, and they did mighty work during those thirty years. Nearly all the good work done throughout Queensland was done during the thirty years of administration which preceded the term when the present Government took office. In 1885 the total debt of the State was, approximately, £17,000,000, and in 1915 it was the amount that I have previously stated. I make the bold statement that the present Government cannot remain in power without the expenditure of loan money. They have kept in power because they have expended borrowed money, and the moment they [3 p.m.] cease to expend borrowed money out they go. We had evidence of that during those tight days when the Savings Bank was transferred to the Commonwealth. The Savings Bank was transferred because we had over-run the constable by the utilisation of the funds of the Savings Bank, and in order to right things an arrangement was come to with the Federal Government, and the amount we had utilised in this direction was made a loan. It was a very unfortunate circumstance. The Government have shown by their past actions that nothing on earth will keep them in power except the raising of more and more loan money. Their evidence is that they have lived on that kind of thing; but, if by any unfortunate circumstances they retain their position as advisers to the King or to the King's representative and they continue expenditure at the same rate, at the end of another fifteen years our public debt will amount to £200,000,000. There is no evidence of a cessation of expenditure; indeed, there is every evidence that they intend carrying on in the same way. I submit, therefore, that there is absolute proof that the Government can only live by the expenditure of more and more local money. The tragedy of the thing is that the Government are blind to the results of their own actions. They do not seem to know what is taking place. The second tragedy is that the bulk of the citizens see no further than the wage they receive. The day must come, and it cannot be far off, when extravagant expenditure will have to stop. The rate at which we are speeding along must cease, or a calamity such as we cannot imagine is going to overtake this fair land of ours. These facts are unpalatable, but they are true, and the Government, or the forces behind them, should be seized of the position of things and bring about a change. Taxation in Queensland during the ten years 1915-1916 to 1924-1925 amounted to £28,841,835, while during the previous ten years, when their predecessors were in office, it amounted to £6,784,000. No doubt it would have been necessary under any Administration to increase taxation, but it is safe to say that the taxation would not have been more than doubled under any Administration, and, if that assumption is correct—and I think it is—then no less a sum than £14,000,000 has been extracted from the people unnecessarily. This money, as in other parts of the Commonwealth, would have gone into avenues of industry and would have been the means of finding untold employment and of sending this land along in a direction of which we have not yet dreamed. About £14,000,000 have been extracted from the people over and above what a Nationalist or Liberal Government would have levied. Had Victoria imposed the same rate of taxation, in addition to the taxation which they have levied during the ten years, they would have levied an extra £22,162,000 from the people. The record, therefore, is a pretty bad one, but the real incidence of it is seen in the figures I previously quoted. Table C4 sets out how that taxation is arrived at. That amount has had to be found by the people.

The all-round actual effect upon the individual is clearly seen in the Treasurer's tables. The population of Queensland is not increasing fast enough. With the great expenditure which has taken place the population increased by 156,219, or only 19 per cent., whereas it increased very much more under previous Liberal Administrations. Our railways have shown a deficit of no less than £12,426,000 in ten years, although freights and fares have enormously increased. The freights on agricultural produce have increased by about 74 per cent. and on goods and live stock by 62 per cent. State enterprises account for an enormous loss. There is a total loss on all State enterprises of no less than £1,374,632, and uncharged interest £131,903. More income tax would have been secured if the State stations had been worked by private enterprise.

But what we have to find fault with in connection with State enterprises is the losses in connection with ventures like Chillagoe. Chillagoe has a debt—and some of the money is obtained through the Trust Funds—of over £1,000,000. Then there are the losses on the Styx River and Baralaba coal mines, and the fish enterprise. We have had the Government writing off £800,000 in connection with State stations. After making such huge blunders in the management of the people's business and acknowledging a loss of £800,000, it is a marvel that the State enterprises still exist. No other Government would last five minutes after acknowledging a loss like that. They would not, of course, have got that far, but would have received

short shrift before arriving at that stage. What these losses will amount to in the event of a general wind-up no one can say. We have had £170,000 written off the Inkerman undertaking. Of course, hon. members opposite have not admitted it, but they rushed into these business concerns, which they were quite unable to manage. The trouble also is that in the Old World notice is being taken of the way in which we are managing our affairs. I read an article recently in the engineering number of the "Times" dealing with the various enterprises of the State and our failure in connection with them. The entering into and carrying on of State enterprises is altogether detrimental to our standing, and will inflict an injury upon us in connection with any financial proposals we may have to make to the Old Country. I think I have said sufficient, in comparing the year 1914-15 with the year 1924-25 and indicating the millions of money which have been spent by the Government, to prove that they have no right to be occupying the Treasury benches and that a stand will have to be taken sooner or later by this community to make some effort to adjust the blunders which otherwise will be handed down to posterity.

One would think that hand in hand with the construction of railways would have gone some migration scheme, but that has not been the case, and to-day we are talking of rejecting terms on which we might settle people on the land such as have never been offered to any State previously. I am glad, however, that the Government are about to sign the agreement. I have a copy in my hands, and the general terms seem to be quite acceptable. I know that in these matters there is a danger of doing too much for people. Those who have had to do with the pioneering spirit know that the pioneers had nothing in their pockets. They simply trusted to their own initiative and enterprise, and they determined to get on. I hope that too much will not be done in this case. A man finds a much sweeter interest in a thing into which he puts his own sweat, and which is the result of his own effort. Subsidising is a wise thing, but it is possible to have too much of it. The main thing we have to do is to interest the people in country life. More people are leaving the country than are going into it. Some of the smaller towns where the opportunities are greater are growing slowly, but many of the smaller places are going down, down. Something has to be done. The principal failing is that the State is a big area governed by a centralised Government at this end of the State. We need to divide it and establish provinces outside and create interests there so that rural development will take place. It may be merely that several local authorities will have to be banded together, with greater powers of administration, or that we shall have to take a leaf out of the book of Canada and split up the country into provinces. As we all know, everybody wants to get to the city, and we have to do something to increase interest in the interior or we shall not develop. At one time I thought only of unification in the sense that I believed that we were being too much governed, but I believe now that we have to be more governed if we are to develop the best resources of this country. If a province extending from Charleville were established and some form of Government were set up, do you not think that development would go on in a way that we have not realised? If the interior is to be settled, and if advancement is needed, we must give a sense of responsibility and interest and allow those people to work out their own destiny. We must have inland administration working for advancement all the time. As I have said, it may mean only the joining together of various local authorities, but Queensland, with its 670,000 square miles or 420,000,000 acres, is too big to be worked from this corner. Whilst you cannot develop in circumstances where interest is not apparent you may where you create that interest. Some of the Canadian provinces are very small. Prince Edward Island has an area of only 2,194 square miles, and a population of 88,615. New Brunswick has an area of 27,911 square miles, and a population of 387,076. Nova Scotia has an area of 21,068 square miles, and Manitoba an area of 231,926 square miles. New Brunswick is governed by an Assembly of forty-eight members. Nova Scotia has an Executive Council of ten members, and a Legislative Council of twenty-one, and an Assembly of forty-three members. Manitoba is a comparatively small area, and was styled by Lord Dufferin as "The keystone of that mighty arch which spans the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific." I feel sure that something should be done in this direction.

Mr. COLLINS: Are you a unificationist?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am speaking of provinces just now. Something will have to be done in that direction if Queensland is going to be developed. It is not being developed, and people are leaving the interior and flocking to the cities. If they had the management of their own affairs out there, they would be able to do very much better than what we are doing for them here. I want to say a few words with regard to land settlement. Land settlement is being discouraged just now because of the delay in payment for crops harvested. Take the wheat crop. The last payment has not been made yet, but it is to be made some time next month. After a farmer has waited for a year he cannot afford to accept his payments in instalments after he has delivered his crop. A man came to me the other day and said he had received only his first instalment for his wheat. He showed me a cheque for £46 odd, but he said it was no good to him. I asked him why, and he informed me that, after paying for the cost of harvesting the crop and for his bags, he had only £5 or £6 left. He asked if anything could be done. Something can be done, and something must be done. I know that we are to have the benefit of the rural section of the Commonwealth Bank, and that is one of the finest schemes that has been initiated by the Commonwealth Government. As soon as the farmer delivers his wheat or his maize, or whatever it may be that he is pooling, he should receive his full payment right away. On that certificate he should be able to go to his banker and receive a decent advance at a low rate of interest. He could be protected by an endorsement made upon the warrant or certificate. I urge that something should be done in this direction. Men could be registered to deal with this matter. I know the evil that followed the issue of certificates in the South. Men had to take anything for them. These certificates, whilst being made transferable for bank advances, should not be transferable in their entirety. Unless something like that is done, the farmer will be discouraged at every turn. You might as well ask a man to work for six or twelve months, and then give him a promise

of payment for his labour. That condition of affairs is mightily unfair, and must be altered. The Federal Government intend to give some thought to matters in that direction. Some months ago I spoke at Killarney in connection with this matter, and said that something of this kind should be done—that, when a man sold his wheat crop, a certificate should be issued to him and on that certificate he should be able to go to his banker and receive a liberal advance. I have read the debates in connection with the Rural Credits Bill that has been introduced into the Federal Parliament, and one of its clauses reads—

> "60ABI. Advances may be made by the Rural Credits Department, upon the security of primary produce placed under the legal control of the bank, to—
>
> (*a*) The bank or other banks;
>
> (*b*) Co-operative associations formed under the law of the Commonwealth, a state or a territory under the authority of the Commonwealth; and
>
> (*c*) Such corporations or unincorporate bodies, formed under the law of the Commonwealth, a state or a territory under the authority of the Commonwealth, as are specified by Proclamation."

The debate was an interesting one, and appears to offer a little daylight in the direction I have indicated.

In the few minutes I have left I want to offer a plea for a better understanding between capital and labour. The everlasting preaching of the gospel of hate which is proceeding from the opposite side of the Chamber should cease.

Mr. COLLINS: Who is preaching that?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. member knows that it is everlastingly coming from his side. I feel sure I am right in saying that at no time in our experience was there a better feeling existing between the employer and employee than there is to-day, and why we should indicate that a feeling of distrust exists, I do not know. In America this feeling is rapidly going out of existence. You know nothing of that state of affairs there. I have information before me which proves that a very fine feeling is growing up there between employers and employees, and will grow up here if we take it in hand. This has been brought about by the employees becoming owners of their own institutions. They are becoming capitalists. There is no unmarried man to-day earning £4 5s. a week who cannot save one-third of that amount. Nothing hinders him from doing it. Professor Carver, of Harvard University, in this connection says—

> "Ownership of the factories and the plants by the workers themselves is coming more rapidly in this country than it can possibly come in any other country, and it is coming without any reformer knowing that it is coming. He has not had anything to do with it. It is coming because the ordinary economic forces are putting into the hands of the workers the money with which to buy the plant in which they are working.
>
> "Very few reformers, says Professor Carver, especially of the professional sort, know that this revolution is going on. Revolutions sometimes come in that way. The world quietly turns over while the professional reformers are barking at the moon. The real things are accomplished, not by people who think they are accomplishing great things; they are accomplished by people who do the day's work and do it well, who function efficiently in society and don't know always that they are revolutionising the world. And this is that kind of revolution. As a result, Professor Carver is able to claim for the United States that the general economic policies of that country come more nearly to conforming to a sound economic programme than do those of any other Government on the face of the earth. That is why we are achieving so much more in the way of prosperity for all classes than any other country is achieving . . . .
>
> "The unique and striking feature in the relation between Capital and Labour in the United States is that Labour has discovered that it can itself become Capital! To invest, that is, in the great corporations which, by wise organisation of both Labour and Capital, can enrich the nation. In the process, of course, that enriches those who hold shares, and all the great manufacturing organisations have put their capital into a form by which every 'hand they employ—anyone, indeed, who wishes to invest part of his earnings in a way which will bring in good interest—may become a member of these organisations; and by his membership, of course, has a share in directing the policy of the organisation of which he is a member' . . . .
>
> "Says Mr. Page: 'The great corporations are infinitely greater now than they were then, but the public does not think of them as a menace, for the public owns more and more of them. Industry in the United States is becoming more and more to be owned directly by the public.'
>
> "All this is illustrated, and proved, by a comparative table showing, first, the comparative number of owners in more than one hundred of the greatest manufacturing organisations in the years 1880-1904; and the number of shareowners in the same organisations in 1922-1924. In the United States Steel, for example, the number of shareholders has increased nearly fourfold; in the Standard oil group it has increased from 6,078 to 300,000. In the great railway companies, they have increased in some cases sixty-fold. Insurance companies twenty years ago were wholly in the hands of tiny groups; to-day, they are in the hands of 45,000,000 shareholders. Mr. Page concludes by saying there has been no time in the history of the United States when the distribution of wealth has been as wide as it is now, nor when the average standard of living was as high. This is the main result of the silent and beneficent economic revolution since the war."

I am sure the duty of individuals who have to do with the leading of the people should be in the direction of trying to bring about a better understanding between capital and labour so that there may be a general co-operation, especially in a State like this, not only between capital and labour in the ordinary business undertakings of life, but that there should be a spirited general co-operation infused into all workers in the

State in order that the highest good may be attained for the State and in the interests of the State.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): One cannot listen to the remarks of the hon. member for Warwick without being impressed with the fact that his sentiments desire the bringing together of the two great sections of the community. Before touching upon other matters with which I intend to deal, let me call to mind what is happening at present in this State of ours. Imagine any one teaching the doctrine, "Let the lamb lie down with the lion." There are people who preach that type of doctrine who expect the worker to go to the front, fight for the Empire, and after doing that duty and returning, we find those very people having those soldiers locked up. This doctrine of expecting the lamb to lie down with the lion is not practicable. I am not one who wants to widen the existing gulf. I want to see the working conditions such as will allow the Empire to be worthy of being defended. The difficulty is that, if we are merely using the working class people as targets for the bullets of the enemy during times of stress and then casting them into prison and leaving them there, this Empire of ours is not worthy of defence.

[3.30 p.m.]

To me this Empire stands for something bigger. The people who believe in that sort of thing and who preach the doctrine of the lamb and the lion lying down together—are not preaching sentiments that go to the building up of a big empire.

Let me deal with one or two matters that interest me concerning the struggle between capital and labour. I listened very seriously to the remarks of the hon. member for Burnett and the hon. member for Burrum. These two hon. members appeared to be very solicitous of the railwaymen, and contended that they were seriously interested in the railway men getting an increased award. I speak as one who understands the railwaymen, having for half a lifetime worked in the railways. The conditions the railwaymen enjoy are eminently better than the conditions enjoyed by the seamen who are on strike. Therefore, if there was any justification for the recent strike of the railwaymen, there must be a justification for the seamen's strike, and I say that anyone who backed the railwaymen must in decency back the seamen. Let us look at the conditions of the seamen. I have here a few extracts from speeches made in connection with this strike by men who were asked to express an opinion about their conditions. One man said—

> "Why didn't we strike in England, and tie up the ships at our 'home port?'
>
> "Well, I'll tell you. In England, a shipowner only has to call for, say, 200,000 men, and he is rushed from all quarters. They are not scabs—they are only starving men who cannot help themselves."

That in the country which was fighting for democracy! Starving men and women in order to get dividends! These are the people who fought for them during the war period. Their troubles about the men who fought the war so long as they can use them to get their pound of flesh in dividends! Then they preach the doctrine of the lamb and the lion lying down together. So long as the lamb is inside the lion they can lie down together. The Labour party has a whole-hearted desire to make the conditions such that we can build up a happy and contented nation, so that we may be proud of the Empire of which we in Australia form a part. Another man said—

> "They told us in 1914 we were fighting to make England a place fit for heroes to live in. Well, a man has to be a hero to live there now."

A lot of these heroes are living in gaols in Australia, and they have not received much sympathy from the people who wanted them to go to the war in 1914 and 1915.

I want to say a few words that may come to the ears of the railwaymen outside. Viewing the strike as I saw it—everybody knows that I saw a good deal of it—I can quite understand now that the battle is won why the Opposition are making a whole-hearted attempt to swing in on the next wave on the backs of the railwaymen. They say, "We were your friends during the strike. We were backing you because we believed you were entitled to an increased award." If they were genuine, there would not be anything seriously wrong with it; but I am one of the railwaymen who worked under their predecessors—under previous Governments—who retrenched men who were getting £110 a year on which to keep their families I can remember distinctly when they gave these men £110 a year and took away £10 as a special retrenchment; yet they are the same people who come along now and say, "We believed in the strike because it was a strike for fair conditions."

The reason why these men are backing the railwaymen and are not backing the seamen is obvious. Of the two conditions one would think they would fight for the seamen in preference to the railwaymen. They are backing the railwaymen and not the seamen because the seamen have no vote in this country and the other men have. After all, this is only in keeping with their commercialism. They have transferred their commercialism to politics, and they can see nothing but votes, therefore they are appealing to the railwaymen in the hope of getting votes at the next election. They will get votes all right as they have always done—they will get them in the neck. During this strike a set of circumstances was engineered by our friends opposite which would have turned out in all probability a worse shambles than occurred in 1912. Right in this river boats were tied up. The "Marguerite" was one of those boats. At the time she was tied up the Bruce-Page Government were trying to create a disturbance on the ground that some of the men in Rockhampton had held up the mails. In my opinion, if the Rockhampton men had persisted in holding up the mails these people would have sent Gatling guns up the coast without any compunction. These people were hurt because the sane Labour Government were just to these men, and carried out the Labour platform. I say that the method adopted in connection with the settlement of the railway strike was a method in keeping with the platform of this party. I stated in my electorate that I stood for the platform of this party, which includes conciliation and arbitration. Assuming that hon. members opposite had been in power, what would have happened? Does anyone think that these people with the iron heel would have negotiated with the railway men? They would

have tried to play the part of the big strong man. I can imagine the hon. member for Oxley negotiating.

Mr. SIZER: There would not have been a strike.

Mr. WEIR: I could not imagine the hon. member in a strike. There would have been a definite attempt to bludgeon the railway men back to work. As some hon. members on this side have said, the strike would not have wound up in anything else but revolution.

Mr. SIZER: You are advocating revolution.

Mr. WEIR: The hon. member cannot see any further than that—I am sorry for him—he does not count in this argument. Anyone who knows me can understand from what I am saying whether I am advocating revolution or not.

Mr. SIZER: You are trying to face both ways.

Mr. WEIR: The hon. member would not make a bad job at facing both ways; I do not know that there is any difference between back and front so far as he is concerned. We have had the hon. member for Burrum telling us that the railway men had a good case. Hon. members opposite have some influence with the Federal Government. They believe that the seamen's strike is holding up the primary industry of this country. They now believe that, owing to the shipping strike, the farming community of this State is being more or less ruined. Assuming that their statement is correct, what is wrong in making efforts to induce their friends in Federal politics to move the Federal ships and save the primary producers? They are blaming the British seamen. Let them use the Australian ships under Australian conditions with Australian seamen to ship the produce away. Why will they not do that? It is for the obvious reason that they are just like the Federal Government. They are part and parcel of the big move which is out to crush all Australian workers, and this is merely one phase of the industrial movement. They think they have the seamen at their mercy on this occasion, and, just as they are treating the seamen, holding up the mailed fist to bludgeon them, so they would have done to the railway strikers if the matter had been in their hands. The two cases show definitely and conclusively that one was handled by a wise Government, and the other has been handled by a Government that has not got Australian sympathies. We were told that the overseas trouble was due to Walsh and Johnson. There are Labour men in this House and in other Houses of Parliament who have been in precisely the same position as Walsh and Johnson, and have been treated in the same way. There were members of this House who were not safe in their own electorates during the conscription campaign. That was because their minds were Australian minds, as subsequent events clearly showed. We were the anti-conscription party, and everyone knows, and history has proved, that our voice was the voice of the people.

Our sentiments were endorsed by the people of the Commonwealth, and just as they were endorsed by the people on that conscription issue so will they be endorsed by the Australian people on this issue. Imagine the strong Bruce Government appealing to the people for a mandate to deport a couple of men! We cannot deport men wholesale, and these two men are to be deported because they are supposed to be extremists. I have a shrewd suspicion that the hon. member for Warwick was kicked out of his movement because he was an extremist. Anyhow, why was the "Rump" kicked out? And what are the Bruce Government? Are they not extremists? They accuse us of being extremists, but they are much more extreme than we are. In connection with the Federal election we know that they are trying to make an issue of the contention that they are not going to be dictated to by men like Walsh, and that he should be deported. If Walsh were deported to-morrow, how would it help them? There would be 150 Walshes in five minutes all ready to take his place, and everybody knows that, if Walsh had not done what he has done, there are men in the union movement who would see that he did. The same thing applies to Johnson. I want to ask, how is the deportation of Walsh or Johnson going to help for one moment? Would it help to deport them to Great Britain, where the seamen are also striking? Would it help to deport them to South Africa, where the seamen are also striking? We find that in Australia, South Africa, Canada, and Britain the seamen are all on strike, and we in Australia are not singular because seamen here are sticking out for £1 a month. Yet hear this enlightened Government appealing to their masters and saying, "Give us a mandate to deport these men. Look at these fellows who are holding up the business of the country." How absurd it is! If Walsh or Johnson or anybody else is breaking the law, the Bruce Government have the machinery and the laws to deal with them. Why did they not deal with them? It is not that they did not want to do so. There are other reasons. The truth is that they have made this a bogus issue at the elections, because they fear the result, hoping that they will stampede the country into voting for them because they say they want to deport two union officials—two mere puppets in the game—who they allege are holding up the country. I do not know either of these men, but my esteemed friend the hon. member for Ipswich knows one of them—Mr. Johnson—and I am content to take my friend's word. He says he is a decent man, and, naturally, a friend of his is a friend of mine. I do not know Johnson, but the hon. member for Ipswich assures me that in his business as a unionist and at conferences this man is a staid and honest debater. He is leading in the strike merely because of his position, and it is ridiculous to try to brand him as a disloyal man who is trying to foment discontent amongst the seamen. Down in the south of Australia we have some of the finest unionists in this wide world, made up of the descendants—many of them—of deportees themselves. I went through the museum in Hobart, Tasmania, the other day, and what I saw there was an eye-opener to me. I read the charge sheets on the walls, and I saw the photographs and relics of barbarism which men with minds like those of hon. members opposite used in the days when Tasmania was a convict settlement and which I am sure they would use to-morrow on members on this side if they had the opportunity. I saw those relics of barbarism, and I saw photographs showing how the convicts were forced to church on Sunday mornings at the point of the bayonet. That is their idea of Christianity. Did you ever hear of anything like it? The same type of mind which did that sort of thing is on the other side to-day.

You only have to hear them talking about deporting these two men and others like them to realise it. These are the Christians who would build up an empire!

Let me go back to that museum again. Anyone can see it. I went through it very carefully, and I read the charge sheets posted on the walls. I saw cases of where men were being deported for fourteen years. What for? For robbing a few cabbages out of a bed in the old country. Probably some kiddies wanted something to eat, and the nearest thing they could get was a cabbage, and the parent was sent out for fourteen years for robbing cabbages. That is the sort of stuff that is coming back amongst the people of Australia, and they expect us to stand for that sort of thing. I do not mind what a man's views are. I can tolerate a man with views opposite to my own. As the hon. member for South Brisbane stated, we cannot get anywhere unless we are tolerant in all matters. Anyone knows that I can be as strongly opposed to a man on certain views as any person can be. I have deep-rooted opinions on certain things affecting my class. Everyone knows that; but do you think for a moment that, because others dared to differ from me and I could not have my own sulky, miserable way, I would hunt them out of the country? That would be unworthy of me as an Australian citizen. I am an imported Australian, too. I am one of those unfortunates who in the ordinary course of affairs might be deported. Fancy me a subject for deportation! By accident I was brought to this country when I was twelve months old. I had better not say that too loudly, or I might be deported in a few months' time. I was landed in this country when twelve months old; yet under this stupid deportation measure, if I attempt to defend my class, they would hunt me out of the country, and I am a better Australian than many of the people on the other side. Thousands of people by accident of birth were born here; by accident of birth I was born somewhere else; but as I have been reared here I have developed the Australian mind and my sympathies are with this country, and I do not want any other. I like this country. That is the difference between a person liable for deportation from Australia and the Australian hatched on the premises. I am claiming to be an Australian.

Let me now have one word about the railway men when they were on strike. No one can gainsay the fact that during the history of the strike the people of the State witnessed the wonderfully good conduct and citizenship shown by the railway men. So long as we can develop that side of character we are going to get somewhere.

I desire to criticise a resolution passed by the Kingsthorpe L.P.A. as contained in the "Producer" of 16th September. The Kingsthorpe members passed a certain resolution, and called on someone else to get them out of their trouble. I say to those men that they are enforced unionists subsidised by this Government. They could never have become so organised if it had not been for the charitable Labour Government, because they do not understand labour organisation. They belong to a body that have been spoonfed because we thought it our duty to spoonfeed them, and I make no excuse for that. I tell them now that there is still a way open for them as Australian workers if they will accept it. If they will come right out of their shell as manly men ought to do, they will recognise that they are workers in this country like the industrialists, and in any future upheaval—there will be others—it is quite within the bounds of possibility that they will combine with their brother unionists in the city to see that none of their produce goes to waste. I saw enough during the strike to convince me that in any industrial trouble there is no desire to rob the man in the country of his bread and butter. His products are his bread and butter, and I can see means by which it will be reasonably possible to eliminate misunderstandings which ultimately have the effect of holding up perishable goods. There is a possibility of a linking-up between local producers' associations and the industrial workers in the city. I commend that to those men and others who are looking for a way out. I commend them to that line of action rather than to the influence of the carping criticism of the Opposition, who never had any time for the local producers' associations, and who in the ordinary course of events are not friends with those who are backing the local producers' associations.

There is one thing that the men in the railway did do. By forcing their strike and winning the day they had the happy satisfaction of knowing that immediately they had won they had established a new basic wage for the whole of the State. The basic wage immediately was increased from £4 to £4 5s. a week, and that in itself is worth while from the railway men's point of view. They have not been selfish, but their work has been for the benefit of others.

There are rumours in the air of the constitution of a Board of Trade in this State. I believe there are big possibilities here for a Board of Trade. I have been going through the report of the committee which was appointed to set a value on the goodwill and assets of the Brisbane Tramways Company. The Board of Trade could function along definite lines, collecting data which will be eminently valuable not only to this State but to the world from the point of view of three essentials—cost of living, wages, and profit of industry. To-day everybody who studies the figures of the statisticians in the Federal sphere knows that there is no definite basis of calculating the output of labour throughout the whole of the Commonwealth. We have a restricted set of figures which deal only with some industries and not with others. I am hoping that the Board of Trade will function sufficently elastically to be able to set down definitely the value of every established industry in this Commonwealth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WEIR: I hope that the Board of Trade will deal with these matters, which the Arbitration Court all along has failed to do. The Arbitration Court had the right—I have quoted the section before now—to take the industrial and commercial records of all industries they were interested in, and dealing with the output, the cost and value of the output, and the value of the stock. In the case of the Brisbane Tramways Company it was proved that 30 per cent. of its stock was watered. I venture the opinion that in some industries in this State up to 50 per cent. of the stock is watered.

The Board of Trade could also verify the figures which have to be considered in the fixation of the basic wage, namely, house rents, and the cost of commodities one ordinarily uses in the course of the year in the maintenance of a man, wife, and family. After amalgamating these costs and deciding upon the reasonable profits to be charged to the industry, we could then find out whether the workers are getting a fair return for what they are doing in developing industry. I believe that the Board of Trade, when appointed, will do good work, and I commend these suggestions to it. I hope that it will be constituted in the near future.

We find some of our opponents continually harping on the fact that certain State owned and managed industries have failed. I will take one instance—that of the Bowen coal field—and deal with it. This industry could be made to show a far better result financially than it is doing to-day. The Bowen coal field to-day supplies coal to the railways in North Queensland at about 18s. a ton. The Railway Department is getting excellent coal from the Bowen coal field. When I was working in the Townsville district it cost £2 2s. 6d. a ton to land coal in Townsville for the department. I know that in many respects costs have increased since I left the North, and it is only reasonable to assume that the cost of coal in the North is proportionately higher, yet the State has been supplying coal from its coal mine at Bowen at 18s. a ton. Notwithstanding this fact the Government are able to show a profit on this mine last year of £8,000. Taking it as a commercial proposition, if coal imported from Newcastle or Bundanba is worth £2 2s. 6d. per ton landed at Townsville, the State coal mine at Bowen has a right to have some of the difference in those costs credited to it. If we did that, instead of showing a profit of £8,000 last year the profit would have been considerably higher. To my mind we are stupid in our method of account-keeping in protecting these industries. I have proved that a fair margin of profit on the coal supplied to the Northern railway has not been credited to the Bowen coal field. As a set-off against that I shall take you to the railways for a moment. Whenever there is a shortage in industry, a drought, or any trouble concerning the metal market or the dozen and one things of that kind bearing upon industry, numerous deputations are here to see the Premier, nearly knocking one down in the rush, squealing about a reduction in freights. The hon. member for Murilla is always wrangling in this Chamber about the Government subsidising Mount Morgan, about the Government giving away too much; yet immediately the cattle industry has a reverse we find the hon. member rushing down here saying that the country is going to ruin, and asking for rebates. I am not in the slightest degree against rebates; but, if the full amount rebated were credited to the railways, it could be debited in the usual way to the General Consolidated Revenue account. In that way one industry would not have to carry the 100 per cent. deduction. It does not seem fair to me that because of an act of God such as a drought, or because there is a fall in the metal market which creates a shortage in price, we should expect an industry like our railways to carry all those goods along its rails at a lower price than it costs to carry them. We should adjust the matter in such a way that the industry concerned will receive 100 per cent. of value for the labour put in.

The same thing applies when we have an extension of our tramways or of our railways. Immediately a step is made in that direction there is a rush of land-sharks to get in to secure land and sell to the people at highly-inflated rates. The people, like the kangaroo, are forced to the outskirts. As soon as an extension of a tramway occurs, these cormorants—and they are really cormorants—rush in, buy ground, and re-sell it to the working people at enormously enhanced values. The State that guarantees the line and supplies the money sits idly by and allows these people to become rich. Immediately the Government propose an extension they should dig up enough courage to commandeer all the land in the vicinity and re-lease that land to the people who have to earn their livings. I understand something of the kind was done in connection with the Transcontinental railway line. No one was allowed to own land privately within some miles of the railway line. That should be done in this State in order to safeguard the revenue and to bring about proper development. It is altogether wrong that the country should find the whole of the expenditure and that the private speculator should wax fat by reason of the fact that he gets in early.

I can see there is need for a Reserve Account. When dealing with the matter of rebates a Reserve Account should be kept so that every rebate should pass through some process of account-keeping to ensure that, when the day of plenty comes, industry which received a rebate will pay back the concession through the imposition of higher rates or something of the kind, to allow the country to carry on and to make up the balance lost during the lean time. Of course, such a thing should not be done too hurriedly, but I commend the idea to the Chamber as a suitable method of adjusting the matter.

Time is getting on, and I have no desire unduly to harass hon. members; but, in conclusion, I draw attention to the fact that quite a lot was made of the fact that we had members of the Empire Press Delegation with us the other day. That was merely an invasion of overseas commercial travellers. I cannot see them from any other angle. They came into this country and put over a lot of "bull stuff"; they were given free railway passes; and they will go home and write up a lot of trash. They came here merely for the purpose of selling their goods. They want us to be the "wood and water joeys" for the other side of the world. I hope our people will come up to scratch and make them realise that we are not going to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water for those people; but that we have enough men, brains, and money to run our own secondary industries and country.

[4 p.m.]

Item (Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor) agreed to.

SUPPLY.

FIRST AND SECOND ALLOTTED DAYS.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

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

> "That £3,321, balance of vote, be granted for 'His Excellency the Governor.'"

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

There is an increase in this vote of £121, which is made up by the following increases in salaries:—Official secretary, increase £40; mounted orderly, increase £30; typist, increase £35; increases as a result of the repeal of the Salaries Act, £15.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): We are all aware that the present occupant of the office is leaving this State in the month of October, and I would like to know what steps have been taken in regard to the carrying out of the platform of the Labour party in regard to State Governors, which, for the information of hon. members opposite and so that there may be no misunderstanding, I shall read—

> "Abolition of the system of Imperially appointed Governors and substitution therefor of local Governors, who shall be appointed on the nomination of the State Government. The Governor in exercising his functions to act only upon the advice of responsible Queensland Ministers while they retain the confidence of Parliament."

I understand a memorial in regard to this matter is being sent to the old country by the five State Labour Governments in the Commonwealth, and I would like to know the position. I am commencing to ask myself what useful function State Governors perform, or if they are of any use at all. I heard His Excellency Sir Matthew Nathan say that the real duties of the Governors were not arduous. Of course, there are social functions that Governors have to carry out from time to time, and I want to say a word or two in regard to these social functions. It is quite true that I, as the representative of the Bowen electorate, have been invited to Government House on three different occasions to dine with His Excellency the Governor. It is quite true, too, that other Governors did not invite the whole of the members of Parliament as Sir Matthew Nathan has done during his term of office. But it is also quite true that we are living in a different age altogether compared to the time when other Governors occupied the position. A few years ago those who believed in the Labour party were hardly considered to be within the pale of respectability, but I am very pleased to say that we have now reached that stage when even His Excellency the Governor thought it wise to invite members of the Labour party to dine with him. I have no objection to that because, while I do not agree that the position is warranted, I have nothing against the persons who have occupied that position. It is a question of principle with me. In my conversations with Sir Matthew Nathan I have found him a man who was widely read—not in literature such as our friends opposite read, but literature that members on this side read. I had no fault to find with that. I am one of those who believe that even if we do have local Governors it is not going to make much difference so far as the great Labour movement is concerned, because, if we appointed a local Labour Governor, he might go on the same lines as Sir Matthew Nathan did outside the representatives of the people—he might invite what is known as society. Those are the social functions that Governors have to fulfil. What we call society consists of well-to-do persons, captains of industry, the exploiters who as a rule live upon exploitation. Although Sir Matthew Nathan may have invited representatives of the people to Government House, I never remember reading where he invited the secretaries of the different trade unions or the members of the Australian Labour Party who make up the Labour movement in Queensland. I suppose they are not considered to have reached the same stage of respectability as hon. members in this House have reached. If we appoint a good Labour man to the position, will he have the courage to invite members of his own class to wander to and fro through the beautiful gardens at Fernberg? After all, as Sir Matthew Nathan said, the duties of the office are not of an arduous nature. That means that, if a local Labour Governor were appointed, he could show the working class through those gardens which by their contributions they help to support. I am one of those who believe with Emerson that every person is a consumer, therefore he ought to be a producer. I am very anxious to know how much the different Governors we have had in Queensland have added to the wealth production of the State. They may have added a little to the intellectual development here by their addresses from time to time.

Mr. MAXWELL: Sir Matthew Nathan was a good man, anyway.

Mr. COLLINS: I have just made a reference to one of America's great thinkers, who said that every man is a consumer, therefore he ought to be a producer. I agree with that. At any rate, this change is taking place all over the world. During the war we saw the disappearance of kings from their thrones. The change is going on to-day throughout civilised society, and mankind is asking itself many questions. One question we in this Commonwealth are asking is whether we could not carry on the good government of this great country with its six States without having Governors brought here from abroad. The hon. member for Maryborough and the hon. member for South Brisbane referred to the development of the Australian spirit. Surely no one would argue that, if we are fit to govern ourselves, and are going to have Governors—I much prefer the plank of the Labour platform some years ago, which stood for the abolition of State Governors—with our 6,000,000 people, who are the greatest readers on this planet, we can fulfil the functions attached to the position of Governor ourselves.

At 4.10 p.m.,

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

Mr. COLLINS: I am one of those who think we can. It would be just as well if we appointed a local man to fill the place filled by Sir William MacGregor and others. Sir William never invited me to Government House, but I have no complaints on that score because at that time I was sitting in opposition, and I was considered hardly respectable, like my friend the hon. member for South Brisbane and the hon. member for Maryborough. At any rate, I am anxious to know what the position is. The Governor and his hangers-on cost us £6,621 a year, and it would be money well saved. The establishment is not needed. I am not asking that a local Governor should "scab" on the imported Governor, because, if the position is worth £3,000 for an imported man, and a local man is appointed and he

is going to carry out the society functions which I have described and invite our own people there—the producers instead of the exploiters of the producers—he should be worth as much as the imported man. If a local Governor did what I have suggested, he would have to be a man of considerable courage—I was almost recommending myself for the position. (Laughter.) The reason I say that is that I know my class so well, and I know that they dearly love a lord. I saw them buzzing round Lord Burnham when he was here. (Laughter.) I know full well that it will require an enormous amount of courage to get away from the conventionalism which is the growth of centuries and say, "While I am Governor of Queensland, I am going to invite to Government House representatives of the working classes; they are going to enjoy these beautiful lawns, the beautiful shrubbery, and these flowers, to which, of course, they have contributed." I rose for the express purpose of getting from the Premier some statement of the position and something about what is being done by the Government to put into operation the plank of our platform which I have just read out.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): In reply to the inquiry of the hon. member for Bowen, I might say that, when in the Southern States, I discussed this matter with Labour Premiers whom I had the opportunity of meeting, and the result of the discussion was that the Premier of the mother State in consultation with myself prepared a memorial, which I signed when I was in Sydney on the last occasion. That signature was followed by the signatures of the Labour Premiers of other States, and was forwarded by post to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but at my request the text of the memorial was forwarded by cable, the reason for that being that a new Governor was about to be appointed just at that time for Victoria and our Governor was just about to leave Queensland, and I thought, from the statements which the Secretary of State had made previously, that the opportunity had arrived when those who agreed with the idea of nominating local Governors should put their views before the Imperial Government. The late Premier, Mr. Theodore, had the assurance of Lord Milner, the then Secretary of State, that, if a majority of the States——

Mr. KERR: The whole of the States.

The PREMIER: If a majority of the States made a request, the matter would be considered. There appears to be some doubt in the minds of some people as to whether a majority of the States would be sufficient or whether the States had to be unanimous. Mr. Theodore has no doubt in his mind. I discussed the matter several times with him. Lord Milner informed him that, if the majority of the States were agreeable, the request would be considered. Five out of the six Premiers have signed the memorial asking the Imperial Government to accept the nomination of the State concerned when new appointments are being made. It is true that the Queensland Labour party's platform provides for the appointment of local Governors. Three at least of the platforms of the other State Labour parties provide for the abolition of the position of State Governor altogether. We as a Labour party cannot obtain all we desire right away, and we believe that step by step is a good policy. I suggested that, now we have had twenty-five years of federation with a Governor-General drawing a big salary as the King's representative in this Commonwealth, the Imperial Government should consider nominations submitted by the State Governments for local men. I am not going into all the arguments, but I have sufficient faith in my own countrymen to believe that we could nominate men in Queensland and Australia who would be quite capable of carrying out the duties of Governor. I desire to combat the argument that is used from time to time, and was used in England quite recently, that locally nominated men would possibly be men who had a political bias, or would be selected by the party in power as supporters of that party. If anyone likes to read the history of the Governors who from time to time have come to the States and the Commonwealth, they will find that the majority have been politicians. They have been none the worse for that. There is only one instance where the Governor has been a Labour politician. That is an indication of the spirit of the age, showing that the Imperial Government, after having a Labour Parliament at Westminster, were prepared to appoint an ex-Labour politician, in Sir James O'Grady as Governor of Tasmania. I believe that a politicial training is a very fine thing, and although the most strenuous years of my life time have been spent in this Chamber, I would not have missed the opportunity for the world. I do not think Mr. Justice Webb will object to my saying that, when he accepted the position of President of the Arbitration Court, he expressed regret that he had not had political experience before taking that position. I have no hesitation in saying that there are few positions men can occupy in the public life of this country in which their occupancy could not be improved by serving a term in this Chamber. It broadens a man's outlook, and you realise that every question has two sides to it. It is not like the knights in allegory fighting for a gold shield or a silver shield, for it has two sides, one of which is gold and the other silver. There are two sides to all questions, and that is quite apparent to any man who has had a political career. I say that the Governors who came to this country with a political training in the House of Commons were improved by that political training. But the very fact that they had served as members of the House of Commons supporting one party largely discounts the statements made recently in England that locally nominated men would have a political bias.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: There would be a different atmosphere and a different environment.

The PREMIER: I do not know that the atmosphere will be improved. I believe in the Australian atmosphere. I believe that, if a man with a knowledge of Australia and a man who has served a certain time in this Chamber were to become Governor, he would be broad-minded enough to carry out his duties just as impartially as any other Governors have done. We have been singularly fortunate in the Governors who have come from the Old Country, and no man has ever graced the office of Governor in any part of Australia with such dignity and success as the man who is about to vacate the position in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) I say that

with all seriousness, and with an intimate knowledge of the man. I do not suppose that Sir Matthew Nathan calls himself a Labour man, but he was a man with broad liberal ideas who had a splendid training before he came to Queensland. He served Queensland well as Governor, but I repeat there are men in Queensland and Australia who can fill the position with considerable saving to the taxpayer. It has been said, and I believe it to be true, that £100,000 per annum could be saved to the people of Australia by the cutting-out of a lot of the flummery and entertainment that is now connected with the office. If Sir Matthew Nathan did invite Labour members to visit Government House, what percentage of the total number of taxpayers in Queensland had access to Government House? Not one-fiftieth of 1 per cent. of the taxpayers of Queensland who were called upon to find the £7,000 or £8,000 which it costs to run Government House. That being so, quite a lot of money that is spent on entertainments could be cut out, and more-or-less purely formal duties transacted by the holder of the office could be carried out by an Australian. I can assure the hon. member for Bowen that I will give effect to his suggestion as early as possible, and recommend, as laid down in the Labour platform, the appointment of a local man to the office of Governor. If the Imperial Government are not prepared to accept our suggestion, that is not our affair. I might say that Mr. Lang, the Premier of New South Wales, and myself put the case for the appointment of local Governors before the Imperial authorities in a very forcible way. I had something to do with the drawing up of the memorial. Mr. Lang and myself put forward arguments which appealed to us as democrats and Australians, and which conveyed an assurance that we had no desire to weaken the link between Australia and the Imperial Government. We said that we believed such appointments would strengthen that link, because it was a recognition of the importance of Australia, that she was now a grown-up daughter and should be treated as such.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): It appears to me that the die has been cast, and that the Governor of the future is to be a local man.

Mr. KING: Not yet.

Mr. FRY: I have quite sufficient vision to know that, when five out of the six States make the request, the position would be rather serious if the Imperial Government turned it down. I have not heard any arguments so far, excepting that of the hon. member for Bowen, in favour of local Governors, and, apart from stating that it is in the party platform, his reasons amounted to nothing more than that it would be nice for the local man to walk through the nice gardens with his comrades smelling the flowers.

Mr. DASH: Did he not say something about a lot of money being saved?

Mr. FRY: He did not. He said that he did not expect a local man would "scab" on his Imperial mate and do the job for less. His argument was not that a local appointment would mean a saving of money to the people, but that a local man could perform the duties of the office just as well. If the Government put their proposals forward as the Australian sentiment, are they prepared to take up the view of the Australian Natives Association and appoint an Australian native to the job? Why go half way? Why not be logical and go the whole way? Assuming that the time arrives that we are to have local men appointed as Governors, how is that Governor to be appointed? Will he be appointed by a party vote of the party in power whereby, say, a vote of twenty-two to nineteen could make the appointment? It might be that the majority of twenty-two would actually represent the minority of the total members in this Chamber, but the nineteen who did not want the party nominee would have to vote with the twenty-two to make the majority. Although selected in caucus by twenty-two votes to nineteen, the twenty-two would only be a minority of Parliament. That vote would not be a true reflex of the opinion of the Chamber.

The PREMIER: What about taking a popular vote?

Mr. WARREN: Do you believe in that?

The PREMIER: I am asking you the question.

Mr. FRY: This may cause a laugh now, but it must be borne in mind that the hon. gentleman speaks as the Premier, and not as an ordinary individual. I ask the hon. gentleman would it not be better, as an alternative, that the Governor be elected by a secret ballot of this House, where no man would be bound by party discipline. We hear a lot from the Labour party, or the Communistic party. What is behind it all? This is a job for somebody. Is there somebody in the Labour ranks who is likely to cause a cleavage? I am not going to ask the Premier that question, but I suggest that it may be a way of putting somebody out of the way. From the speech of the hon. member for South Brisbane this morning it seems quite possible that someone has been selected for the job. When it comes to the question of electing a local Governor it is the duty of the Labour Government to show in what way a local man will be superior to an imported Governor. I might say that my bias is on the side of the local man, but I want some argument stronger than that of going round the gardens at Government House, seeing the flowers and having a cup of tea. There must be a good strong constitutional principle in its favour. There is no argument advanced in favour of the proposal on the score of saving money. There is no argument put forward on the score of efficiency, no argument put forward to say that the local man should have certain qualifications such as a world-wide knowledge of economic questions or a world-wide knowledge of history. So far, educational attainments have not been mentioned. No qualification is mentioned except that it is in the Labour platform that we must have a local man appointed to the job. In an intelligent Chamber speeches like that seem to me as flat as "ginger-pop" that has been standing open for twelve months.

Mr. WEIR: How about chocolates?

Mr. FRY: This matter is a very much more serious one than is indicated by the jocular interjections of humorous and one-sided politicians. If we are to have local men, let the Premier consider the advisability of having our Governors appointed by a secret ballot of this Chamber, when no one will be bound hand and foot by party discipline. We know of an instance of a vote taken within the precincts of this Chamber where a Government, by 22 votes to 19, appointed a gentleman to a very prominent

position; yet, if that appointment had been by vote of this Chamber, it is probable—I say probable because I do not know the actual details—that the votes would have been 50 to 22 against the appointment. Yet that appointment is said to represent the will of this Parliament, because we have to vote the salary of that official and by so doing endorse the appointment. If we are to make any appointments—which should be above party considerations—that are to be held in respect by the people, if those appointments are not to be by popular ballot, as was suggested by the Premier, let them be by a secret ballot of this Chamber.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The statement has been made that an appointment to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement of Sir Matthew Nathan has already been made, and I would like to know if the Premier has any information on the subject. I would also like to know whether it is correct that an extension of time was sought for Sir Matthew Nathan, who is leaving our shores in October.

[4.30 p.m.]

There is no question but that an important departure has been made. I do not take the stand that once a custom is established it should always be continued, but it seems unreasonable that Parliament should not have been consulted in some way before a memorial was signed by the Premier on behalf of this State, and, as the hon. gentleman himself stated, has now been posted to the home authorities asking for locally appointed Governors. It is only right that Parliament should have some say, because we on this side of the Chamber represent a large number of people in Queensland, and we are entitled to have some say on such an important issue as the abolition of imperially appointed Governors. The question may arise as to the duties of the Governor. I take the view that the Governor is a link with the Empire, and it is important that the outposts should have some connecting link with the centre of the Empire. On the question of efficiency, a locally appointed man could easily carry out the job, but we must not forget that sentiment plays a very big part all through life. A nation without sentiment is not going to thrive, and is not going to get very far. The link binding us to the Empire should be strengthened rather than broken, even though it may only be a sentimental link. On these grounds I regret exceedingly that, if the same expenditure is to be maintained, we are going to break a link that is binding us to the old country. The hon. member for Bowen said the position was not warranted. Of all the members of this House the hon. member for Bowen is the one who never stands up to what he believes in. When it comes to a vote in this Chamber and the hon. member has an opportunity of doing anything, he sidetracks the issue and votes with his party. We not only have a Governor, but the hon. member is willing to vote £1,000 for a Lieutenant-Governor. He voted for it last year, and probably will vote for it again this year.

Mr. COLLINS: I voted against it in the proper way.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member has not got the "guts" to stand up in this Chamber and do the right thing.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KERR: He has not got the heart to do it. He talks to "Hansard" and says, "I will wipe out the Governor" and then sends a hundred or so copies of "Hansard" out to his electors, but when he is asked to vote, he will vote the extra £1,000 a year to the Lieutenant-Governor. Where does the hon. member stand? He talks about different ages of the world. He is not alive to the times, but is living in dreamland half the time. If he would only study practical politics a little more instead of the Marxian theories which he puts forth in this Chamber, he would get further. He speaks about Imperialism and matters which divide the more thinking members opposite from the extreme section of the party, but when the Estimates come before us in connection with the Governorship of Queensland—and an imperially appointed Governor constitutes a strong link between the old country and Australia—the hon. member says the job is not warranted. The hon. member ought to say once and for all where he stands in these matters; he cannot have it both ways. I hope the Premier will tell us whether an appointment has been made, and whether it was suggested that an extension of time should be granted to Sir Matthew Nathan.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): So far as I know, no appointment has been made, nor do I think that any appointment will be made till Sir Matthew Nathan's leave comes to an end. The Governor has been granted five months' leave by agreement between the Imperial and the Queensland Governments. It is not usual for a Governor to be appointed before the leave of his predecessor expires. I can assure the hon. member that, so far as I know, no appointment has been made, nor has any name been suggested to the Queensland Government. With regard to an extension of Sir Matthew Nathan's time, no official request was made to extend his period of office beyond the five years' term.

* Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): One point seems to have been missed with regard to this matter. The position of Governor may be a sinecure so far as any act of interference with Queensland affairs is concerned for perhaps years, but there may come a time when parties in Parliament are evenly balanced, and through some chance vote one party is put out and another party gets the reins of power. The question will arise as to which party should get a dissolution. That is the time when an Imperial Governor, with no local ties or leanings, is required. We are not likely to get a Queenslander—no matter from which side he comes—who can divest himself of all party feeling or be exempt from unconscious bias at such a time as that. He is pretty sure to be a man who has been identified with one side or the other in politics. When there is a decided party advantage to be gained or lost with regard to dissolution of Parliament, and the parties are pretty evenly balanced, it will be in the interests of the State to have a decision free from bias or partiality of any kind, and at such a time a Governor appointed from outside Queensland will be better able to give an impartial decision than a local man, especially men of the type who have been sent out to Australia generally as Governors from the old country. I might mention that our State Governors have not all been selected from one side in politics. In Tasmania they have a member of the British Labour party as Governor. That shows that

in these matters the British Government are not tied to any particular party.

A question of a minor character—because on such a big matter as this is in principle the saving of £1,000 or so is only a small matter—is that of expenses. Has our experience of hon. members on the other side, when they had the opportunity of spending money, given the people any reason to think that any saving would be effected by falling in with their suggestion? I say "No." I am confident that even if a local man were appointed—a nominee of the present Government, as he would be—the people of Queensland would not save a penny.

As for the reason which has been advanced by the hon. member for Bowen about the people of Queensland having the opportunity to take tea with an imported Governor, remembering that we have 800,000 people in Queensland and assuming that his duties included the entertainment of every one of them, I am inclined to think that he would have a pretty big job, and I am afraid he would not be able to do it even for the money which the imported man spends.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not what the hon. member for Bowen said.

* Mr. SWAYNE: At any rate, that is not the question. The real point is that, when the balance between the two parties is very even indeed and it is quite a nice question, calling for the exercise of an unbiased judgment and a sound knowledge of constitutional law, as to which party should have a dissolution, in nine cases out of ten the decision given would be looked on with suspicion either by one side or the other; in any case before a change a referendum should be taken.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): This is certainly a matter of importance, although the hon. member for Bowen was somewhat inclined to treat it rather lightly. Personally, rather than see a Governor appointed locally by Parliament, I would rather have no Governor at all. It is not that there are not any number of men in the community capable of filling the position. Nobody on this side of the Chamber would argue that there are not men in the community who would not only fill the position but also do honour to it; but the whole thing is that so long as we have this connecting link we want it to be as free from political bias as possible. I consider that the hon. member for Mirani put his finger right on one of the weak spots of such an appointment. We know that on one or two occasions in the Federal Parliament, and also in State Parliaments, Governments have asked for dissolutions, and a considerable amount of disapprobation has been shown both by the Opposition and the public with regard to the attitude which imported Governors have taken up. I certainly think that in a time of crisis when a Government ask for a dissolution—as they are quite justified in doing—those difficulties would be intensified if we had locally appointed Governors. I do not see why the position should be in the gift of any Government, whether Labour or Nationalist. If we are going to make a change, let us do without them altogether, and let the Chief Justice be the link between the Empire and ourselves rather than make the position the football of any party that may be in control of the Treasury benches.

The hon. member for Bowen spoke about invitations to Government House. I would like to see him at Government House. I am quite sure he would have red spats on. I would very much like to see the hon. member for Bowen in red spats and gloves and telling his valet to get out of his road. He could do it perfectly. He is becoming more conservative as he grows older. In a year or two he will not only frequently visit Government House but we shall see him a member of the Queensland Club.

Mr. COLLINS: Who is serious now?

Mr. TAYLOR: He has certainly been taking some lessons during the last few years as to how to go about the business. Getting back to the serious side, we have to consider whether it is going to be of benefit to the State to have locally appointed Governors instead of Imperial Governors. It is not going to be of any benefit whatever. Rather than see the link with the mother country severed we should strengthen that link, and at no time has that been more necessary than at the present time. We know that the old country is passing through a very critical period, and, notwithstanding that five State Premiers have agreed to local Governors, I sincerely hope that the request will not be granted. It has not been submitted to the people in the shape of a referendum, although the people are vitally interested in the matter. One hon. member stated that it had not been submitted to Parliament.

Mr. SWAYNE: There should be a referendum on the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the people by referendum signify their acceptance of the proposal to appoint Colonial Governors, then I would have no objection to it. At the same time I do think that the Government are making a retrogressive move in endeavouring to obtain the appointment of local Governors.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): It would be far better if hon. members opposite were to cast their jocular remarks to one side. I take it that this is a serious matter. I read out the plank of our platform which I have signed.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Have you read the plank on arbitration?

Mr. COLLINS: I know how the hon. member for Oxley was dealt with when he could not induce sufficient people to attend his public meeting at Bowen. While I have signed that platform I am not prevented from advocating, if I think right and proper, that the position of Governor should be abolished. As a member of an industrial association and as a member of a political organisation I have the right to have the question of the abolition of the position of State Governors placed on the agenda paper for consideration at our convention early next year: but, having signed the Labour platform and the wisdom of the party having declared in favour of local Governors, I must support that platform. For the information of the hon. member for Enoggera, I pointed out that the Governors would be recommended by the State Government, but he did not listen.

Let me now come to the argument that men in politics should not be appointed to the position. There will land in the course of a day or two, as Governor-General of Australia, Lord Stonehaven, who was created a peer after he was appointed to the position. Who is he? Hon. members opposite know as well as I do that he was one of the leading Tories in Great Britain, who in the House of Commons opposed every reform in the interests of the mass of the people. He can hold the scales

of justice as between parties without any effort at all, but I know which way the scales will go. Somewhat on the lines that I used to hear of in the days of my youth, when it was put in these words—"The rich man always gets the balance of the scales." I take it that Lord Stonehaven—this genius from the United Kingdom—has no bias in politics at all. Oh, no! His votes in the House of Commons will show that. I took the trouble to look them up not so long ago. Of course, he is fit to be Governor-General of this great Commonwealth, associated as he has been all his life with the Conservative party of Great Britain. When we propose the appointment of a local Governor who might be drawn from this or the opposite side of the Chamber, we are told that he would not be able to deal with a crisis such as the hon. member for Mirani mentioned. I suppose that the local man would bolt from a crisis. I have not seen an imported man bolt from a crisis, and I take it that the local man would stand up to it just as well as the imported man. No matter whether hon. members opposite agree with me or not, the time will come when Governors will be abolished, and the duties as suggested by the hon. member for Windsor could be carried out by the Chief Justice. After all, we are moving in the right direction, and perhaps after the next Labour Convention we may have in the State Labour platform a plank for the abolition of State Governors. We know that a vote was taken in the Conservative Victorian Legislative Assembly a few weeks ago on the question of the abolition of imported Governors, and it was only defeated by two votes. I am pleased that I raised the question, because as a result we have got a lot of information from the Premier.

Item (His Excellency the Governor) agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

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

"That £110 be granted for 'Executive Council.'"

Item agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

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

"That £23,255 be granted for 'Legislative Assembly.'"

There have been increases in salaries amounting to £1,468 and decreases amounting to £925, leaving a net increase in the vote of £543.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I beg to move—

"That the vote be reduced by £1."

I do so as a protest against the manner in which Parliament has been debased by this Government. Throughout the English-speaking world it is generally recognised that a Parliament elected by a free people is the greatest palladium of popular liberty that the world has ever given us. What has Parliament deteriorated to in Queensland? As year follows year we find that the powers of Parliament are being more and more restricted. Only quite recently we found during a great crisis in Queensland, when its principal means of communication—in which something like £55,000,000 of the people's money are invested—was closed, all work was stopped, the highroads of the State were taken possession of, and in certain parts of Queensland the people were threatened with starvation simply because there was a dispute between the Government and a section of their employees. If ever there was a time when Parliament should have been sitting to deal with the question, it was then.

The PREMIER: What should Parliament have done?

Mr. SWAYNE: Parliament was debased into a nonentity. Each member, representing between 5,000 or 10,000 voters, was denied an opportunity of inquiring whether the Government were upholding their position as a Government or discussing the best method of dealing with the position, and whether they were going to secure for the people the full exercise of their rights. That was a very recent happening. One of the most serious reflections as to the right of the people's representatives to decide these public questions was contained in an utterance by the Premier the other day. We know that for years past a stand has been adopted—nominally by hon. members opposite and in actuality by hon. members on this side of the Chamber—to the effect that arbitration was the proper means of settling all disputes between employer and employee in Queensland. The happenings to which I have referred had a very serious bearing on that principle, and there is a general demand throughout the country for a clear declaration from the Government as to whether arbitration or direct action is to be the method of settling those disputes. The Premier has found himself up against it on that point, and now he says that it will be for the next Labour Convention, held at Rockhampton or elsewhere, to decide.

The PREMIER: You know you have always been opposed to arbitration.

Mr. SWAYNE: Was there ever such a pitiful resignation and abnegation of authority on the part of anyone in his position as that exhibited by the gentleman who stands at present as the ruler of Queensland? The hon. gentleman does not say this is a question upon which Parliament, representing the people as a whole, should decide. He says that the question will be settled at some convention attended by the representatives of employees only. That convention will represent only one section of the community, and that not always the most enterprising or industrious section. They will decide as to whether the great principle of arbitration shall be upheld or not. If our Parliament is not to deal with great questions like that, what is the use of having a Parliament at all?

Bodies such as I have referred to have been given the privilege of breaking the law whenever they like. The Premier must know that these strikes—particularly the last big one—have nearly all broken section 65 of the Industrial Arbitration Act. Yet these men can do such things with impunity. Once the principle is admitted that one section is at liberty to break the laws of the country, the thing will never stop. Every individual will claim the right to break the law. As an abstract question of justice that cannot be denied.

I am an old member of this House, and, when I contrast the old liberty of speech and freedom of debate that obtained in this House years ago——

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes, in 1912, 1913, and 1914.

Mr. SWAYNE: With that which exists now, it is borne home to me what very mild words I use when I say that Parliament is debased. There is frequently no opportunity at present to discuss important questions. Only the other day we had before us the question of the basic wage—a matter which vitally concerns our industries.

The position we are in at the present time in regard to industries requires the closest scrutiny and the most careful consideration; yet a law which vitally affects our industries was put through all its stages under the "gag" in one day. That shows how farcical Parliament has become. A few sessions ago we had the principle of vot-
[5 p.m.] ing by proxy introduced, thereby doing away with the representative character of Parliament. Only a short time ago we were "gagged" on forty-one occasions in one session, on several occasions without any debate at all. In Committee sometimes the "gag" was applied before any opportunity was afforded to move amendments, and some of the unjust laws on the statute-book have been passed because no opportunity was given for free discussion by the elected representatives of the people. That is not parliamentary government. During the session I am referring to the Unemployed Workers' Insurance Bill and the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Bill which provided for proxy voting were rushed through the Committee without discussion, yet they contained big principles affecting the vital interests of the people of Queensland. For the sake of cutting down the time that Parliaments sits by a few weeks is it worth while so to limit the time that such questions cannot be discussed properly? We know that under the present Administration Parliament never sits for longer than ten or fifteen weeks; yet, when hon. members opposite were on this side of the Chamber, they used to urge vehemently that five months at least were requisite to discuss the business of the people of Queensland. We know that the present Government have engaged in additional undertakings, therefore the business of the Government has increased two or threefold; yet the time for discussion has been reduced. Again, if there is one principle in connection with British Parliaments more than another that has been insisted on in the past it is the right of the representatives of the people to decide what the taxation shall be, and also as to how that taxation shall be expended. I have figures showing that during the past five years huge sums of money have been passed without discussion. Altogether the sum which has been passed without discussion amounts to something like £60,000,000, and it is most significant that the votes that are most open to criticism are put through year after year, under the conduct of the present Government, without discussion at all. How long is it since we have had an opportunity of discussing State enterprises? For five years we have not had a full discussion on them; and we all know what huge sums have been lost, and what strange questions have arisen in connection with the various undertakings. Again, I think I am safe in saying that during the past five years the railways have only been discussed twice, and I am justified in saying that the present position of the railways, which anyone can see is unsatisfactory, is largely owing to the lack of parliamentary criticism.

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*): This vote contains an item of £1,105 for the Parliamentary Library. I congratulate the Government on making tardy recognition of the services of the librarian by giving him an advance in salary. From inquiries made some time ago I understand that we have in the library about 60,000 volumes. I am not a voracious devourer of the works in the library; in fact, I cannot claim that I am even an active peruser of them. My experience of sixteen years of political life has shown that I read more seriously and widely before I came into Parliament than I have read since. I think the Parliamentary Librarian in the past has been most miserably paid. When we consider that a man occupying a purely routine office like that of Town Clerk of the Greater Brisbane Council is paid £1,500 a year and the Assistant Clerk gets £800 a year, it seems to me that the amount set down for the Parliamentary Librarian is a miserable recompense to give to one who is the most up-to-date man in this line with whom I have come in contact. My experience in Parliament has shown that our librarian is a walking encyclopædia. (Hear, hear!) If one wants a work on a particular subject, he has only to go to Mr. Murray, who can put his hand at once on the particular book which will supply the information required. I think the salary given is not a due recognition of the services of a man of Mr. Murray's ability. It is true that his salary has been advanced above that of a member of Parliament—and personally I do not complain, because members of Parliation have made themselves very cheap. When they reduce themselves to the despicable position of taking 5s. a week off a man earning £4 5s. a week, they do not deserve to be paid any more than £500 a year.

Mr. CLAYTON: The Labour Government did it.

Mr. FERRICKS: Parliament did it. (Opposition dissent.) Members of Parliament reduced themselves then to that level. If their services are not widely recognised, it is their own fault. The reason why I rose to speak was not to draw attention to that despicable act of Parliament, but to complain once more about what I consider the unfair conditions hon. members are subject to if they want to refer to books of reference or parliamentary records of other States or the Commonwealth or of the other Dominions. Strange as it may seem, the records of the Commonwealth Parliament—"Hansard," books of reference, and everything else in connection with the Commonwealth Parliament—are placed on the same plane as those of South Africa, Canada, and New Zealand. The Commonwealth records are foreign to us! It is no fault of the librarian or his assistants, but you cannot get what you want unless you dig amongst the records of the other Dominions. We are part of Australia. Why this little narrow parochial jealousy against the Commonwealth? Considering that we have a Chamber which housed an extinct House of Parliament at the other end of this building, could not the Commonwealth records be housed there, where they would be accessible to members? You have to go up into what is really an attic and get smothered in dust to get hold of "Hansard" or a book of reference which happens to be a Commonwealth record. This parochialism has been rampant in this Parliament so long that it is about time that

we cut out this petty little jealousy of the Commonwealth Parliament. I appeal to you, Mr. Gledson, and I ask you to bring before Mr. Speaker the advisableness of transferring the Commonwealth records to a place where they will be accessible to members instead of at the far end of the top passage of this building. I do not think that it is fair to the Commonwealth or to Queensland.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I would like to support the contention of the hon. member for Mirani and his amendment as a protest against the action which the Government have taken on so many occasions of departing seriously from the fundamental principle of freedom of speech under a system of a democratic Parliament—a departure which is likely to lead us into very serious trouble before many years are past. From the time of King John and Magna Charta the people have looked forward to the ideal of a free institution with representatives of all the people in the community, each of whom could exercise his voice in the interests of the section he represented free and unhammelled, protected by privileges which nobody else enjoyed, so that his speech could not be open to question even in the courts of law. They realised that their eventual aim was the good government of all the people, particularly—as my friend the hon. member for Bowen would say—in the interests of the common people. Unfortunately to-day a system has been introduced which largely by use and eventually by abuse has departed very seriously from that principle. No doubt when the closure was introduced into the Standing Orders it was necessary to curtail eight or ten hour speeches, which undoubtedly constituted undue obstruction. Nobody will deny that undue obstruction did take place, and it was not in the interests of any one that it should continue.

No one in his wildest dreams ever imagined that an instrument for good would be used to close down discussion without even one member having an opportunity of speaking. No one would have imagined that the instrument would have been used for altering the arbitration system in a few hours without reasonable discussion on such an important measure. We have abused a valuable instrument. As surely as night follows day, if Parliament loses respect for itself, then so surely will the people consider their views and substitute something in its place.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You helped to disgrace it.

Mr. SIZER: I presume the hon. member is referring to my suspension. I have no regrets on that point for the reason that drastic diseases require drastic remedies. If a member who desires to speak is prevented from speaking and he protests, then he should be prepared to carry the penalty. I was prepared to carry the penalty placed on me.

Mr. BRUCE: You did not carry the penalty; you were here all the evening.

Mr. SIZER: I took the penalty.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: No, you did not.

Mr. BRUCE: You hung round the House all night.

Mr. SIZER: If hon. members opposite are prepared in the name of liberty and freedom of speech so to debase an institution of this great Empire, then they are unworthy of the traditions of the party to which they belong and the people from whom they have descended. It is not right that we should carry on a sham of a system, and I say that this is a sham of a system. If this place is to be used to record the results of Labour conventions, union meetings, and caucuses, then it becomes only a sham, and it is just as well to recognise the fact and to consider whether this utility is here in the interests of the people or the interests of ourselves. If we are to be ruled by one man, then it is time that the public decided on the question. I for one will always rebel against being ruled by one man, particularly when that man's views would not coincide with the views of a majority of the House if expressed by an open vote. Such a system cannot be justified by hon. members opposite or anyone else. Unless we are free to discuss matters in the interests of the State, we are not functioning as we are supposed to function, and we are departing from the grand principles upon which Parliament was established. I want to emphasise that the application of the closure in this Chamber has been a disgrace. On a number of occasions it has been applied when not one hon. member has had the opportunity of speaking, and that calls for the strongest condemnation possible from those who are in control. As sure as I am standing here to-day, unless we are prepared to uphold the dignity of Parliament and observe its privileges it will be taken from us, and we shall have only ourselves to blame.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I intend to support the motion moved by the hon. member for Mirani. It is a travesty on common sense to call this Chamber under socialistic rule a deliberative body. There is no consideration of Bills which hon. members consider should be placed on the statute-book. Parliament is an institution with the highest authority in the land, and it is something that the people look to for control; but it is regrettable that it has been displaced by a section of hon. members opposite in caucus, who do not represent either the majority of the electors or even the majority of the Government party. The position is that about one-quarter of the members of Parliament control this institution.

I mentioned at a previous stage that this Chamber merely recorded the views of the majority of the caucus. We have reached a stage when hon. members opposite have ceased to think of the people outside. They only think of themselves, and all others are whipped into line by the use of the word "scab." Hon. members opposite have said that they have the unionists of Queensland behind them. That is a deliberate misstatement. There would be hardly a member on this side of the Committee if we did not have a number of the right-thinking unionists behind us. As a community, we are entitled to our freedom of thought and our method of expressing our thoughts to the people through Parliament. The intelligent unionists stand for constitutional government, which is something that is not represented by hon. members who are in charge of the government of this great State. Only the briefest and most inadequate explanations are given when Bills are introduced. I can quote instances when misleading particulars of the contents of Bills have been given not only to the Opposition but

to the people outside. Hon. members have been deprived of the right to introduce private Bills. What opportunity have the Opposition, representing 50 per cent. or more of the people, of introducing private Bills and obtaining the deliberate consideration of this Chamber upon them? I have a motion on the business paper dealing with the inadequate housing of the people, especially in the metropolitan area, where two or three families live in one house. This was a condition of affairs almost unheard of prior to the advent of this socialistic Government. By the action of the Government that motion has been swept aside, and hon. members will not have an opportunity of expressing themselves upon it. That shows that it is necessary that some action should be taken. That is why we say that it is a travesty of common sense to say that this Chamber is a place where evils existing in the State may be remedied, and an opportunity afforded hon. members of placing remedial legislation on the statute-book.

Mr. BRUCE: You happen to be in the minority, that is all.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows that is not correct.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If that is not correct, why are you not over here?

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the electorates were juggled.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KERR: Hon. members on this side represent a larger number of voters than hon. members opposite, and one vote should be of equal value with another. I have explained why I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mirani. The work done by this Parliament has not increased, yet we have increased the salaries by appointing a greater number of Ministers. Why have the people to pay for the upkeep of additional Ministers?

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

Mr. KERR: I am dealing with the vote for the "Legislative Assembly," and giving my reasons for supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mirani. In 1915 we had eight Ministers, and now we have ten.

Mr. COLLINS: We could well do with a dozen.

Mr. KERR: If we had forty Ministers, the hon. member would not be one of them; he is in his proper place. In Western Australia, where the representatives have large electorates, they have reduced the number of Ministers from eight to six. When we take into consideration the cost of elections, Royal Commissions, and the cost of parliamentary government—which I have said is a travesty of common sense—the upkeep of Parliament has increased more per capita in this State than in any other State in Australia.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Absolute rot.

Mr. KERR: I shall prove that. Although we are paying such large sums of money we are not getting the efficiency that is desirable. The hon. member for Mirani has moved his amendment for that reason. Here are the figures showing the increase per capita from 1914 to 1925 for the maintenance of the Legislative Assemblies in the various States—

New South Wales ...	... No alteration.
Victoria	... 2d.
Queensland	... 1s.
South Australia	... 8d.
West Australia	... 6d.
Tasmania	... 10d.

We are passing considerable sums of money for the maintenance of this institution, and it is time we started economising, ascertained where the money is going, and endeavoured to secure greater results from this institution than are being secured to-day. We could also do very well with a reduction in the number of members.

The PREMIER: We could very well do without the Opposition.

At 5.31 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. KERR: Although members opposite think they could do without the Opposition under existing circumstances, there is no doubt that the Opposition have kept them in check day in and day out. The Premier could do without some of his own members very well. The late Premier did without some of his supporters when he introduced proxy voting. If there was no Opposition in this House, God knows where the country would get to. Ministers themselves know that they have to consider what the Opposition will point out to the people in the country. We are leaders in thought in a sense—I will exclude myself, if necessary. (Government laughter.) We represent as large a number of people as the Government. Parliament is a travesty under existing conditions. This Chamber has become merely a recording Chamber for the various strike committees and for caucus, and does not represent the true ideals of our great State. The hon. member for Mirani, like myself, has been stopped by the "gag" many times as well as by other methods adopted in this House, and opportunities have been taken away from us until to-day we have to seek devious ways of discussing certain things which we know perfectly will be for the benefit of this country. If the hon. member for Bowen agrees with free speech, I hope that he will give his wholehearted support to the amendment, and assist to make this Chamber something more in accord with the requirements and desires of the people of Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): When the vote is taken, the hon. member for Enoggera will know where the hon. member for Bowen stands. I admit that there is a difference to-day as compared with the past. In the past we had practically a committee of the employers or of the capitalist class sitting on this side of the Chamber to register what laws should be placed on the statute-book. I am willing to admit that to some extent things are changed now, and, instead of a committee of the Employers' Federation sitting on this side, there is a committee of the working-class movement sitting here, and we are placing on the statute-books laws that are in the interests of the mass of the people. I know something about the time of King John, to whom the hon. member for Sandgate referred, and also Magna Charta, and so forth. We all know that for a long time in the old country a few nobles went to make up the House of Commons and the House of

Lords. We all know that people had to fight desperately to get the franchise to enable them to send representatives to the House of Commons, and even to send representatives into this Legislative Assembly.

I want to say something in reference to the vote for "'Hansard' and other printing, Telegrams, Stationery, etc." I notice that the vote this year is reduced by £1,000, and I would like some explanation of the reduction. Hon. members will remember that for a number of years I have been advocating—and shall continue to advocate until I see it realised—that "Hansard" be made free to all persons who make application for it.

We were told by the hon. member for Sandgate that hon. members of this House do not receive the respect which is due to their position. I am one of those who blame the Press for that, especially the Conservative Press, which has been continually sneering and jeering at members of Parliament for a number of years past. I am anxious that the great public should know what is said and done in Parliament. Quite apart from the passing of laws Parliament should be used for the moulding of public opinion. If hon. members would express ideas in this Chamber which would be for the betterment of the State and Commonwealth and for the general welfare of the people, it would be better for all concerned.

The hon. member for Sandgate complained about the restriction of privileges in Parliament through the action of the "gag" from time to time. We on this side are not responsible for the "gag," which was in existence long before we took possession of the Treasury benches: and, if the "gag" is applied from time to time, hon. members opposite have only to thank themselves for it, because they first introduced the "gag." Long before the working classes took possession of the Treasury benches in any country of the world the "gag" was in existence.

I notice that there is an item of £550 for "Library Books, Binding, and Periodicals." I do not think that is an adequate amount for a parliamentary library such as we ought to have. In these days £550 does not go very far in the purchase of new books, and Parliament should be quite up to date with modern thought and with the development in politics and science in different countries so that hon. members will be well informed when they speak in debate. As I said before, we may be able to use Parliament, not only as a law-making machine, but also as a means of propaganda and of educating the great public outside.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): The moving of the amendment by the hon. member for Mirani is perfectly justified for the arguments adduced by himself and the hon. member for Enoggera. During the debate the Secretary for Public Works said, by way of interjection, that the "gag" was introduced by the party supported by hon. members on this side, and that we never anticipated that it would swing back on ourselves in the way it has done. During their occupancy of the Opposition benches hon. members opposite found fault with the application of the closure and the treatment they were subjected to by hon. members now sitting on this side. They talked about the disgraceful proceedings which took place through the introduction of the "gag." We now see their inconsistency in perpetuating something which they themselves believed to be unjust and wrong. But they went further than that, and introduced proxy voting. For this and for the absolute loss of control of the State by gentlemen opposite during that unfortunate week we passed through—goodness knows that is serious enough—the hon. member for Mirani would be perfectly justified in moving his amendment.

I quite agree with the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for South Brisbane as to the librarian and the excellence of his work and the small amount of money he receives. He is courteous and does his very best to assist hon. members, be they on this side of the Chamber or be they on the other side. It is my experience that, if you are to keep a faithful man, you must pay him, and it is nearly time that the Government recognised Mr. Murray's ability.

I am very pleased to notice that the services of our reporting staff have been recognised. I sincerely hope that the Government will recognise that they are working these men thirteen hours a day for a fortnight or perhaps longer.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You try their patience pretty often.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not alone, but to me it is wonderful how they grasp the meaning of what a member says, even at times of the remarks of the Premier.

We have heard a lot about expenses, and I would just like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that, notwithstanding the size of our expenditure, notwithstanding the weight of taxation which the people have to bear, there is no evidence of any attempt on the part of Ministers to curtail their own expenses. From the return which has been laid on the table I find that they total the marvellous sum of £6,100.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: If I cannot touch upon that, I shall content myself with asking Ministers to try to reduce the burden of taxation which the people have to bear.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I support the amendment. For some years it has been very apparent that the evils of the party system have become prevalent throughout Australia and especially in Queensland, and have not made for the good government of the country or for the improvement of the social and industrial conditions of the people. Unfortunately the wishes of the people are not ventilated by a Government composed as this one is of Labour representatives. Unfortunately the true sentiment of the electors—although perhaps expressed at caucus meetings—are not reflected in a vote on any Bill or other matter in Parliament. It is a majority of the Government party, not a majority of members of the House, who decide each issue. In many instances a member opposite might agree with members on this side on matters affecting industry and the conditions of the people, whether in a city or in a country electorate; but a vote from such a member in supporting our views is denied because of the hidebound conditions that obtain under the unfortunate party system brought about by Labour in politics. To some extent party politics may have advantages, but the extent to which party politics has developed and the party system has operated in Queensland for a

number of years has been the means of destroying the value that this Chamber might have been to the State.

The PREMIER: The Opposition are responsible for that. They have wasted time.

Mr. CORSER: The Opposition cannot be responsible for the actions of the Government or of caucus. The Premier knows that on two or three occasions recently he asked the House to adjourn and not sit at all. The Government should not push aside any matter of grave importance merely because they do not desire to sit. We have the whole year in which to do our business, and the Premier cannot blame the Opposition for wasting time. I agree that Parliament has, to a very great extent, lost its value as a deliberative body. It is unfortunate, nevertheless it is true, that Parliament has lost that value, and, if the Premier at the opening of Parliament were to introduce his programme and hand over all his proposed Bills to the Clerk of the Parliament, then the work could be completed in a few hours and the expense of conducting Parliament would be saved. We could pay members of Parliament for attendance for one day, and then they could return to their electorates and carry out their individual work. It would be better to do that than to pull the country's leg by coming here and claiming that we are debating Bills. The Premier must agree that he pulls the people's legs when he comes here with a Bill and asks us to debate it. The matter has already been decided by caucus, and hon. members opposite are bound to support the Bill whether they like it or not. The wishes of the people and their representatives are not considered at all, but the whip cracks, and Government members are bound to vote along the lines planned for them. They have lost their individuality and freedom of speech within their own party. The amendment is a protest against the system built up by "Labour in politics." I protest against the system because I do not know where it is going to lead us. An illustration of the futility of Parliament as at present conducted was given during the recent strike. It was then made clear that outside this Parliament there is another body which is the controlling authority, controlling the wishes of the elected members of Parliament on the Government side. That is the body which is really governing the country to-day, but its members are not being paid as members of Parliament. Thank God the Labour party's term is nearly at an end. The Government should be honest with the people and say, "We are going to carry these Bills through all in one day, and only charge the country for the attendance of members of Parliament, who are here pretending to be representing their interests, for one day." The Government are dominated by a machine and by a section of the people who control the whole of the organisation of hon. members opposite without one thought for the good of the whole of the people, and without a single consideration of what is best in the interests of the State in which we live.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): Before speaking to the amendment I would like to record my appreciation of the work of the officers of Parliament—those within the Chamber itself, the officers of the library, and also the members of the "Hansard" staff. We are indebted to those officers for the efficiency they display. It is true that, if the present occupants of the various offices were not there, someone else would be in their place and the positions maintained; but those who now fill the positions deserve the appreciation and congratulations of every hon. member for the efficiency with which they carry out the tasks allotted to them. It sometimes seems to me that the "Hansard" staff are possessed of something like superhuman ability for the manner in which they record some of the speeches which are delivered on many subjects at a great rate of speed. They labour all day long, and very frequently there are but few errors in their reports. As the hon. member for South Brisbane said, when we ask the librarian for an authority on a particular subject within a very short time Mr. Murray will produce the most up-to-date authority available in the library. It is good that we should have such officers. I do not wish to make the officers on the floor of the House blush, but I say without any fear of contradiction that nearly every Minister is indebted to Mr. Bernays and his assistants for the efficient manner in which they perform their parliamentary duties. (Hear, hear!)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are the most efficient staff in Australia.

Mr. FRY: Very frequently Ministers have claimed the credit for something which only interested them for the moment and which was poked into their left ear by an officer. I have heard some things going on at the table when Chairmen of Committees have been prompted on some point.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! Do I understand the hon. member to say that he has heard things whispered into the ear of the Chairmen on points which arose in a discussion?

Mr. FRY: What I said was that questions sometimes arise on which Chairmen of Committees have been in doubt, and they have referred to the Clerk of the Parliament. (Government members dissent.) Do the various hon. members who have passed through that chair deny that what I have said is correct? Why these mock heroics?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why?

Mr. FRY: The hon. gentleman has said that it is disorderly to interject, but he interjects more than any other hon. member on the Government benches. The hon. gentleman served for a period as Chairman of Committees, and he knows what I have said to be correct, and every hon. member in the Chamber knows it to be correct. I know that what I say is perfectly correct, and great credit is due to the officers of this Parliament for the way the ceremonial and administrative part of our business is carried out.

Referring to the amendment, the hon. member for Bowen set himself out to say that his Government were not responsible for the "gag." They may not have been responsible for the introduction of the "gag," but it must be borne in mind that some years ago an hon. member could stand up in this Chamber and talk for two or three days. It was the boast of some hon. members that they spoke for twelve and thirteen hours. Hon. members opposite have gradually whittled away that privilege; and those who claim to be the apostles of free speech now make it impossible for an hon. member to speak his allotted time, if he so desires.

I refer particularly to those who speak on the Address in Reply. I notice that thirty-eight members spoke on the Address in Reply, when the time expired. If another hon. member desired to speak, he was unable to do so because of the expiration of time. In face of that we have hon. members opposite supporting the "gag," and saying that hon. members on this side were responsible for the introduction of the "gag." In all probability the hon. member for Bowen will contend that the man who introduced the razor is responsible for any harm done by the razor. The man who introduces a thing is not responsible for the manner in which it is used. The "gag" in the hands of a wise person or a wise Administration might be useful; but in the hands of a fool or an autocrat—a person who will vent his spleen on others—it may be a very dangerous thing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that a discussion on the principles of the application of the "gag" will not be in order. The Speaker and the Chairman of Committees are, by the Standing Order, appointed the judges of whether a question has been sufficiently debated, and any discussion after the closure has been applied is a reflection on those officials. Unless there is a direct motion that the ruling of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees be disallowed, I cannot permit a discussion upon that question.

Mr. FRY: I thank you for your explanation, Mr. Pollock. We see from the business-sheet of to-day how this Assembly is acting. It prevents the discussion of this motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Enoggera—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to amend the Act dealing with workers' dwellings by substantially liberalising the total deposit consideration and in other particulars. Further, that this is necessary because of the present house shortage and the inadequate housing, having in mind that it is one of the foremost requirements of every family to own their own home."

That has been wiped out by the curtailment of private members' day, but on the same paper we have this motion, which is in the charge of an hon. member on the other side, the hon. member for Merthyr, and is coming before Parliament for discussion.

> "Consideration in Committee of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Bank of New South Wales Act Amendment Act of 1864, and for other incidental purposes."

[7.0 p.m.]

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I am pleased to note that the librarian has received some consideration. It would be difficult indeed to find a more faithful servant or one more capable to fulfil his duties than Mr. Murray. We never appeal to him in vain, and in serving members of Parliament who, in turn, are servants of the country, he is serving the country in a very wide sense.

What I have said in regard to the librarian applies to the extraordinary fine servants we have in the reporting staff. Whilst members of Parliament are very much concerned indeed that they should be faithfully reported, it seems to me that the outside people, too, who are extremely anxious in these days for the fullest information, are rendered faithful service as a result of the accurate reports given to them of the speeches made by hon. members. At times the order in the House is not as good as it might be—I am very pleased that you, Mr. Pollock, are making a very fine attempt to improve matters—one wonders how so faithful a report is given by the reporters in the gallery. I am glad, therefore, that their services have been acknowledged. I suppose some explanation may be forthcoming in regard to the saving in the item, "'Hansard' and other Printing, Telegrams, Stationery, etc." I notice that there is a reduction of £1,000 in this item, which rather more than covers the extra emoluments that the officers are receiving.

I think members of this Committee should make a strong protest in regard to the way in which Bills——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I thought that I would be in order at this juncture, as we are dealing with the vote for the Legislative Assembly, in stating that insufficient time is given to the consideration of Bills. In that respect members are served with scant courtesy. Very frequently Bills are thrown down one on top of the other, and hon. members find that they have scarcely time to scan them. Very frequently, too, the Bills introduced are amendments of Acts, and it is a matter not only of reading the Bills but of referring to those Acts in order to be rightly informed in regard to them, and naturally there is some justification for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Mackay. The conduct of the proceedings of the Chamber and the efforts that are made in the direction of securing discipline meet with my full approval. I have no objection to make so long as fairness is meted out evenly and impartially, and I think that is the case with regard to the present Speaker and Chairman.

* Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): The hon. member for Enoggera referred to the fact that under the present caucus system the freedom of action of hon. members is interfered with. When an hon. member is elected he should come here with a free hand, apart from any pledges he may have made in regard to the party platform he is supporting, to do what he thinks is right and just in the interests of his electors; but, owing to the extreme length to which the caucus system has gone on the Government side, that is not the case. Slightly over one-fourth of the members of the House when party numbers are very close can predominate over the whole. Take the present position of parties in illustration of this. There are forty-three members on the Government side, who can be divided into twenty-two and twenty-one, and under the system in operation the twenty-two can entirely control the whole House. The twenty-one may hold different opinions to the twenty-two, but when the matter is settled in caucus they come into the House tied down to the opinions of the twenty-two. The twenty-nine Opposition members may be perfectly in accord with the views of the twenty-one members referred to, but the latter having first been overruled by the twenty-two members in caucus have to abide by the decision arrived at outside Parliament; so that, under the extreme party system now in vogue, it

is quite possible for the twenty-two members referred to to control the other fifty members. I do not think the electors realise to what extent the party system has gone. In my opinion every man should come to Parliament free to do what he thinks is right and just according to his own conscience and in the interests of those he represents. I know that under the party system such a state of things has not prevailed for many generations in any Parliament, but I consider that the extreme caucus system which obtains on the Government side, by which all the members of the party are obliged to abide by the decision arrived at by the majority in caucus, is subversive of the best interests of the people they represent, and the worst example we have yet had. It may be said that we on this side also have a Caucus, but we have not the same cast iron pledge which obtains with hon. members opposite. During my parliamentary life I can recall many instances when members belonging to the Liberal party or Country party have exercised their own discretion and voted against their party. Many instances have occurred when I have voted with hon. members opposite against my party, but I do not remember one single instance where, no matter what his opinions were, one hon. member opposite has voted against his party, although I happen to know cases in which members on the other side have thought their party was wrong. Carrying the party government system to such an extreme is wrong and not in the best interests of the people.

The way in which discussion has been "gagged" has also been mentioned. Without intending any reflection on the Chair, I should like to make an answer to those who say in reply, "You first passed the Standing Order which allowed the 'gag' to be applied." It did emanate from the old Liberal party, but I would like to point out that previously I have sat here for several hours listening to one speech, and I do think that some limit to that kind of thing was necessary. I think I am safe in saying, however, that neither the Nationalist nor the Country party would have thought of moving the "gag" until at any rate a question had been debated. We know that that practice has been followed over and over again by hon. members opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SWAYNE: I am speaking now of the leader of the House. Over and over again he has moved the motion and the question has been put without discussion, and I think that a practice like that makes efficient parliamentary deliberation impossible.

I am glad to know that during the discussion several references have been made to the way in which legislation has been rushed through without proper time for debate, and that contention is emphasised by the many cases which have come to light of defects in our laws caused through that practice. Formerly it did not matter so much. There was an Upper House—A House of Review—and the number of mistakes we have discovered in recent legislation would justify the reinstitution of the Upper House as a House of Review. Seeing there is only one Chamber and that the whole responsibility for making laws at present devolves upon us, it is all the more iniquitous that legislation should be rushed through without proper discussion. Nor do I think that our interests should be sacrificed to party interests in the Commonwealth arena. To-day we have commenced doing two days in one, or eight days' work in four. That is not conducive to a proper consideration of the various questions which crop up in the House or in Committee. Furthermore, although they are called double days, they are not such days as we had when Parliament commenced daylight sittings. At the beginning of the session we sat from 10.30 a.m. till 5.30 p.m., with an hour interval, making seven hours in all. Now, we commence at 10.30 a.m. and the first "day" ends at 4 o'clock, with an interval of one hour, or five and a-half hours in all. After 4 o'clock, for our second day we sit till 10 with another hour's interval, or five hours altogether—a shortening of each day. The people of Queensland must realise that Parliament under those conditions is not functioning in the best manner or giving the best results to which they are entitled, and which are absolutely necessary if our laws are to be framed in a satisfactory manner and proper attention is given to the redress of injustices and wrongs. I think that I have been amply justified by the discussion in moving the amendment.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): When the present Premier decided to introduce day sittings he characterised night sittings as a barbarous method in which to conduct the business of the country. I do not know how he describes the method of sitting both during the day and night.

The PREMIER: You raised no objection at the time.

Mr. MOORE: We were in an unfortunate position. The Financial Statement was to be discussed, and we knew that after a certain time the closure was to be applied. If we had spent a considerable time objecting to the inclusion of two days in one we would have had to curtail our discussion on the Financial Statement. We had to choose the lesser of the two evils. It does not say that, because we neglected at that time to object, we necessarily agreed with the innovation. The Parliament of New South Wales has considered the business of Parliament more important than the Federal campaign and has refused to adjourn. Parliament should look after the business of the country, and no one can say that the business of the country is to be effectively carried out by sitting long hours and rushing legislation through in the way it has been rushed here.

I desire to refer to a statement in the "Daily Standard" which I think reflects on the characters of hon. members. I would like to know whether there is anything in the statement which is made. In reporting the proceedings of the Alderley branch of the Australian Labour party, it says—

> "A motion was carried that any commission received by members of Parliament for negotiating loans for the country be donated to the fighting funds of the party."

There must be some reason for a motion like that being passed by an Australian Labour party.

The PREMIER: What reason do you suggest?

Mr. MOORE: I suppose they have some inside knowledge that commission has been

received by certain members of Parliament, and it has been put to other use.

Mr. COLLINS: Innuendo again.

Mr. MOORE: Is there any innuendo in a direct statement published in Labour's official organ? I know nothing about these commissions, and, when I see a statement like that published in a paper, I presume that the Australian Labour party has some inside knowledge which induces it to pass such a motion.

Mr. FOLEY: There must be a few "white ants" in that Australian Labour party.

Mr. MOORE: Evidently the Alderley branch has a pretty wide and extensive knowledge of Labour organisations.

Mr. LLOYD: It is a bogus Australian Labour party.

Mr. MOORE: This was published in the "Daily Standard," which has the Labour badge at the top of the publication. It is recognised by the Queensland Central Executive. The report goes on to state—

> "A letter from the Queensland Central Executive requesting all members of Australian Labour party branches to sign pledges declaring that they are not members of the Communistic party was dealt with, and it was resolved, 'Recognising that all pledges previously signed are treated as scraps of paper, members of this branch have no objection to signing a pledge relating to Communism, and will observe it in the same spirit as Parliamentarians observe pledges signed by them.'"

That is a rather extraordinary statement. We have had it stated here that members of Parliament have to sign certain pledges and they adopt a certain course irrespective of whether it coincides with their opinions or not. Here are have the Alderley branch of the Australian Labour party saying that they are prepared to keep the pledge in the same way as members of Parliament keep theirs. This is rather a drastic statement to come from a Labour organisation. It is just as well that members of other Australian Labour party branches should prove or refute such statements, which are of a most damaging character. I would like to have some statement from the Government as to where these commissions to members of Parliament have gone in the past, if they were not donated to the fighting funds. If any commissions were received, they should have been paid into the Treasury. This is a most definite statement, and is of such a damaging character that something should be said in refutation of it or some statement published in the Press to say that the branch was misinformed. When I go into my electorate, I may be asked what I have done with these commissions. If I say I did not receive any, my electors will want to know who has got my "cut." (Laughter.) As this statement appears in the official organ of the Labour party, some explanation is warranted before the vote goes through.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I do not consider the statements of the leader of the Opposition of any importance, but, if it will satisfy him, he can have my assurance that no commissions are paid to any member of this party in connection with the flotation of loans.

Mr. VOWLES: How do you know?

Question—That £23,254 only (*Mr. Swayne's amendment*) be granted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 17.

Mr. Barnes, G. P	Mr. Maxwell
,, Brand	,, Moore
,, Clayton	,, Morgan
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Elphinstone	,, Sizer
,, Kelso	,, Swayne
,, Kerr	,, Vowles
,, King	,, Warren
,, Logan	

Tellers: Mr. Kelso and Mr. Sizer.

NOES, 28.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Hanson
,, Bertram	,, Hynes
,, Bruce	,, Kirwan
,, Bulcock	,, Land
,, Carter	,, Larcombe
,, Collins	,, Llewelyn
,, Cooper, W.	,, Lloyd
,, Dash	,, Mullan
,, Farrell	,, Payne
,, Ferricks	,, Riordan
,, Foley	,, Smith
,, Gilday	,, Wellington
,, Gillies	,, Wilson
,, Gledson	,, Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Dash and Mr. Foley.

PAIRS

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnes, W. H.	Mr. Wright
,, Taylor	,, Conroy
,, Appel	,, Stopford
,, Deacon	,, Cooper, F. A.
,, Edwards	,, Hartley
,, Walker	,, Bedford

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): I see that on this vote there is an item "Empire Parliamentary Association—Contribution towards Cost of Publications—£100." This appeared on the Estimates for the first occasion last year, and you may remember, sir, that during the last session of Parliament we held a meeting in Parliament House and expressed the desire to form a branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, in connection with which this vote of £100 is for literature. I should be glad if the Premier would give us some information as to what has happened to that proposed branch of the association. Personally, as the ex-Premier, Mr. Theodore, did at the time, I attach quite a lot of importance to the formation of the branch in making a link in the various parliamentary associations throughout the Empire. Literature comes to hon. members regularly, and I for one would be glad to hear from the Premier whether anything has happened in that regard.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I assure hon. members that the matter has not been overlooked. Only a couple of days ago I discussed the matter with the Speaker, and it is proposed to call a meeting to carry the matter a stage further.

Item (Legislative Assembly) agreed to.

[7.30 p.m.]

PREMIER AND CHIEF SECRETARY—CHIEF OFFICE.

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

> "That £13,190 be granted for 'Chief Office—Premier and Chief Secretary's Department.'"

This vote shows an increase of £913, which is made up of increases in salaries.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I would like to draw the Premier's attention to the method of appointing justices of the peace through-

out the State. I represent a district where hundreds of new settlers are being placed on land adjacent to railway proposals running out 130 to 150 miles from Rannes and 60 from Monto, and in that large area naturally great inconveniences are suffered by settlers who wish to sign papers or make applications to the Agricultural Bank if there are no justices of the peace available throughout the area. It is only in exceptional circumstances that 100 new settlers are placed in an area within a few months, and it is impossible to meet their requirements in the matter of justices of the peace if the parliamentary representative is limited to nominating three men for appointment every quarter. It is claimed that three nominations a quarter are sufficient for the old electorates, but, when you have new territory being settled by new people, all requiring some attention in these matters, it is impossible to fulfil all requirements in that area as well as provide the necessities in the older districts if one is limited to three nominations a quarter. I find, too, that in some instances when I have nominated fifteen residents in this area through the Local Producers' Association only one of these has been appointed by the Chief Secretary's Department and possibly two have been appointed from older districts and towns where they are certainly not so urgently required, and, on top of that, there are probably three political appointments at the request of Labour organisation in the district. I want to protest against the hardship that these new settlers are enduring through the men I have nominated not being appointed, when we know that industrialists can have appointments made through the local Labour organisations in centres where there are enough justices of the peace already. I endeavoured to secure the assistance of the Secretary for Public Lands in this regard when he was acting as Chief Secretary, and on 6th July last I wrote to the Under Secretary, Chief Secretary's Department, in answer to a question as to whether I had any objection to two more nominees of the Labour organisation. From fifteen to eighteen nominations have been sent in from these new areas by local producers' associations, yet industrial organisations can nominate men from towns and have them appointed in a couple of weeks. This is my answer to the Chief Secretary's Department, and it is self-explanatory—

"The Under Secretary,
Chief Secretary's Department,
Brisbane.

"To-day I have yours of the 4th instant informing me that Mr. —— of —— has been recommended for appointment as a justice of the peace and asking if I have any objection.

"I do object for the reason that several L.P.A's in the Upper Burnett and Callide have asked me to nominate certain of their members. Many of these have been nominated by me months ago and not yet appointed. Some L.P.A.'s who wrote you direct were informed they must secure nomination through their State member. This is the treatment meted out to L.P.A.'s, and they naturally resent the preference given to political nominations similar to the one in question. I was not asked by your Department if I objected to the L.P.A. nominations.

"About two weeks ago I suggested to the Minister for Lands, who was at the time Acting Chief Secretary, that these L.P.A. nominees of the Callide and Upper Burnett be put through by the Government, as it was impossible for me to secure their appointment with my right as a private member limited to three each quarter. At the Minister's request I left a list of the nominations with him, expecting they are to put through this quarter. They are a natural corollary to the settlement and should be provided in the scheme.

"No doubt my reply to your question could not reach Brisbane before the appointment I am asking about is made. This has been done before. I oppose any nominations till the L.P.A. nominations are appointed. There were then and are now many in that area who have no J.P's within miles of them, and I am asking for assistance for them at the request of their L.P.A's.

"Yours faithfully,
"BERNARD H. CORSER."

At the last quarterly revision I secured three nominations, but unfortunately none of the names were put through. I would draw the attention of the Chief Secretary to the urgent necessity of granting this ordinary convenience to the settlers who have been placed in large numbers in the Upper Burnett. I ask that the assistance which these justices of the peace could give should be at once provided. The only nominations that have been submitted by me to the Chief Secretary's Department are from the local producers' associations in the area, and I naturally resent Labour nominees being appointed at the request of Labour organisers from time to time while the nominations of the settlers are pushed aside.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): Other hon. members on this side have a similar complaint to that made by the hon. member for Burnett. There was a case recently where a workers' political organisation in my electorate nominated no less than six men, and the whole six were appointed in one list, while the member of Parliament for the district is limited to three. The workers' political organisation—which is an insignificant institution—could nominate six men and get the appointments put through at one time. The local producers' association or the council endeavoured to nominate people, but their nominations were refused, and they were told that any nominations should come through the member for the district. That was a proper answer to give to the local producers' association or the district council, but why is not similar action taken in connection with Labour political organisations? I feel sure that, if the political organisations, independent of those supporting the Government party, made recommendation, they would be told that the nominations must come through the ordinary channel, but the workers' political organisations are not told that.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is no such body as a workers' political organisation now.

Mr. MORGAN: If the Labour party were not in power, and we had an organisation in connection with the Country party throughout the State, a complaint would be made if those organisations were allowed to

nominate indiscriminately, as the workers' political organisations are allowed to do. If hon. members opposite were sitting in opposition, they would object strenuously to the occurrence of such things.

I would also like to ask the Premier a question in regard to his expenses, particulars of which were tabled this session. His expenses were:—Allowances, £206; hotel expenses, £218; car hire and incidentals, £303; total, £728. I would like to know whether he drew an allowance over and above his salary and hotel expenses and motor-car hire when he was engaged in the electoral contest lately in New South Wales when he was assisting his brother as well as other Labour candidates. It is only right that hon. members should know. I am very pleased to know that after many years we have succeeded in getting an account of ministerial travelling expenses tabled each year. I do not care which party is in power, we have a right and the public have a right to know how much has been expended by Ministers in the discharge of their public duties, and those expenses ought to be audited by the Auditor-General, and, if members so desire, the vouchers should be placed on the table.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is a reflection on the Auditor-General.

Mr. MORGAN: It may be, but does he make a report on ministerial expenses?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Of course he does.

Mr. MORGAN: He does not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He does so.

Mr. MORGAN: Does he report to the House or to Ministers? I have not seen his report, and I have yet to learn that there is such a report in connection with these expenses. I quite agree that, when Ministers travel through the State they are entitled to hotel expenses legitimately incurred. We on this side recognise that, but those expenses should not be hidden from the taxpayers, who have to meet them. No Minister who has nothing to hide and has not received money "under the cush" need fear to expose the facts to the light of day.

Hon. W. BERTRAM: You know that the Auditor-General audits every account.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman knows anything about it any more than anybody else. He has a lot to say about these matters, but he is not in the chair, but is occupying the seat of an ordinary member, and he cannot now call me to order. Whether the Auditor-General examines these vouchers or not, I defy the hon. gentleman to show me where he has made reference to them in his report.

The PREMIER: There is no occasion to make reference to them.

Mr. MORGAN: What is the good of saying that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He made reference to the 1912 expenditure by the Denham Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: I have always been open-minded on these matters. If a Minister is drawing them legitimately, I have no objection to make; but we have a right to know just how they have been incurred, and in some cases—although we have not been able to prove it—we have had suspicions. No doubt when hon. members opposite were sitting over here, they were suspicious that the expenses in some instances were not legitimately incurred. I do not hold a brief for previous Ministers or say that they incurred only legitimate expenses. I know cases in which they did not, and I am sorry to have to say it; but simply because expenses were illegitimately incurred by previous Ministers that is no justification for hiding the expenses of Ministers of to-day, and the sooner we know definitely how and for what reason these expenses have been incurred the better it will be for all concerned. If the Premier drew expenses when he was electioneering in New South Wales it was an illegitimate use of public funds, and he ought to be made to refund the money.

A Minister who uses public funds for his own purpose or uses them for entertaining people who have no right to be entertained, or for paying a candidate's expenses which otherwise would have to be paid by his organisation, should be prosecuted, and, if necessary, treated as an ordinary criminal, for he is really a pickpocket taking money out of the coffers of the State, and is nothing more or less than a common criminal. I am pleased to say that the ex-Premier was the first Minister to disclose his expenses, and now that the system of disclosing ministerial expenses to Parliament each year has been instituted, I hope that it will continue for the future. Ministers have a right to travel into the country so that country people may interview them and so that Ministers may know the conditions under which country people live, and, when they are asked to disclose their expenses, there should be no desire to hide anything. The whole matter should be openly disclosed, and, if necessary, the vouchers should be laid on the table of the House so that hon. members can judge for themselves whether the expenditure has been justifiably incurred.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I sincerely hope that the time will arrive when the Ministers in their own interests, when asked in respect of their expenditure, will do what directors of companies do when requested by shareholders, and will place all their cards on the table. If they do that, they will not be open to suspicion.

The question of the appointment of justices of the peace has been mentioned. In that connection I desire to emphasise the remarks of the hon. member for Burnett. I speak rather feelingly on the subject because I have had the same experience as he has had. During the last session I had occasion to answer a letter sent to me by the Chief Secretary's Department asking if I had any objection to three persons being appointed to the commission of the peace. I replied asking the Chief Secretary for the name of the person or persons who had nominated them—I had an idea. I found that they had been nominated by the local Australian Labour party, and the Australian Labour party consisted of a gentleman named Joseph Silver Collings, who had been touring my electorate as a political organiser distributing political favours in the form of "I will appoint you a justice of the peace." The individual's chest began to swell out when he knew that he was to be placed in that very questionable position of honour. I knew only one of the

three persons nominated, and my reply to the department is on record. I could not say whether the gentleman I knew was mentally fit for the position, and I told the department so. The fact remains that certain nominations that were made by what are supposed to be non-political bodies in my district—I refer to the Local Producers' Associations—have been ignored. In certain towns where there is a changing population, and where a number of justices of the peace come and go, and where there is a scarcity of these gentlemen, such towns have not been honoured by the department.

I asked only recently why one very estimable person had not been put on the list, and I was informed that he had been placed in the background because three nominations had already been gazetted. When there are not sufficient justices of the peace in the district I do not see why, because a political organiser comes along and distributes political favours in one locality, the rest of the electors should be deprived of very necessary appointments. I never make a nomination unless I am asked, and invariably the request comes from an inspector of the State Insurance Department or some public officer in the district—usually a Crown Lands ranger—and the appointment is desired to serve remote centres of population where signatures are required to be witnessed. That hard-and-fast rule of appointing three justices of the peace should be overlooked when requests come from public officers and the nominees will serve the district. I trust that the little discussion we have had on this matter will bear fruit, and that all political nominations will come to hon. members in the ordinary course of affairs. Other appointments have, as a matter of courtesy, to come through the member, but in certain cases, if the Labour political organiser desires an appointment and a nomination comes from headquarters, it is honoured. The member is certainly asked whether he objects to the appointment, but I do not know if an hon. member has objected in such cases.

Mr. WARREN: I have objected, but they were appointed notwithstanding my objection.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I would like a little information on the custom which obtains with respect to the appointment of justices of the peace. I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Dalby. I, too, have been interested in knowing why certain names have been placed on the list of justices of the peace, because I understood that all nominations had to come through the member for the district. Nominations have come through me, but from time to time I have found that other nominations are received and dealt with by the Chief Secretary, and I have found on inquiry that invariably the nominees were supporters of the Labour party. There should be some rule, such as the hon. member for Dalby suggests, governing this matter.

Hon. W. BERTRAM: Has any nomination made by you been turned down?

Mr. SIZER: I have had some.

Mr. KELSO: I will not go so far as that, but the rule that all nominations should come through the member for the district should be observed.

Mr. ROBERTS: The Government made that rule themselves.

Mr. KELSO: It is certainly very embarrassing at times to discover that political appointments have been made to the list of justices of the peace.

Reference has been made to the travelling expenses of the Ministers. I cannot see what the Auditor-General does to check the expenses of Ministers. As an accountant I do not think that the Auditor-General would go into details when auditing the vouchers of the Ministers. I understand that these vouchers are initialled by the Under Secretary of the department. I would like to ask the Premier whether it is a fact that every Minister from the moment he leaves Brisbane draws two guineas a day travelling expenses in addition to hotel expenses and motor-car hire?

Mr. CORSER: That is right. I assure you it is. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: The Minister ought to do me the courtesy of answering my question so that it may be on record.

The PREMIER: Your "Whip" has replied. As a member of the Public Works Commission, he draws his two guineas a day.

Mr. CORSER: And pays his way out of it.

Mr. KELSO: The members of the Public Works Commission are appointed for a certain specific purpose, and they draw two guineas a day while they are engaged on that specific work. I take it that every Minister of the Crown is paid £1,000 a year for the work he does during the year. I say deliberately that, if every Minister draws two guineas a day when he leaves Brisbane, in addition to motor-car hire and incidental expenses, then he is paid unlawfully. He has no right to such money unless it is granted by Parliament. It would be all very well if a list of expenses incurred were made out and ratified by Parliament. It is just adding a little more to what we have to put up with each session.

It would be very interesting if the Premier would answer that little question about the Northern Rivers trip. I am very interested in that trip. The hon. member for Toowong and I had some splendid meetings there. While there I and other hon. members on this side of the Chamber saw the lavish way in which Ministers travelled. I understand—as a matter of fact I know—that the Premier was there, as also were the Secretary for Railways, the Secretary for Public Works, and the Attorney-General—four Ministers of the Crown electioneering in the Northern Rivers district of New South Wales.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! The hon. member must deal with the vote for the Chief Office—Premier and Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. KELSO: Of course, if I cannot refer to that matter, I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Pollock. I was referring to the Chief Secretary. I hope the Premier will tell us whether, as Chief Secretary, when he leaves town he is drawing two guineas a day in addition to his salary. If so the hon. gentleman is drawing unauthorised expenditure.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): While on this question I desire to ask the Premier a question in regard to the item "Incidental and miscellaneous expenses, £5,000." Does the hon. gentleman's department frank the

expenses of members of the Labour party when they are touring other States during a political campaign? We are certainly entitled to know, in face of the statement that has been made in connection with the extraordinary extravagance that appears to be in force in another section of the vote. I repeat the question: Can the Premier inform hon. members whether the £5,000 for "Incidental and miscellaneous expenses" represents money paid to certain representatives of his party to tour southern States for the purpose of advocating their particular brand of politics?

Mr. WRIGHT: I can answer that for you, No.

Mr. MAXWELL: You are not the Premier. I am asking the Premier.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): We have asked a certain question, and we should receive an answer. We have asked the Premier if he drew expenses during his electioneering travels in New South Wales. We are not asking for the definite amount. The hon. gentleman may not be able to tell us offhand, but did he draw his expenses while electioneering in New South Wales? I understand that Ministers draw three guineas a day allowance when they are out of the State. It seems that Ministers also charge hotel expenses, motor-car hire, and incidentals to the State, and it appears to me that that three guineas should not be allowed them in addition, because Ministers apparently do not meet any expenses out of their own pockets. A Minister puts the three guineas into his pocket, draws his £1,000 as well, and charges all his expenses to the State. It appears to me that a good way to make money would be [8 p.m.] to go out of the State for a few weeks and draw three guineas a day and get all living expenses paid as well. The Premier should follow the example of his predecessor, Mr. Theodore, who was always very outspoken, and at all times gave us all the information that we desired. It was generally understood that the late Premier was not extravagant in the matter of expenses; in fact his expenses were always lower than those of any other Minister. It would be a good thing if the present Premier were to adopt that principle and act straightforwardly in the matter of expenses. He should not hide anything in this regard. A good example set by the Premier would be followed by the rest of the team. We hope the hon. gentleman will not remain dumb, but will give us the information we desire. If the hon. gentleman will not give us the information on this vote, we shall have to ask a question in the House in the ordinary way.

The PREMIER: You might not gain anything by that, because the Minister could refuse to reply.

Mr. MORGAN: If the Minister did not reply straightforwardly and honestly, people naturally would be suspicious. I trust the hon. gentleman will let us know whether or not he did draw expenses and travelling allowance during the time he was electioneering in New South Wales.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Euchan*): In order that the hon. member may not lose any sleep, I desire to inform him that I did not draw three guineas a day when in New South Wales, but I always have and always will continue to draw what I am entitled to as expenses as a Minister when doing the public work of the country. Possibly the hon. member will not be satisfied with any reply I make or that any Minister may make, and I suggest to him that during the first week after he becomes a Minister, instead of attending to his ministerial duties, he spend the time looking up the vouchers in connection with the expenses of his predecessor.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): Mr. Pollock——

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Another justice of the peace wanted? (Laughter.)

Mr. FRY: I will give you all the justices of the peace you want.

Mr. COLLINS: Give us something big this session.

Mr. FRY: The hon. member for Bowen wants me to give him something big—I give him this: "Incidental and miscellaneous expenses, £5,000," and no vouchers to back it!

Mr. MORGAN: Ministers' expenses are something big.

Mr. FRY: The Premier's expenses last year amounted to £728 13s. 8d. Is that big, or is it only a trifle? Is it only a trifle compared to the big amount that we cannot find? We would like to see those vouchers, and probably after seeing the vouchers the people who sent us here would give us something bigger and give us the Government benches.

Mr. COLLINS: Have you heard of Mr. Appel's trip to the North when he was Home Secretary, which cost over £800?

Mr. FRY: I have heard of something else. £728 13s. 8d. was the amount of the Premier's expenses last year, and, in addition, we have "Incidental and miscellaneous expenses, £5,000." We want to know something about that.

Mr. COLLINS: That is what you call "big."

Mr. FRY: Of course it is a bigger amount than the hon. member is drawing at present. Probably that is one of the reasons why he is making so much noise.

Mr. W. COOPER: Perhaps that is what is the matter with you, too.

Mr. FRY: When I get into that position, I shall be the first to put all the vouchers on the table so that hon. members can see.

Mr. W. COOPER: That is a joy not in store for you.

Mr. FRY: It does not matter what the future may hold in store for me, but at the next election the hon. member will get the biggest surprise of his life. I think that the reply of the Premier is unsatisfactory. I suggest that the leader of the Opposition should approach the Premier with a view to getting the vouchers placed on the table so that we may examine them. If we could examine the vouchers—or perhaps if the secret fund which is in charge of the Premier were inspected by the leader of the Opposition—we would find out where the money goes to. We would find out whether any of the money is used in an improper way for party political funds. We cannot find that out now because we cannot see the vouchers, which are carefully hidden away.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I would draw the attention of the Premier to another matter

which has a very important bearing on some of our institutions, particularly Dunwich. We have a provision in the vote for the visiting justice. I think that everything should be done to assist the inmates of the institution in making complaints to the visiting justice to get things put right.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): I want to see a different method adopted by the Premier when he is travelling in the electorates. Some alteration should be made in fairness to members who represent the different constituencies. We know that in days past, when the Premier of the day was going into an electorate which happened to be represented by Labour, he would do the representative the courtesy of informing him that he was paying a visit to his electorate and ask him to accompany him.

Reference has been made to the money which is expended by the Premier in connection with expenditure from this vote while he is travelling in the electorates. I have no fault to find with that expenditure, as I recognise that a Minister of the Crown, when travelling on public business, is not expected to pay his expenses out of his own pocket; but when he is going through an electorate he might exercise the courtesy of informing the member beforehand, even if he is an Opposition member, and thus afford him an opportunity of making representations on the occasion of the visit. I take exception to the tactics adopted by the Ministers of the Crown for many years past, which have become worse and worse in this respect. I have no objection to the Minister incurring reasonable travelling expenses, but I would appreciate the courtesy of being informed when he is about to tour the electorate which I represent.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): It is very amusing to hear the hon. member for East Toowoomba talk about the attitude of previous Ministers and previous Premiers towards members of the Opposition. On more than one occasion—in fact on dozens of occasions—when hon. members opposite were in power, members of the Opposition never received the slightest indication whatever that Ministers were coming into their electorates.

Mr. ROBERTS: They always did.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They did not. In fact, in quite a number of instances the people who received the Minister or the Premier in a particular town went out of their way to prevent the local member, if he was a member of the Opposition, from appearing too much, and endeavoured to keep him in the background. Although, perhaps, it is only a fair thing that a Minister who is going into an electorate should have the courtesy to intimate to the member concerned that such is his intention, to say that it used to be done under the previous Government is absolutely untrue. In many cases Ministers had not the slightest regard for what was courteous in that respect, and to say that the Government to-day should do what previous Governments did in this respect is totally unsound.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I would like an intimation from the Premier on a rather important point. I take it that he gives instructions as to the preparation of the Estimates, and I would like to learn from him whether all the increases indicated on them date from 1st July last. We know that a large number of the more highly-paid officers received increases in November last year, and throughout the Estimates we find that such officers are to receive increases this year. Is it the intention, as set out in the Estimates, to pay those increases from 1st November next or from 1st July last? If from 1st November next, the Estimates are absolutely misleading.

The PREMIER: The new classification took place last November.

Mr. KERR: Then the increases will not be paid until next November?

The PREMIER: The increases will date from 1st November next.

Mr. KERR: Then any increases printed in the schedule as dating from 1st July are incorrect. I hope the Premier will make some inquiries, because I intend to ventilate the matter when the Public Service Commissioner's vote is being discussed.

Item (Chief Office—Chief Secretary's Department) agreed to.

AGENT-GENERAL FOR THE STATE.

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

> "That £12,625 be granted for 'Agent-General for the State.'"

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I read the Agent-General's report with very much pleasure. I think it is one of the finest reports we have ever had from any Agent-General, at any rate for the last ten years. Very fine information with respect to the meat industry of Queensland was furnished in that report disclosing that the prices realised for Queensland beef in Great Britain have been higher than during any period for the last ten or twelve years. In spite of that, the producer is not receiving sufficient to defray the cost of production, which is proof positive that, whilst prices have increased in Great Britain, the producer is not receiving his fair share of that increase. Why should the producer be asked to produce beef at a loss when it is being sold wholesale in London at a price exceeding that ever previously realised in the history of the meat industry? This is a very important matter, and calls for inquiry on the part of the Government. The meatworks may claim that the overhead expenses are high, that the shipping charges are responsible, or that wages in the industry have increased so considerably that they have eaten very much into the profits. If there are people making undue profits, then it is the duty of the Government to protect the producer and see that no undue profits are made. Here is the second largest industry in Queensland, from which the Government have received an enormous amount of revenue in good seasons, and a considerable amount of revenue in bad seasons through railway freights, etc. Surely the Premier can devote a portion of the money required for the administration of the Profiteering Prevention Act towards holding a public inquiry into the true position of the producer and the consumer in the meat industry. The meatworks treat us with contempt, and have refused to meet us in conference.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. gentleman desire an inquiry into local prices or oversea prices?

Mr. MORGAN: I would like the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to

inquire into both local prices and prices overseas. Here we have an industry of such dimensions that it will have treated 550,000 head of cattle—the greatest number ever slaughtered in the history of Queensland—before the season closes. Yet, in face of this, the producers are carrying on their business at a loss. The Government are aware of that from their experience on their own State stations, where last year they showed a loss of £110,000. When cattle are produced at less than the cost of production something is wrong, and the question is what is wrong. Is it a fact that those handling our beef are making too much profit, or are the overhead expenses too great?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Or have the owners paid £10 or £12 a head for their cattle and over-capitalised their runs?

Mr. MORGAN: High prices were paid in some individual cases.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Did the State pay a high price?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: So did a number of private people.

Mr. MORGAN: That is so, but cattle on the State stations were last year written down as low as £3 13s. per head.

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

Mr. MORGAN: I will do so in connection with the vote for the Commissioner of Prices.

The PREMIER: We are now discussing the vote for the Agent-General.

Mr. MORGAN: It is the same thing. I am now referring to the report made by the Agent-General. It is a very fine report in every respect. He enumerates the prices brought by meat for many years, but, independent of that, I ask the Premier to hold a public inquiry into all phases of the industry. I would also like the Premier to cause the Agent-General to cable weekly reports with respect to the markets for butter, wheat, cheese, meat, and other produce. These reports could be handed to the Press, and thus circulated. At the present time reports are published in the Press every week or month, but we do not know their origin. For all we know, they may be the inspired reports of people interested in the markets overseas, and they might be misrepresenting the value of the produce to the producers. If those reports came from the Agent-General, we would have confidence in them. That is not asking too much of that official. The amount of £1,500 is set down in the vote for the salary of the Agent-General, while an additional £11,125 is provided for clerical assistance, stationery, etc. Reports may be received from the Agent-General at the present time, but, if they are, they must be pigeon-holed.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I have a distinct recollection that the ex-Agent-General made a public statement that a lot of "graft" was going on in the office of the Agent-General, and that the position was only a sinecure.

Mr. PETERSON: He also said the office was not wanted.

Mr. KELSO: In justice to the staff, the Premier should cause the present Agent-General—who is taking his duties very seriously—to make a report on the statements made publicly by the ex-Agent-General. It is only fair to the staff that the Agent-General should report whether any grounds exist for those statements.

Mr. DASH: Did you see that in the "Standard"?

Mr. KELSO: No; I am referring to the remarks of the ex-Agent-General, and they were made last year. That gentleman may have been suffering from pique at the time, and possibly his remarks cannot be substantiated. At the same time, those remarks cast a reflection on the staff, and it is only fair that the Premier should institute inquiries into the matter to exonerate the staff.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I support the remarks of the hon. member for Nundah. Last year the reason given for the resignation of Mr. Fihelly was "Personal and private." Had the matter stopped at that, perhaps no questions would have arisen, but Mr. Fihelly made the statement—

> "I was fed up with the job, that was all. I had too little to do, and too long to do it in. The job was a sinecure, and overrun with graft."

We must realise that the ex-Agent-General made a statement that he would submit a report to Cabinet.

The PREMIER: Where did you get all that information from—the Tory Press?

Mr. KERR: No, it all appeared in the "Standard." Surely in the circumstances, and more especially after the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, when he pointed out that a branch of the Australian Labour party had raked up a question as to who was drawing commission out of the flotation of loans, the matter merits investigation. Mr. Fihelly is a responsible officer of the Labour party and a representative of the Australian Labour party with aspirations to enter the Federal Parliament. Those statements were made seriously so that the attention of the public would be drawn to them. The office of the Agent-General cost us nearly £13,000 last year. There are sixteen officers there, the salaries of the higher-paid men ranging from £300 to £680 a year. Is it that they are receiving "graft" in addition to their salaries? What is behind the matter? Did Mr. Fihelly resign because of something that he was unable to take on, or did he exhibit pique because he thought the Premier went to England to do something he thought he should do? We are entitled to have some explanation.

There is another point. As I said, there are some sixteen officers in the Agent-General's Office. Some of those officers are highly capable, but, with the exception of the Agent-General himself and, I understand, the secretary, not one is a Queenslander—the others are all Englishmen. The report from the office states that there are numerous inquiries as to immigration, and as to our timber, cotton, and sugar industries, and other matters relating to our State and Australia generally. It is stated in the report that these officers deal
[8.30 p.m.] with intending immigrants, and they have to explain the prospects and the advantages of Queensland, and I venture to say they are not capable of giving true accounts to people who desire

to come here. If we had a Queenslander in that office, he would make a much wiser and better selection, and be able to tell the intending settler the exact conditions he would have to contend with in Queensland.

Mr. WRIGHT: A very small percentage of immigrants go to the Agent-General's Office.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member is only an immigrant himself. He has only been here a few weeks.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is why I know more about it than you.

Mr. KERR: The Agent-General says that forty per day call at the office for information. That must be untrue if what the hon. gentleman says is right.

The PREMIER: Do you not know that the Agent-General and the Secretary are both Queenslanders?

Mr. KERR: That is so, and I have said it, but there are fourteen others there who are drawing high salaries, and their job is to interview intending immigrants, and it is essential that they should have a knowledge of our State and a knowledge of our outlook in life. Mr. Theodore agreed with that viewpoint, but no action has been taken. The Premier should take immediate action in that regard. We have the officers here with the necessary knowledge, and they should be sent to the Agent-General's Office, where they would be of some advantage to the State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: A lot of officers in Brisbane have never been outside Brisbane.

Mr. KERR: That may be so, but you would not select such an officer as that to go to England. The Government should select the very best man that is offering for the job—a man who has travelled all over Queensland, and one who knows all about it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How long would you have him remain there? You would have to change him every three or four years.

Mr. KERR: It would pay us to do that, and it is only right that we should do it. It would only mean a small expense, after all is said and done, as the fare home and back would only require to be paid once in three years.

There is one other point that I should like again to stress in regard to the Agent-General's Office. The office is situated at 410 Strand, London, and I want to impress on the new Premier, who perhaps may be going home next year, though probably, as there is an election coming on, he may not have an opportunity of going. The Premier after the next election may be the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Aubigny. Let us hope it will be that hon. member; but I do suggest that whoever goes should look into the situation of the Agent-General's Office. It is situated in a place that may be passed by many millions of people, but all business people, so far as I could see when I was in London, went to Australia House for information, and, when they asked for literature concerning Queensland, they were referred to 410 Strand, and a large percentage of them no doubt never went near the place. The separate States are more or less unknown to the general population in England, but they know Australia generally, and it is to Australia House that they go, and, in turn, they have to be referred to the Queensland office in an isolated part of the Strand.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS interjected.

Mr. KERR: I understand that an unfortunate occurrence took place at Mount Gravatt in connection with a recent arrival, but because one person is incriminated in such a way you cannot blame the others. Again, consumption is a difficult disease to find out, as you cannot diagnose it. A lot of people come out to Queensland with the intention of getting cured of that disease, but, unless they tell the medical officer, he cannot find out whether they have got "T.B.," and will have to do the best possible under those conditions.

There is another point I wish to stress. I would suggest that the Premier should take up quarters for the Agent-General in Australia House, because it will be cheaper to do so. The lease of the Strand building has ten years to run, and the leasehold value has improved during the occupancy of the present Agent-General. If we cannot get the lease cancelled, we can sublet the place at a much higher rent than we are paying. It would certainly be wise to remove to Australia House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have you got your eye on the Agent-General's job? (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: No, but I was fortunate enough to visit Australia House on many occasions. I had a difficult job to find our Agent-General's office.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Did you find any other interesting places in London?

Mr. KERR: Yes. If the hon. gentleman went there, he would also find them. (Laughter.) I suggest that the Premier should consider the question of sending Home higher-paid officials to replace those in the London office. They should be Queenslanders, brought up in our own public service. He should also remove the present office from the Strand to Australia House.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): I certainly endorse what the hon. member for Enoggera has said as to the wisdom of sending home periodically men who are closely conversant with Queensland conditions. It is quite true, as the Premier has said, that our Agent-General and the Secretary are Queenslanders; but the secretary is a permanent officer. How long is it since he was in Queensland?

The PREMIER: A good many years.

At 8.40 p.m.,

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

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is a good many years. What does he know of the advances which Queensland has made in that time? What does he know of the development which has taken place? What does he know of the cotton industry, and things of that nature, in which conditions have altered as compared

with the time when he was here? I certainly think that an exchange of officers is well worthy of consideration.

I am of opinion that the Agent-General's office could be made a tremendous power for good, but I do not think that the Agent-General is in some ways given the responsibility to which he is entitled. Just as an illustration, let me say that, when I was in England, I wanted to nominate five people to come to Queensland. Although I was well known as a Queenslander, my nominations were not accepted, and the Agent-General stated that the power to do so had been taken from him and they could only be accepted by cabling for authority. That was done—there was some urgency in the matter—and authority was immediately given. When an office which is costing something like £13,000 per annum is not able to accept nominations from well-known Queenslanders of Britishers desirous of coming over here, surely something is wrong. That clearly indicates the point I am trying to make, that sufficient responsibility is not placed on these officers in London. They are afraid to move, and that being so Queensland is not getting anything like the return from the office which it should secure. In my judgment it is a business office, and it should be maintained with the business acumen which is associated with such institutions.

There are one or two points in the report to which I wish to refer. On the first page it is said with regard to the Wembley Exhibition—

> "Some excellent films sent over by the Department of Agriculture were, unfortunately, too late to be shown at the exhibition, which closed before their arrival from Queensland."

Where is the business in that? It is indicative of what generally happens. Queensland is too late, except when it comes to borrowing money. On page 3 the Agent-General says—

> "A general pamphlet on the timber industry would be most useful for distribution to inquirers."

You go into the Agent-General's office and you find a very big display of Queensland timbers, very attractive to look at, but there is no literature which any inquirer can take away giving him information as to what the timbers are useful for and in what quantities they are to be obtained. I just want to refer to that, because we are expending a considerable sum of money, but we are not finishing the job, and we could get a much better return if these details were attended to.

Another point to which the Agent-General calls attention is this—

> "It would be a convenience if an up-to-date list of exporters of Queensland products could be printed and copies forwarded to this office for distribution to inquirers."

That is a very sensible suggestion. We want to provide a market for our goods, and the way in which the idea of preference is spreading over the Empire makes people in England desirous of purchasing Queensland products. The thing is to enable the importer to be able to put his finger on the exporter at this end, and these things could be attended to if greater responsibility were given to the Agent-General, and the list asked for supplied.

I should be very sorry to think that there was any truth in the statements which have been made about "graft" in the Agent-General's office. I saw no indication whatever that anything was improperly conducted there. I believe the officers conscientiously try to do the right thing, but they are handicapped I firmly believe that, if the Agent-General was given this greater authority, there would be no need to complain that the job had not sufficient in it to occupy a man's full time. Every member of Parliament who goes to England sincerely desirous of advocating Queensland's claim can find occupation for every minute of his time, and, if that is so, I am quite certain the Agent-General can dig in and find out a means of popularising this country, and have profitable occupation for his time if he sets about it in the right way. The Agent-General's office is all right, but he should have greater authority, and, if that were given him, I am quite sure the State would obtain a better return for the money which is spent every year.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): The report by the Agent-General is very creditable, and one for which he should receive due recognition I notice that the report dealing with the trade of the office for the year 1924 shows that the indent work amounted to £180,000, whilst the sales on behalf of Queensland amounted to £84,000. The report states—

> "During the past year eight-five indents were received from the State, of an approximate f.o.b. value of £180,000, and comprised work from:—Main Roads Board, Government Chemical Laboratory, University of Queensland, Railway Department, State Stores Board, Department of Public Instruction, Department of Public Health, Treasury, Harbours and Rivers Department, Portmaster, Brisbane, Department of Agriculture and Stock, Home Secretary's Department, Metropolitan Fire Brigades' Board, Government Analyst, Chief Secretary's Department, and Marine Department."

Here we have the State Government buying £180,000 worth of goods through the Agent-General's office in London. I would like to know the details of those purchases, and whether those goods could not have been produced here. I contend that the Agent-General should be a general agent. Every man in the American diplomatic service is a commercial agent. He has instructions to keep his home office supplied with the fullest details as to the opportunities for increasing and expanding American industries. Their positions are not sinecures, and they know that they are there to boom American production and increase the sales of American industries. What is our Agent-General doing? Is he increasing the sales of Queensland products? Is he obtaining markets so we can increase the sale of our products? London is the centre of the commercial world, and the Agent-General is there at the gates of the world. Probably the Government have not afforded him the necessary facilities for carrying out the work. He should be provided with all the necessary facilities for doing that work. Before the present Agent-General left for his post in England I said to him, "You have a chance to make a name for yourself. Make your department pay and show Queensland what you are made of as a commercial man. We look to you to show results." He replied, "I will do everything I possibly can to help our State along." I want him to get a

chance to make good. Is he getting a chance to boom this State? The goods from Queensland sold in London through the office amounted to £84,000, while the total amount of the trading transactions amounted to £264,000. The cost of doing that business was approximately 4 per cent. The hon. member for Bulimba made the asertion that very few immigrants call at the office for information.

Mr. WRIGHT: I said a small percentage.

Mr. FRY: The Agent-General in his report for the year under review states that the callers for information averaged about forty per day. If we cannot get more than forty people seeking information about this State in a city like London, especially during the Wembley Exhibition, there is evidently something wrong. We made a great display at that exhibition, and made the people of the Old World sit up and take notice, but the net results of all our expenditure and trouble were a miserable forty callers per day at the office out of the millions that live there. The only information that we have to go on is the official report of the Agent-General. In the interests of the State and of himself, I ask the Government to give him a chance; and, if he requires the assistance of a capable commercial man—I do not care to what party he belongs so long as he has the ability—such a man should be appointed. We do not want political interference or jobbery. If such a man is appointed, he should be able to put the claims of the State before the world, and the State should back him up by supplying him with a fair average sample of our products. Any orders executed should be fair standards of our products and not shoddy stuff. It is not fair to send a man to represent this great State in London and provide him with picked samples and then send poor quality goods to orders. All goods supplied should be true to sample. I am not desirous of criticising the personnel of the office, as I do not know it. The Agent-General should know his staff, and, as his report contains nothing to the contrary, we must presume he is satisfied with it. Every hon. member must agree that it is the duty of the staff to maintain the spirit of the people of Queensland and not the characteristics of the people of the Old World. It should be our desire to increase the work of the office to such dimensions that the cost will not be 4 per cent., but perhaps only ½ per cent. We shall then know that the business of the office and the State is being increased. The State will know by the results that it is a profitable office, and this vote would be passed, so far as I am concerned, with more readiness than I vote for it to-night.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I am very pleased to read the Agent-General's report for the current year. I am also very pleased with the criticism in regard to that report which has emanated from hon. members opposite. What I am most interested in in the report appears on pages 8 and 9, in connection with frozen meat. We as a State are keenly interested in the matter owing to the number of cattle stations that we own at present. On page 9 there is a very interesting table—interesting to me at any rate. I find that the whole of Australia sent to the United Kingdom in 1924, 60,164 tons of frozen meat and Argentine—which I understand is Australia's principal competitor—sent 578,347 tons. The money value to Australia was £3,450,466, while the money value of that frozen meat to the Argentine was £27,646,172.

I remember some years ago getting up in this Chamber and pointing out that, instead of sending all our products to London, which we do as a rule—London, London, London, as if it were the only market in the civilised world—it would be better for us to pay some attention to Continental countries. I mentioned Italy as one of the countries where, in the future, we could get a market for our meat. I now find this in the present Agent-General's report—

> "As has already been indicated, the development of the frozen meat trade in Continental countries exceeded all expectations. Great Britain, which for so long provided the only considerable market for frozen meat, is now faced with a number of formidable competitors. The operations in 1924 leave little room for doubt that frozen meat has established itself as an acceptable and even essential food for industrial workers in Europe at a price which they can afford. The estimated imports of frozen meat into the various Continental countries during the year were as follows:—
>
> Italy ... ... 125,000 tons"

That is the country to which I referred five or six years ago. Very little notice was taken of my words at the time. The report continues—

Germany	...	...	100,000 tons
France	...	...	95,000 tons
Belgium	...	...	95,000 tons
Holland	...	...	27,000 tons
Austria	...	...	10,000 tons
Czecho-Slovakia	...		6,000 tons
Hungary	...	...	1,000 tons

Judging from the report of the Agent-General, we have no need to be disheartened in connection with our cattle industry. At one time the average annual consumption of meat per head of population in Italy was 26 lb. What I pointed out in regard to that market years ago has proved to be correct, and the Continent of Europe will consume a great deal more meat in the future than it has in the past.

Mr. KELSO: Italy is where the Fascists come from. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: Don't you interject such silly damned interjections. (Laughter.) The hon. member is elected by the people and should be an intelligent representative; he should scorn to make such silly interjections when another hon. member is addressing the Chair. If the hon. member for Nundah does not take the government of the country seriously, then he should. If the hon. member chooses to be flippant, I regret very much that he should represent such a lot of flippant electors. I am dealing with something for the welfare of the State, and I do not deal with the matter as the hon. member does, as if it were a game. With this frozen meat industry we are going to develop our State and also find more employment for our people. The report continues:—

[9 p.m.]

> "The outlook for the frozen meat trade generally is one calculated to inspire confidence, especially from the producers' point of view."

I was very pleased to read that statement in the report, and, as the representative of

a large cattle-breeding electorate, I want the people in that part of Queensland to realise that the outlook is not as black as it has been made to appear, judging by the Agent-General's report and judging by the fact that the Continental countries are now taking frozen meat. Of course we do not contribute a large amount compared with Argentina, but at any rate the outlook for the future is fairly bright.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I desire to refer to the question of immigrants coming to this State. The Secretary for Mines the other day pointed out that he was quite satisfied that the people coming to the State always brought a certain amount of money with them, and that they would not become a charge upon the State. Let me refer to the report of the Agent-General in this connection, and point out that the Minister was quite right in that statement. On page 4 of the report I find this—

> "Persons migrating to the State deposited with this office £11,598 12s. 11d. for their credit in the Commonwealth Savings Bank, and £912 was received by way of landing money for payment at the rate of about £2 per head to certain migrants on arrival in Queensland."

So you can see that these people are not paupers when they come here, as some of our friends on the other side would lead us to believe. They do not come without a shilling and become a burden on the State, nor do they, as the hon. member for Fitzroy interjected when the Secretary for Mines was speaking, draw outdoor relief. That report gives the lie direct to such a statement. When this vote was being discussed last year the ex-Premier, Mr. Theodore, was in charge of these Estimates, and the very same question was raised on that occasion that has been raised to-night with regard to staffing the Agent-General's office with Queenslanders. The Premier is partly right when he says there are Queenslanders there. There are Queenslanders by adoption, but not Queenslanders by birth. Mr. Huxham, who is a very estimable man, and Mr. Dillon were both Queenslanders by adoption, but Mr. Dillon has been there so long that I do not think that he can now claim that he is a Queenslander. On the last occasion when this question was being discussed Mr. Theodore admitted that it was desirable that Queenslanders should be sent home, and I would like to know what the Premier intends to do in the matter. Who would be better advocates of Queensland than Queenslanders themselves? I contend that they would be the people who would be best fitted to boost this State.

I wish to draw attention to the statement which has been made to the effect that the visit of the ex-Premier synchronised with the opening of the British Exhibition at Wembley. Up to the present we have received no report of what took place at Wembley. I have seen some photographs of the Commissioners at the exhibition. I do not blame them for being dressed to suit the company they were in—(laughter)—but we as a Parliament have a right to know what took place at Wembley. From what I can learn, conditions seemed to be in a most deplorable condition until Mr. Joyce and Mr. Mobsby went to Wembley, and people scarcely knew where to find the Queensland exhibit. We find from the report of the Agent-General that some of the exhibits from the Department of Agriculture arrived too late to be placed on exhibition at Wembley. While it may be quite all right for those exhibits to be utilised later on, they unfortunately missed the bus. They were required while the exhibition was on so that the people of the Empire and of other nations could see what Queensland produces.

The report of the Agent-General is an excellent document compiled under the most trying circumstances. Mr. Huxham went Home buoyed up with great hopes. Although a Queenslander only by adoption, there was no better advocate for Queensland than Mr. Huxham. As soon as he settled down, his wife, who had gone home with him, was taken away from him. If ever anyone deserved the sympathy of members of this House, it is the Agent-General. I sincerely hope that the Premier will take into consideration the suggestions which have been made from this side in all good faith and take the necessary action to allow people of other lands to see what Queensland can produce. If an interchange of officers between the Agent-General's office in London and the public service here could be arranged, it would do a great deal of good.

I do not know whether I shall be in order in dealing with the exhibition at Wembley on this vote—I may have an opportunity of doing so on another vote—but I would ask the Premier if it is his intention to give Parliament an opportunity of discussing that matter. Some hon. members have had the privilege of going there. I am glad to know that Mr. Joyce and Mr. Mobsby did good work for Queensland at Wembley, and I hope that an opportunity will be given later on to discuss the whole question of the exhibition there.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): We have passed through a very unfortunate period in the history of our cattle industry, but the Agent-General in the valuable report which has been presented to us claims that the industry has very nearly recovered on the British market. He states that the total values of frozen and chilled meat imported from the various sources of supply during 1924 were—

	£
Australia	3,450,000
New Zealand	11,157,000
Argentina	27,646,000
Uruguay	2,726,000
United States of America	254,000
Other countries ...	1,356,000

The values per ton of the three principal importing countries were—

	£
Australia	57
New Zealand	75
Argentina	48

Passing from the meat industry, we come to one which is very important and affects a greater number of persons than the meat industry. We find that the total imports of butter for 1924 were as follows:—

Country.	Cwt.
Argentina	538,000
Queensland	174,000
Victoria	325,000
New South Wales ...	130,000
New Zealand	1,086,000
Canada	131,000
Other countries	377,000

I have not quoted the imports from all countries, but "other countries" includes Siberia, whilst Argentina has only lately come into this field. It appeals to me as a great tragedy that our exports to Great Britain are held up to-day by the shipping strike, the work of the Agent-General's Office and his endeavour to secure better markets nullified, and the home market being occupied by foreign countries. This is the time when the results of the Agent-General's work in increasing the markets for this particular product should be felt. But the market is closed against us, and a very serious state of affairs is likely to occur from the tremendous opposition from Siberia and other foreign or ex-enemy countries. It makes one almost imagine that it is part of a scheme to deny us and give to foreigners the opportunity which the shipping trouble seems to be providing. Other countries are becoming very formidable competitors of Australia, and, if we are to have our markets closed against us by a world-wide organisation in the interests of the foreigner and against those of British Dependencies, it is time for us to drag some of the scales from our eyes and realise the position. The meat export trade of Australia has not played the part it should have played.

The cheese export of Australia for 1924 was 46,785 cwt., as against 1,479,000 cwt. from New Zealand, 1,005,985 cwt. from Canada, and two or three times Australia's export from Italy and the Netherlands. That makes one realise the great importance not only of the Agent-General's Office but of developing along certain lines in Australia. I cannot say that I agree with the line of thought of the hon. member for Kurilpa in connection with the Agent-General's Office. I believe that in Australia we can do a great deal more than the Agent-General's Office, the Press delegates, or the Federal and State Governments to assist immigration. If we can provide reasonable possibilities of a good living on the land for people desirous of following that occupation, there is no necessity to spend money on people from overseas by paying their passages.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: We can save the Agent-General's Office the expenditure of that amount of money. We can encourage the people on the land, and they will induce their friends from overseas to follow them to Australia. We know that, when gold is struck, a rush sets in, and there is no necessity for an Agent-General to induce people to come along. When our secondary industries pay good wages, we do not need the Agent-General's Office to induce people to come out here. In fact, we have to take some means of preventing them from coming and overcrowding our industries. If we make our farming pursuits remunerative and make it possible for those industries to provide sufficient revenue to compensate for the lonely life that many people have to live in country districts, there will be no necessity for the vote that we are discussing. The people on the land will advertise Australia, and, if the return from the land is commensurate with the work involved, there will be sufficient inducement for those people on the land to encourage their friends from overseas.

Item (Agent-General for the State) agreed to.

AUDIT OFFICE.

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

"That £17,880 be granted for 'Audit Office.'"

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I desire to bring under the notice of the Premier a matter to which I called the attention of the ex-Premier last year when this vote was being discussed. The salary of the Auditor-General is provided for in the schedules at £1,000. I have previously pointed out that for a great number of years the Auditor-General has been receiving this salary. I desire to show the unfair treatment that has been meted out to the Auditor-General, and in making the comparison I am about to make I want it understood that I am not finding fault with officers in other departments who have received increases. I want to draw attention to the Commissioner for Trade. He is an estimable officer, who prior to his present appointment was an audit officer under the Auditor-General, yet I find that the Auditor-General, who was his superior officer, receives £1,000 per annum, whereas the Commissioner now receives £1,100. I do not call that "cricket." It is most unfair, and gives very little encouragement to officers of the calibre of the Auditor-General. I am satisfied that there are hon. members opposite who do not stand for anything like that. Here is a man who holds a position of great responsibility. What encouragement is it to such men when they see subordinate officers transferred to positions which are not paying, and who are receiving £100 more in salary? The Premier must realise the ridiculousness of such a position. The ex-Premier stated that, although the salary was a fixed one in the schedule, he recognised that it required consideration. The Premier should go thoroughly into the matter.

Mr. COLLINS: The chief inspector has got an increase.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is so, and there are other officers receiving increases. I do not find fault with that. What I find fault with is that an officer with the qualifications of the Auditor-General should be receiving a salary £100 less than an officer who formerly occupied a subordinate position to him.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: If you look further down the Estimates you will see that an extra allowance of £250 is provided for the Auditor-General.

Mr. MAXWELL: Twelve months have elapsed since that was done.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: Look further down the list.

Mr. MAXWELL: I certainly would like the Government to go into the matter and see that justice is done to this officer.

Mr. KELSO (*Yundah*): I had a note to speak on this matter, but hon. members opposite are right. For the first time there is an allowance of £250 further down the Estimates for the Auditor-General. Further down again I find "Travelling expenses of Auditor-General, £150." It seems to me that on this occasion the Government have evidently recognised that the Auditor-General should get something more, though it would have been far better to increase

his salary. In addition to the argument used by the hon. member for Toowong, I would point out that the Auditor-General is a financial judge of the operations of the State. He has as much responsibility as a judge of the Supreme Court, who gets £2,000 a year. The Auditor-General, an expert in his profession—a man who has spent long years dealing with these matters and who knows his business from A to Z—sometimes has to act as a critic of the Government, and should be quite apart from the existing politics of the Government. He has to give a financial critique of the Government's financial operations during the year. Therefore the Government have placed him on the Schedules, recognising that he must be outspoken and must be in an independent position. So his appointment is one made by Parliament.

Mr. DASH: Yet you quibble at the Auditor-General passing certain accounts.

Mr. KELSO: It is not a question of passing accounts. Nobody doubts the Auditor-General's word, but perhaps he did not go into the matter in detail. All we asked was that the vouchers should be placed on the table. If any hon. member asks for those vouchers to be placed on the table, he is quite entitled to do so. It is not a matter of trusting the Auditor-General. If an hon. member wishes to go further than the investigation of the Auditor-General, he has a perfect right to do so.

For a long series of years, away back to the time when £1 was worth more than £1 is worth to-day, the Auditor-General was paid £1,000 a year, and until this year his salary has remained on the Schedules at £1,000. It would be far better for the Premier to make the salary £1,250.

I shall mention an officer—and I remind the Premier that I am not saying this man is not worth the money, because he is. The Public Service Commissioner has had his salary increased this year from £1,250 to £1,500. I say nothing against Mr. Story, and I do not think anybody in this Chamber will do so. He is a most capable officer, and apparently the Government recognise his ability by increasing his salary from £1,250 to £1,500; but, after due deliberation, I say that the responsibility attaching to the office of Public Service Commissioner is not nearly as great as that attaching to the office of the Auditor-General. I am talking upon a question that I understand. It has been suggested that Mr. Story settled the strike, and perhaps that has something to do with his increase; but the responsibilities attaching to the office of Auditor-General are equal to those attaching to the office of a judge of the Supreme Court. The Auditor-General is asked to pass judgment fairly and dispassionately on the expenditure incurred by the State. In order to do that he must be in a position where
[9.30 p.m.] he is not under the whip of any Government, so that he can act in a fearless manner and give his opinion honestly, as we know Mr. Robertson does. I do not think any man in this Chamber would dare to say that the Auditor-General is not a most capable officer.

Mr. RIORDAN: Is the Public Service Commissioner not a most capable officer?

Mr. KELSO: I said so at the start, and I hope the hon. member will not twist my remarks, as he often tries to do. I started by pointing out that Mr. Story is a most capable officer and worth the money he is going to get; but I also say that the Auditor-General is a most capable officer, and I say that the Auditor-General has more responsibility than Mr. Story.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He has not.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. member can differ from me, but I know more about the responsibilities attaching to the office of Auditor-General than the hon. member does. I hope that the Premier will see his way to add the £250 which is put down as an allowance to the Auditor-General to his permanent salary. I think the office requires it, and I hope that, when the next Estimates come on, the salary for the Auditor-General in the Schedules will be £1,250.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*): Personally I do not think the Auditor-General is in a very bad position, seeing that he is on £1,000 a year. I do not know whether hon. members are arguing that the Public Service Commissioner and the Commissioner for Trade are getting too much or that the Auditor-General is getting too little; but, if the Auditor-General cannot get along on £1,000 a year, how can we expect the two clerks at £160 a year and the clerk on £120 a year to get on? The amount set down in the Schedules for the Auditor-General is £1,000 a year, which, with the £250 allowance on the Estimates and the further amount of £150 for travelling expenses, makes a total of £1,400 a year. In the circumstances the Auditor-General is much better off than many other people in the State. I regret very much that, when giving increases to those over £1,000 a year, more consideration was not given to those on the bottom rungs of the ladder. Those who are getting £300 a year and over do not feel a reduction so much as those in receipt of less than £300 a year, and I do not think increases to those in receipt of high salaries are warranted at a time like this when we have had trouble with the men on the lower rungs. Before increases of this kind are given, more consideration should be given to the bottom dog. It is all very nice to put in a plea for the Auditor-General. We recognise the responsibility that the Auditor-General has to carry, but, as his salary is included in the Schedules, I take it that he will continue in office until he is seventy years of age. He is only removable by Parliament. Those on the lower rungs have no great security of tenure, while the officers who are mentioned in the Schedules have security of tenure so long as they do not displease Parliament. I for one recognise that the position of Auditor-General is just as responsible as the position either of Mr. Story or the Commissioner for Trade, and I do not think any of them will want for anything if they are allowed to carry on at their present salaries.

At 9.35 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): What I object to is the granting of a private allowance, no matter what position a man may be in. I shall be glad if the Premier will explain why the allowance of £250 is given to the Auditor-General, and what are the conditions attaching to it. It should be direct salary—not salary and allowance.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): It is quite true that there is

provision made on the Estimates on this occasion for £250 as an allowance to the Auditor-General, which is very easily explainable. It is about fifty years ago since the Auditor-General's salary was fixed by statute at £1,000, and it appears from the speeches of Opposition members that they regard that salary as too little. The Auditor-General has had a considerable amount of work to do during the last few years which did not obtain in days gone by, such as the supervision of the State enterprises, the Wheat Board, and other things which come under his jurisdiction now, and it was thought that the salary should be increased; but it cannot be increased except by the method employed in these Estimates of making an allowance. It is proposed to amend the Audit Act at the earliest possible moment to increase the Auditor-General's salary. We have to recognise that the responsibilities borne by the Auditor-General should be adequately paid for. Not only in Queensland but all over Australia men holding high and responsible positions have had their salaries increased from time to time. It is quite true that the lower-paid men have to live, that they wear the same amount of clothing and require the same amount of housing and food as higher paid officers; but it must be recognised, if we are to retain the services of men occupying positions like the Auditor-General and others, we shall have to increase their salaries. As I said before, it is fifty years since the salary was fixed, and forty-eight years since the salaries of Ministers were fixed. Of course, Ministers' salaries have not increased in the same ratio as those of other people.

Mr. KELSO: You admit you want more salary?

The PREMIER: Hon. members can increase it at any time they like. (Laughter.) It is forty-eight years since Ministers' salaries were fixed at £1,000. It is proposed in the near future to alter the Act and increase the Auditor-General's salary to £1,250 a year.

Item (Audit Office) agreed to.

IMMIGRATION.

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

> "That £11,728 be granted for 'Immigration.'"

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): It was my privilege to become associated somewhat actively with this question, being a member of the council of the New Settlers' League. In that connection, although I think that every year invitations are extended to Government members to take up representation on that body, I am sorry to say that I have never yet seen any of them at any of the meetings. It is rather unfortunate that that is the position, because this question of immigration should not be one of party politics. The body I have mentioned has endeavoured to keep it free from party politics, but the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite abstain from lending their advice and help to the movement is rather unfortunate, and I make the suggestion that they remedy that omission as soon as possible, because, no matter what our political differences may be, our public utterances all go in the one direction—that Queensland wants immigrants. The Premier attended the annual convention of the New Settlers' League and expressed his firm belief in the need for increased population, and how necessary it is to Queensland; but, when it comes to the actual work of the New Settlers' League, so far I have not seen any member on the Government benches attend the meetings, although they have been invited to do so. It was very satisfying indeed to hear at the last meeting of the council very laudatory reports of the work of the officers of the Immigration Department. It was stated that very excellent attention is given to arrivals from overseas, to the extent that they are made to feel quite happy and comfortable on reaching the shores of Queensland. It is pleasing to know that such attention is being given, because it is important that a good impression should be made on their minds.

Mr. WEIR: Some of them are down at St. Helena now.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: They may not be the only people who should be in St. Helena. (Laughter.) This question is a very important one, and, judging by the interruptions of hon. members opposite, if they are indicative of the party which they represent, it looks as if we were misled as to the intentions of the Government. We have in our midst at present a gentleman named Amery who is an emissary from the British Government to remind Queensland that there is an organisation which exists specially to assist immigrants, and that the British Government placed very large sums at the disposal of the Overseas Settlement Committee to assist immigration to different parts of the Empire, and from a speech which I heard him make I gather that £3,000,000 per annum for fifteen years is set aside as expenditure from revenue—not loan—with the object of assisting immigration within the Empire. He told us, what was a surprise to me, that of this £3,000,000 last year only £450,000 was expended, and that about £2,500,000 was unexpended simply because proper claims had not been put forward within the meaning of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: In what way is that money expended?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I understand that of any expenditure which the State or Commonwealth Government may decide to incur for this purpose 50 per cent. will be advanced by the Home Government.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I think you are making a mistake.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The hon. gentleman can correct me.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is subject to agreement between the Commonwealth and British Governments.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is quite true that the British Government only recognise the Commonwealth Government in the matter, but that does not prevent the State making suggestions to the Commonwealth Government and taking the initiative so that their proposals can receive their endorsement and they can get the assistance of the British Government. Although we are all crying out for population, very little effort is being made to obtain the immigrants the country require, and on that

point I want to call attention to some authoritative statements which have been made recently.

Quite recently we had a visit from an Anglican Bishop from South Tokio. He said:—

> "He was in sympathy with the White Australia policy if it were possible. He felt very strongly that all Australians did not realise the strength of the living forces in the East, with which some day they must come to terms. The time was passing if it had not already passed—when terms could be dictated to Japan. To-day Japan asked equality; to-morrow she might demand it. The Young Japanese party would get what it wanted, by peaceful means if possible, but they would get it. The rioting at Shanghai was an instance of what the demands of the younger generation might mean."

That is a warning coming from an Australian who has spent a great number of years of his life amongst the Japanese in a country where the population is being almost forced into the sea by reason of there not being sufficient space available to make provision for the expanding numbers. In that connection may I direct the attention of this Chamber to some statistics showing the populations per square mile in some of the countries which figure very largely in this question. The population per square mile in Australia is one and four-fifths, in New Zealand eleven and four-fifths, China 225, in Japan 376, in Germany 310, in France 172, and in England 701. One has to bear in mind that by reason of the mountainous nature of Japan there is not the same amount of land available for agricultural purposes and the feeding of the Japanese is becoming quite a problem. There is not the slightest doubt, like it or not as we may, that that country is being forced by economic circumstances to seek a new outlet for its population, and we have seen the efforts which that country made at the League of Nations Convention, and she thoroughly intends sooner or later to raise this question in a very pronounced form. The Labour party has always proclaimed that its mission is to stop the selfish retention of anything of value or any particular benefits. It has taken advantage of that doctrine of late to break up institutions where they thought that wealth and other benefits were being selfishly retained. You have to take that doctrine a little further. In Queensland we have a country which we are continually stating has potentialities second to none in the world, and I do not think any man questions that. If that is a fact, how can we possibly hope to retain that extraordinary wealth for a handful of people when ordinary humanitarian considerations should cause us to ponder and argue that we should make these great potentialities available to this excess of population which is accumulated in such huge numbers in other parts of the world, to such an extent in many cases that they cannot live. What better illustration can I take than Great Britain at the present time? I have shown that England's population is 701 to the square mile, whereas that of Australia is a little under 2. Surely with all these opportunities which have been made available by the British Government, money galore, opportunities found for us, with England having a population of 701 per square mile as against ours under 2, if our sympathies were in the right direction and we really meant what we said, it should be possible for us to translate some of these swarms in Great Britain, who are on the border line of starvation, and give them an opportunity to share in our prosperity in this country. That is the humanitarian consideration, and, apart from that, there is the other and more selfish argument that we must take steps to populate this country, because, if we do not, most assuredly it is going to be taken from us. Australia may protest, and may say to Japan that we are not going to tolerate interference, and that we are not going to permit them to enter our country except under control and in such a manner as we prescribe; but what steps can we take to maintain this determination? Assuming that Japan were to defy us and send over her surplus of population and take forcible possession of some of our unpopulated spaces, what is Australia going to do? We have no army or navy, or any means for defending our continent. The only possible hope we have is to go to the seat of Empire and ask Great Britain to keep the invader out. That is an unsatisfactory position. Surely the right position, and the right step to take economically and from a humane standpoint, is to take charge of the surplus population which is available in Great Britain and spread it over this vast continent so that we shall turn into actual reality these vast potentialities which we so frequently refer to.

Mr. HYNES: What is the use of bringing them here if we cannot absorb them in industry?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I dealt with that matter as fully as I was able when speaking on the Financial Statement. I gave my views as to why we were not able to absorb these people in industry. In my humble opinion the fault lies at our own door. The interjection of the hon. member is a pertinent one, and I suggest that he consider the arguments we advance on this side from time to time as to why our secondary industries are not advancing. I make bold to say that we are coming to the end of our tether so far as absorbing any surplus population in our primary industries is concerned. There is no use putting people on the land unless we have more people to consume their production. The world's parity governs the prices obtainable for the exportable surpluses in our primary industries, and, except in isolated instances, it stands to reason that we shall have to look to our own country to consume our primary products. The only hope we have, then, is to establish secondary industries in our midst so that one industry will be dependent on the other. What the one produces the other will consume, both from a primary and a secondary point of view.

Hon. T. DUNSTAN: Would you have the secondary industries brought from other parts of the Empire?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is quite impossible for us to establish secondary industries to the extent I mean without the aid of Great Britain. If the circumstances were made more favourable and confidence was established in the minds of those who can establish and finance industry, we would attract from Great Britain men who have not got use for their brains, money, and experience in that country, and the great secondary industries which could

be established here would absorb that surplus. It stands to reason that these two things must go hand in hand, and that the necessary corollary to all these projects is confidence and stability; and you are not going to have that if the country is to be plunged into unauthorised railway strikes, of if employees are to hold up industry by tying up ships by the hundred in our ports. All these matters destroy confidence and jeopardise our chances. This question is of the utmost importance, and it is a duty not only to ourselves but to our kith and kin across the sea and to those who are to follow us that we should make some real effort to find a solution. Assuredly we are not going to be permitted to retain this country with its sparse population indefinitely. Undoubtedly the menace is there. When the Premier gets up at these conferences and states that the Government are really sympathetic in these matters, we may assume that he means what he says.

At 9.55 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the provisions of Sessional Orders agreed to by the House on 29th July and 25th September, I shall now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

The House adjourned at 10 p.m.