

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 26 JULY 1928

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 26 JULY, 1928.

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

QUESTIONS.

NUMBER OF ELECTORS ON STATE ELECTORAL ROLLS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Attorney-General—

“1. What were the numbers of electors on the State Electoral Rolls for the farming electorates of Drayton, Pittsworth, and Musgrave when they were abolished?”

“2. What are the numbers at present enrolled for the electorates of Flinders and Mount Morgan now represented by members of the Cabinet?”

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

“1. At the time when the electoral districts of Drayton, Pittsworth, and Musgrave were merged into other electoral districts, the number of electors on the roll was—

Drayton	4,502
Pittsworth	4,170
Musgrave	3,786

“A perusal, however, of the Electoral Districts Act of 1922 will indicate that pursuant to such merger, three new electoral districts were created—namely, Sandgate, Wynnum, and Kelvin Grove—the first two of which are represented by anti-Labour members.”

“2. Number on roll up to 30th June, 1928—

Flinders	2,770
Mount Morgan	3,964

“However, through the bold progressive policy of land and mineral development in the Flinders electoral district, and with the welcome information as recently disclosed in the press regarding the position of Mount Morgan, it is

anticipated that the number of electors on the roll in these districts will be considerably augmented in the near future.”
(Opposition laughter.)

AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM HOSPITAL TAX ON RATEABLE PROPERTY.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Home Secretary—

“What is the total sum derived from the tax levied for hospital purposes on rateable property in Queensland?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*), for the HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*), replied—

“The Hospitals Act of 1923 provides that the local authority of an area component in a hospitals district constituted under the Act, may pay the hospital precept from the local fund, or it may levy a hospital rate. The greater number have not levied a hospital rate. Of those that have done so, some have levied excess hospital rates and charged other expenditures to such hospital rate, which was contrary to law. The department is not in possession of the details of the amounts collected from hospital rates, but is in a position to give the amounts which were legally payable by the local authorities, or legally leviable by a hospital rate. If the hon. member desires only the total amount of tax levied by hospital rates, the information will have to be obtained from the local authorities which levied such rates.”

MINERAL LEASES, 215 AND 211, MOUNT CANNINDAH MINERAL FIELD.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

“1. Were the labour conditions in connection with mineral leases 215 and 211, Mount Cannindah Mineral Field, being complied with during July, 1922?”

“2. Was a Warden's Court held in Gladstone during September, 1927, to deal with an application for the forfeiture of these leases on account of non-fulfilment of conditions?”

“3. If so, was the applicant for their forfeiture in court, and was a telegram received by the court from the Department of Mines asking for an adjournment because owing to the railway strike a representative of the department was unable to be present; also from the Mount Cannindah Copper Mines Company, asking for an adjournment?”

“4. Was the Court then adjourned, and, if so, has it since resumed its hearing of this case?”

“5. Who are the shareholders in the Mount Cannindah Copper Mining Company?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*) replied—

“1. It is presumed that this inquiry refers to July, 1927. The leases were not under exemption during that month.

“2. Yes.

“3. and 4. Applicant for the forfeiture was in court at the hearing, and his evidence on the application for forfeiture

was taken at that sitting, but owing to the absence of railway facilities at the time, a representative of the lessee company was unable to be present; he, however, attended at the adjourned hearing of the application for forfeiture, and on the statements given to the court the warden recommended that the leases be not forfeited, but that the lessees be requested to seek exemption and allow tributes if applied for. This has been the practice of the department for some time in connection with copper leases throughout the State, owing to the low price of copper.

“5. The department has no knowledge as to who are shareholders in this and other mining companies.”

COST OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES BOUNDARIES COMMISSION.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Vanango*) asked the Premier—

“What was the cost of the recent Local Authorities Boundaries Commission—

(a) fees to members of the Commission; (b) travelling expenses; (c) other expenditure; (d) total?”

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“(a) £1,443 15s.; (b) £757 18s. 9d.; (c) £634 9s. 5d.; (d) £2,836 3s. 2d.”

GOVERNMENT PROTECTION FOR PRIMARY PRODUCERS DURING INDUSTRIAL STRIKES.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“Will the Government make available to primary producers the protection desired by them and expressed by a resolution of the Local Producers' Association sitting in Brisbane in May last, reading:—‘That, in the event of a strike holding up primary produce, the farmers organise the carrying on of the necessary utilities under the protection of the Government.’”

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. D. A. Gledson, *Ipswich*) replied—

“The question of protection of individuals or groups of individuals is not a matter for the Labour and Industry Department.”

EXPENDITURE BY MAIN ROADS COMMISSION, 1927-28.

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

“1. What is the amount actually expended by the Main Roads Commission during the last financial year on—(a) main roads; (b) developmental roads; (c) maintenance of main roads?”

“2. Of the actual expenditure by the Main Roads Commission during the last financial year under the Commonwealth Main Roads Agreement, what amount was contributed by—(a) Commonwealth grant; (b) State subsidy; (c) motor taxation.

“3. What was the total amount available to the Commissioner for the financial year of—(a) Commonwealth grant; (b) State contributions; (c) motor taxation?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. T. Dunstan, *Gympie*) replied—

“1. During the year ended 30th June, 1928, the following amounts were expended by the Commissioner of Main Roads:—

	£
(a) Main roads	327,059
(b) Developmental roads (the Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1925, and the Federal Aid Roads Agreement Approval Act of 1926)	329,189
(c) Maintenance of main roads	149,193
(d) Advances to shires on account of works ...	30,750

“In addition to the above, an amount of £130,831 was expended on sinking fund contributions, interest on loan portion of Federal Aid Funds, investigations and surveys, salaries, office rents and general office expenses, purchase of plant, cost of collections under the motor vehicle and heavy vehicle regulations, depot buildings and stocks, travelling and living allowances, printing, postages, etc.

“2. Of the actual works expenditure under the Federal Aid Roads Agreement Approval Act of 1926, funds were provided as follows:—

	£
(a) Commonwealth grant	318,341
(b) State subsidy ...	238,756
Loan, £144,928; revenue, £93,828.)	
(c) See revenue under (b).	

“3. Total amount available for financial year—

	£
Annual contribution by Commonwealth ...	376,000
Annual contribution by State (loan and revenue)	282,000
Loan appropriations (State)	110,421
Motor vehicle revenue, £360,000, less revenue £93,828 provided in State quota of Federal aid scheme	266,172
Miscellaneous receipts (repayment of maintenance by local authorities, rents, unused roads, etc.) ...	52,400

“Owing to the Federal Aid Roads Agreement not being ratified with the Commonwealth Government until the middle of the financial year 1926-27, the first year's operations were commenced six months late, and in consequence of this delay there was, in addition to the above sum, an unexpended balance available from the first year's quota of £357,334, being made up of Commonwealth quota £204,197 and State subsidy £153,147.

“The exceptionally wet season prevented shire councils from proceeding with authorised works as rapidly as was anticipated. The statement submitted by the Minister for Works and Railways at the meeting of the Federal Aid Roads Board at Canberra in April of this year indicated that this State was well for-

ward with its Federal aid programme, in comparison with the other States, whilst at 30th June plans and specifications absorbing the whole of the Commonwealth and the State subsidy money available at that date had been completed and forwarded to local authorities for their approval and starting of works.”

AMOUNT RECEIVABLE BY QUEENSLAND IN 1927-28 FROM COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT ON PER CAPITA BASIS.

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

“1. Had the Commonwealth and State Financial Ratification Act not operated, what amount would have been receivable by this State under the per capita basis for the financial year 1927-28?

“2. As in Question 1, what amount would it have been necessary to provide for statutory Sinking Fund for the financial year 1927-28?

“3. What amount was paid or payable to the Commonwealth for the Sinking Fund under the agreement to 30th June, 1928?”

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“1. Owing to the delay of the Parliament of Western Australia in ratifying the Financial Agreement, and to the fact that the Western Australian Bill has been reserved for Royal Assent, the Agreement is not yet in operation. On a per capita basis Queensland would have received £1,118,192, but I would refer the hon. member to the States Grant Act, 1927, under which the sum of £1,131,646 was payable during the financial year 1927-28.

“2. £277,887 18s. 2d.

“3. £259,256 16s. 8d. was payable. Of this amount, £90,254 10s. 11d. has been paid in accordance with contractual liabilities, £55,082 7s. 3d. has been paid to the Commonwealth Government on account of loans raised for the State, and £113,919 18s. 6d. is held in Suspense Account and is available for payment to the National Debt Commission in accordance with the agreement.”

APPORTIONMENT OF ORIGINAL COST OF TREASURY BUILDINGS, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, AND EXECUTIVE BUILDINGS.

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

“Will he state how the cost of the original Treasury Buildings, Parliament House, and the Executive Buildings was apportioned between loan and revenue moneys?”

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“As far as can be ascertained, the whole cost was charged to loan.”

REDISTRIBUTION OF ELECTORATES BEFORE NEXT STATE ELECTION.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Attorney-General—

“In view of the fact that the rolls for 1927 show that each Government member represents on an average 5,906 electors,

while each Opposition member represents 7,119 electors, will he consider the unfairness thereof and rectify the undemocratic position of affairs by taking action so that at least the electoral law may be adhered to in the matter of the laid-down quota, and also which will permit Queensland to have a just and proper opportunity as desired by the electors at the next State election?"

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

"Part of this question is based on incorrect premises, as there is no illegality merely owing to the fact that the number of electors in any electoral district may be above or below the prescribed margin in the Electoral Districts Act. It is somewhat refreshing to learn that the Opposition are desirous of a redistribution of electoral districts after the caustic criticism and baseless charges of gerrymandering which have been hurled from time to time at the Redistribution Commission appointed by this Government. Apparently that charge has now been withdrawn, otherwise it is difficult to see how the Opposition can logically press for another redistribution. It may also be interesting to remind the hon. member that according to official figures, in the election of 1912 (following the redistribution of the anti-Labour Government) Labour secured twenty-four seats after having polled 99,034 votes (or an average of 4,126 votes per seat), while anti-Labour secured forty-eight seats after having polled 116,998—including the Independent votes—(or an average of only 2,437 votes per seat), with the result that the anti-Labour Government secured ten more seats than they would have been entitled to on a proportional basis. As Labour represents the great majority of country electorates, doubtless the aim of the Opposition is to secure greater representation for the metropolis at the expense of the country and rural districts. This Government will take such action as it may consider necessary in the matter, having always in view the equitable representation of the electorates, taking the State as a whole."

EXPENDITURE ON OUTDOOR RELIEF, 1927-28.

Mr. KING (*Logan*) asked the Home Secretary—

"What was the expenditure on outdoor relief for last financial year?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*), for the HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*), replied—

"£46,806 4s."

BALANCES OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ON 30TH JUNE, 1928.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Treasurer—

"What were the balances of the Public Accounts on 30th June last—(a) Loan Fund; (b) Consolidated Revenue; and (c) Trust Fund?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

"The information will be contained in the Treasurer's Financial Statement."

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT DURING 1927-28.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Treasurer—

"What was the increase in the public debt during last financial year, and the amount of the public debt on 30th June last?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

"The information will be contained in the Treasurer's Financial Statement."

REVENUE INCREASE UNDER HEADING OF "MISCELLANEOUS OTHER RECEIPTS," 1927-28.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Treasurer—

"Will he give an explanation of the fact that revenue received last year under the heading of 'Miscellaneous Other Receipts' (£173,665) was £77,556 more than the corresponding revenue for 1926-27 and £50,665 in excess of his estimate?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

"The information will be contained in the Treasurer's Financial Statement."

EXPENDITURE UNDER WORKERS' DWELLINGS, WORKERS' HOMES, AND AGRICULTURAL BANK ACTS, AND FROM LOAN FUND.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Treasurer—

"What was the expenditure during last financial year under the Workers' Dwellings and Workers' Homes Acts and the Agricultural Bank Act, respectively, and the expenditure from the Loan Fund exclusive of these amounts?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

	£	s.	d.
"Workers' Dwellings—			
Loan Fund—Advances,			
etc.	413,994	15	0
Trust Fund—Work-			
ing expenses, etc.	134,399	14	4
"Workers' Homes—			
Loan Fund—Advances			
and purchase of			
land	285,902	3	8
Trust Fund—Work-			
ing expenses, etc.	41,649	15	1
"Agricultural Bank—			
Loan Fund—Advances,			
etc.	333,356	8	9
Trust Fund—Work-			
ing expenses, etc.	138,639	14	0
"Other expenditure			
from Loan Fund	3,005,651	5	7"

ADJOURNMENT DURING EXHIBITION WEEK.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*), without notice, asked the Premier—

"Is it his intention to adjourn Parliament during the whole period of Exhibition week, as was done last year?"

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

"I think it will meet with the approval of all members of the House if we follow the usual custom, and do not sit during Exhibition week."

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Ordinances under the City of Brisbane Act of 1924.

Regulations under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1922, entitled "The Venereal Diseases Regulations of 1923," dated the 16th February, 1923.

Regulations under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1922, entitled "The Food and Drug Regulations, 1923," dated the 21st June, 1923.

Regulations under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1922, dated the 3rd July, 1923, amending the Food and Drug Regulations, 1923.

Proclamation dated the 22nd March, 1923, appointing Saturday, the thirty-first day of March, 1923, as the date on which the Firearms License Act of 1927 shall commence.

Regulations under the Firearms License Act of 1927, entitled "The Firearms Regulations, 1923," dated the 22nd March, 1923.

Regulations under the following Acts:—
The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1925.

The Diseases in Plants Acts, 1916 to 1924.

The Fruit and Vegetables Act of 1927.

The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act of 1926.

The Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1925.

The Pest Destroyers Act of 1923.

[4 p.m.]

STANDING ORDER No. 17.

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF DEBATE ON
ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): I beg to move—

"That, during the present session, the period allotted to the discussion of the Address in Reply, under Standing Order No. 17, shall be extended to ten full sitting days, exclusive of the day upon which it is moved and seconded, and all other provisions of that Standing Order shall, *mutatis mutandis*, continue to apply."

Question put and passed.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): I beg to move—

"That the Standing Orders Committee for the present Session consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. King, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Moore, Mr. Bulcock, Mr. Ferricks, and the mover, and that the said committee have leave to sit during any adjournment of the House."

Question put and passed.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): I beg to move—

"That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by Order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members. That such committee consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Barber, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Dash, and Mr. Swayne."

Question put and passed.

LIBRARY REFRESHMENT ROOMS,
AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS
COMMITTEES.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): I beg to move—

"That the Library, Refreshment Rooms, and Parliamentary Buildings Committees for the present session be constituted as follow:—

Library.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Elphinstone, Mr. Collins, Mr. Pease, Mr. G. P. Barnes, and Mr. H. M. Russell;

Refreshment Rooms.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pollock, Mr. H. J. Ryan, Mr. F. A. Cooper, Mr. Corser, Mr. Maxwell, and Mr. King;

Parliamentary Buildings.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Riordan, Mr. Dash, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Logan, Mr. Morgan, and the mover."

Question put and passed.

SITTING DAYS.

HOURS OF SITTING.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): I beg to move—

"1. That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at ten o'clock a.m. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and after two o'clock p.m. on Thursdays, Government business do take precedence of all other business.

"At five-thirty o'clock p.m. on each sitting day, Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House, without motion put, until the next sitting day, but before doing so shall invite the Leader of the House to notify the Order of Business for the succeeding sitting. If the House is in Committee the Chairman of Committees shall leave the Chair at twenty-five minutes after five o'clock p.m., report progress, and ask leave to sit again. Whereupon a motion for leave to sit again shall be moved and put to the House, without amendment or debate, and Mr. Speaker shall thereafter adjourn the House until the next sitting day.

"Nothing in this Sessional Order shall be construed to prevent the House adjourning before five-thirty o'clock p.m. if it appears to be the wish of the

majority so to do, in which case the desire of the Committee or of the House may be tested by motion (moved by a Minister) either 'That the Chairman do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again,' or, if Mr. Speaker is in the chair, 'That the House do now adjourn,' which motion shall be put either in the Committee or in the House without amendment or debate. If the hour for automatic adjournment has arrived, and it is desired to adjourn over the next sitting day, the question 'That the House at its rising do adjourn until _____' may be put before Mr. Speaker declares the House adjourned.

"Business interrupted at five-thirty o'clock p.m. under this Sessional Order shall stand as an Order of the Day for the next sitting day.

"If a division is being taken either upon a question relating to the business before the House or a Committee of the Whole House or upon a motion of closure, the same shall be concluded before the House adjourns, or the Chairman leaves the chair.

"Division upon a motion of closure shall include also division upon the question upon which the closure has been moved.

"2. That during the remainder of this session, Standing Order No. 17—'Debate on Address in Reply'—shall be construed as if five-thirty o'clock p.m. were substituted for ten-thirty o'clock p.m. wherever it occurs in the Standing Order, and eleven-thirty o'clock a.m. for four-thirty o'clock p.m.

"3. That during the remainder of this session, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Standing or Sessional Order, Standing Order No. 307—'Days Allotted for Supply'—shall be construed as if twenty-five minutes after five o'clock p.m. were substituted for ten-thirty o'clock p.m. in paragraph 5, and 'five o'clock p.m.' were substituted for 'ten o'clock p.m.' in paragraphs 6 and 7.

"If on the last day but one of the days allotted for Supply the whole of the Votes remaining to be dealt with, including Votes on Account for the ensuing year, have not been disposed of before twenty-five minutes after five o'clock p.m., the Chairman shall not leave the chair until decisions have been arrived at upon each of the remaining Votes, and the sitting of the Committee and of the House shall be continued until the whole of the Votes have been decided and reported to the House, and an Order made for reception of the Resolutions from Committee of Supply.

"On the day appointed for the reception of any resolution or resolutions reported from Committees of Supply and Ways and Means it shall be within the discretion of the Leader of the House to proceed forthwith with the Appropriation Bill founded on such resolutions, notwithstanding that the hour of five-thirty o'clock p.m. has arrived, but upon the passage of the Bill no further business shall be proceeded with at that sitting: Provided that if consideration of an Appropriation Bill is entered upon at or before the hour of five-thirty o'clock p.m., the period for the discussion of

the Bill at all stages shall be limited to eight o'clock p.m., at which hour every question necessary for the disposal of the remaining stages of the Bill shall be put by Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, without amendment or debate.

"On the days allotted for Supply, it shall be optional to set down any Bill for initiation in Committee, to precede consideration of Supply, such initiatory proceedings not to extend beyond eleven-thirty o'clock a.m., at which hour the Chairman shall leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

"4. That during the remainder of this session, if occasion arises to put into operation Standing Order No. 249, the Standing Order shall be construed as if 'eleven o'clock a.m.' were substituted for 'four o'clock p.m.' and 'five o'clock p.m.' were substituted for 'ten o'clock p.m.' in paragraph 2. If the business then under discussion is not completed by five-thirty o'clock p.m. the Committee may continue to sit until all the clauses of the Bill or other matter have been disposed of, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Standing or Sessional Order. Thereupon the Chairman shall make his report to the House, and all action necessary to complete the business of the Committee may be taken notwithstanding that the hour for adjournment of the House has arrived."

The Leader of the Opposition has called "Not formal." I understand he desires to make an alteration. The matter was considered by me, but, as we have had day sittings so far during the whole of this Parliament, let us finish this Parliament under the day sittings. If the hon. gentleman succeeds—which no one thinks he will—

Mr. KING: By Jove, you do! (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: My attitude generally is not the attitude of the Leader of a Government who is afraid of being defeated—but that is by the way. If successful, the hon. gentleman may alter it; if he is not—and I do not think he will be—then I hope to have an opportunity of making some alteration myself.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I called "Not formal" to this motion, not necessarily because I desire to make a change myself, but because I think that in a matter like this it is only reasonable that the House as a whole should have a say as to what should be done. We know perfectly well that in the Government Party the division of opinion is such that the numbers are pretty close—that almost as many want night sittings as want day sittings. This is a matter which affects the convenience of members, and not the convenience of the Government, and I think it is only right that in a matter which affects every member, his own personal convenience, and his ability to attend to the wants of his electors, every member should have the opportunity of having an equal voice in the decision. Such a matter should not be decided in the Government caucus room and then be brought in here in the way it is. It is a matter peculiarly for the decision of the House, and I think members on this side are just as much entitled to have a say

Mr. Moore.]

on a matter such as this as members on the other side.

It is a matter which also affects the convenience of the public. It is a matter which should not be a party question, but one on which every hon. member should have the right to express his opinion and give his vote as he chooses, for the convenience of himself and his electorate. I hold that on a matter which vitally affects every one of us and also the people outside a vote of this House should be taken instead of a secret vote, the result of which is merely announced to the House.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): I desire to endorse the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. In a matter of this kind it is only fair that there should be a non-party vote. Hon. members know that there is not unanimity on either side of the House as to whether there should be day or partly day and partly night sittings. The excuse given by the Premier that, because we have had two sessions of day sittings during this Parliament, it is good enough to continue them till the end of this Parliament, does not carry very much weight; and I strongly suspect that the real reason why the Government are continuing the day sittings is that they wish to prevent the people of the metropolis from coming here to hear the destructive criticism of members on this side of the Chamber. (Government laughter.) Judging by what I hear outside, there is a desire on the part of the public of Brisbane, at any rate, when they find they have the time at their disposal, to come here and listen to these proceedings. The Government are giving no opportunity whatever to them to come here and slake their curiosity as to the explanations which are going to be given by the Premier as to how he is going to win the next elections. I know from the remarks of the Premier in former sessions that his private opinion is that he would like to sit in the afternoon and evening.

The PREMIER: I have expressed it.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman has expressed himself so, and there are members on this side who agree with him. I agree with him.

The PREMIER: Not for the reason you give.

Mr. KELSO: But what opportunity have members on this side of expressing their views? What chance have they of joining with members on the other side in voting for what suits them best? I believe that a number of members on the other side believe just as the Premier believes. I think that, if a non-party vote were taken, it would be decided that we should sit in the afternoon and evening.

The PREMIER: There is one objection to that. It would lead to my voting with you, and that is a thing I do not want ever to happen. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: If the hon. gentleman followed my views more often, he would be on safer lines. At any rate, I put this question: Have Ministers, as a result of the last two sessions, been satisfied with working in Parliament during the day, and at the same time attempting to deal with the work of their departments? It is impossible for Ministers to do their duty to the satisfaction of themselves and of the public when they

[Mr. Moore.

have to attend Parliament during the day. On more than one occasion during last session when Cabinet had to meet—and it is quite proper that Cabinet should meet at a certain time in the morning—we had no Ministers at all on the front bench, and, in order to make the House a little more presentable, the vacant Ministerial seats were occupied by private Government members. I ask hon. members opposite whether they are of the opinion that the debates under the system of day sittings have equalled the standard set when Parliament sat partly in the daytime and partly in the evening. Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that it is very depressing to be compelled to speak in this House when there is not even a quorum present. We are supposed to devote our intelligence to this work and put our best into our speeches, but are hon. members opposite personally satisfied that the debates in this House are equal to the standard set under the evening sittings? I think the Premier might unbend even now, seeing that he is so gracious to-day.

The PREMIER: You speak rather feelingly about this lack of a quorum, but other hon. members on your side can always command a good House. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: My observations are based on the circumstances that exist when I am listening to other members deliberating in this Chamber. I am pleased to say that I can generally command a very fair House. I ask the Premier to reconsider this matter and allow an open vote of the House in order to test the feelings of hon. members.

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*), who was received with Opposition cheers, said: First of all, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. I would also sympathise with them in the very difficult situation in which they found themselves. The only thing that the new hon. member for Mitchell could find on which to congratulate the Government was the step they had taken after the Land Settlement Advisory Board had condemned their administration root and branch from the time that they entered office until last year. Feeling that he would not be justified in being associated with any criticism of the Government during those years, he contented himself with saying very little. I have hopes for him, because obviously he felt his position very keenly, and realised that the position was a most unsatisfactory one for any member of the Government to try to defend.

The hon. member for Balonne has made a most extraordinary volte-face. When I was in his electorate the hon. member was a political candidate; he was very enthusiastic about the land policy of the Government at that time. He even defended the Water Act.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You assisted him quite a lot during that election.

Mr. MOORE: I helped the hon. gentleman the other day. I spoke at Mackay, and he rushed up there immediately afterwards. (Opposition laughter.)

However, Mr. Speaker, what I want to point out is that the hon. member for

Balonne, who was so enthusiastic over the Government's action, in supporting their administration in land matters, has turned completely round since the report of the Land Settlement Advisory Board, and now is enthusiastic over what the Government have done since appointing that board. One thing or the other must be wrong, because the whole of the report of that board condemned the administration of the Government root and branch.

Mr. BULCOCK: Has there not been a drought meanwhile?

Mr. MOORE: It is not a question of drought; it is a question right through of the administration of the Government and their amendments of the Land Acts.

I just want to quote one or two things that the hon. member for Mitchell said. He said that it behoved the Government to foster the wool industry. We all recognise that. How did the Government foster it up to last year? They fostered it by raising railway fares and freights—by raising the freights on sheep over 100 per cent.; by raising the freight on wool by over 80 per cent., and in every way by imposing taxation and disabilities on the wool industry. They restricted the operation of people in that industry; they disallowed partnerships, and did everything to make this industry decadent, and then they appointed a board to take evidence and inquire into the industry when they found it practically down and out. The board brought in a report which practically condemned the administration of the Government from 1915, and last year the Government were forced to bring in an amending Act to remedy their hideous mistakes.

The PREMIER: How can an industry which pays half our income tax be down and out?

Mr. Bow: Where were you when the Mitchell by-election was on?

Mr. MOORE: I was doing my duty. The hon. member also congratulated the Government on the amendment they had brought down to the Land Acts last year.

Mr. Bow: What were you doing for the small holder?

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member contended that this amendment had encouraged financial institutions to come to the help of the industry, otherwise it would be down and out. Those are the hon. member for Mitchell's own words.

Mr. BULCOCK: Didn't he make some reference to a drought just before that?

Mr. MOORE: Yes; but the Government have put forward war and drought as excuses ever since I came into this House. It is time that we came down to facts. The cause of the condition of the industry is the administration of the Government. I am here to point out exactly where the Government are wrong. The Government themselves appointed a board to take evidence and go into the country to inquire into the industry. What was the result of that inquiry? Did it not condemn the action of the Government from 1915? Of course, it did. Then we have the hon. member for Mitchell saying that it behoved the Government to foster the industry! He also expressed appreciation of the work of the Land Settlement Advisory Board, and said that the Government were making some

attempt in this desperate position to improve the industry, and will continue to do so until conditions improved.

Mr. BRUCE: What is your policy?

Mr. MOORE: Our policy has been definitely stated since 1915, and, after we had hammered it into the Government year after year, they appointed a Land Settlement Advisory Board to go out and take evidence. What did that board report? Exactly what the Opposition had been advocating for years.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is not true.

Mr. MOORE: It is rather an extraordinary thing that the Premier himself, when Secretary for Public Lands, turned down three amendments to the Land Acts that were moved by myself, and in the following year brought in amendments to the Land Acts to make the selfsame amendments that I had moved.

Then the hon. member for Balonne started to criticise the Federal Government for not bringing in a childhood endowment scheme.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: They promised to do so.

Mr. MOORE: Does not the hon. member know that his own deputy leader, the Secretary for Agriculture, when he went down to a conference of Premiers, moved for a commission to be appointed to go round the different States in order to find out whether the different States could bear the cost of such a scheme?

The PREMIER: Do you disagree with that?

Mr. MOORE: No, but the hon. member for Balonne comes here and condemns the Federal Government for doing what his own deputy leader asked that Government to do. Let me quote exactly what the Deputy Leader of the Government said on that occasion—

"If industry could not pay, the burden was simply passed on, and no good result was achieved. Having all these things in mind, he considered it was of paramount importance that a survey should be made of the position in every State in order to ascertain the actual position in each, to ascertain the exact nature of the problem as it affected each State and, generally, to provide complete data of a reliable character."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That was after Mr. Bruce had definitely said that his Government did not intend to bring in a childhood endowment scheme.

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Bruce said that it was too great a tax to be imposed by direct taxation, and the Deputy Leader of the Government said that it was owing to that fact that the people had turned down the referenda proposals.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I said nothing at all about the referenda proposals being turned down. Mr. Bruce definitely stated that he did not intend to introduce a childhood endowment scheme.

Mr. MOORE: At any rate, the published report reads—

"Commenting on this motion, Mr. Smith said: 'The Commonwealth definitely refuses to consider the introduction of a scheme wholly financed out of revenue owing to the excessive taxation involved; and it had no power to take

Mr. Moore.]

the initiative in imposing a charge on industry, as the people had refused the granting of the necessary power at the last referenda."

The PREMIER: Mr. Bruce said that.

Mr. MOORE: Now I want to tell hon. members what the Leader of this Government said in his policy speech of 1926. The hon. gentleman said that, if the Commonwealth Government did not take immediate steps to introduce a childhood endowment scheme for the whole of Australia, his Government would formulate a scheme for Queensland without delay. (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: And this Government will do so if the Commonwealth Government do not.

Mr. MOORE: The Secretary for Agriculture, continuing, had this to say—

"Leading thinkers of the State of Queensland are unanimous that the time is opportune for the introduction of such a scheme in this State. The State of Queensland is in a good position so far as the introduction of such a scheme is concerned."

Yet the hon. member for Balonne has the audacity to get up in this House and condemn the Federal Government for not carrying out a promise that his own leader had definitely made. That is the sort of thing we have to put up with here.

The extraordinary thing that struck me about the Governor's Speech is that all those things which are so vital to the State are conspicuous by their absence. I ask hon. members: What is the one factor that is causing us most anxiety? Is it not unemployment—the most tragic circumstance, and one of the greatest difficulties with which we are confronted to-day? The tragic position of Queensland should not be treated in such a light fashion.

The PREMIER: Let us hear what your solution is.

Mr. MOORE: I met a deputation of the unemployed this morning. I suppose it will be said that I instigated that meeting; but I am always prepared to hear the point of view of the unemployed, because I recognise that unemployment is one of the most distressing things we can have in this State. There can be no doubt that the present unfortunate position is the result of the legislation of the Government, and until we get rid of that legislation the position will not improve. All that is offered to the unemployed is the statement that the Government are collecting statistics to show how many persons are unemployed at the end of each quarter.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Mr. MOORE: That is what is stated in the Governor's Speech. The Governor's Speech also says that unemployment to-day is due to seasonal occupations. We know that, to a certain extent, it always has been so in Queensland. That is nothing new; but it is rather extraordinary to read it in the Governor's Speech.

The PREMIER: Are we responsible for the seasons?

Mr. MOORE: No, you are not responsible for the seasons.

Mr. HYNES: How do you account for the fact that there is less unemployment in

[Mr. Moore.

Queensland than there is in the other States?

Mr. MOORE: How does the hon. member account for these statements in the Speech? First of all the Speech "cracks up" the sugar industry, and says that there was an enormous crop last year.

Mr. BRUCE: Is that not true?

Mr. MOORE: Yes, and due entirely to the action of the Federal Government in putting on the embargo. The Speech goes on to say—

"The splendid season experienced in agricultural areas has brought about a greatly increased production, exceptional wheat yields being secured on the Darling Downs as a result of the favourable conditions prevailing in the spring.

"Maize, on account of its suitability to Queensland conditions, is a popular crop, and, generally speaking this year's harvest will be a good one.

"The expansion of trade in the peanut industry is most marked, and the early installation of modern machinery and the erection of storage silos are designed to place the Peanut Pool Board in a position to cope with the increasing crops.

"The past financial year has shown record returns in the dairying industry, butter returns were greater than during any previous year, whilst cheese production reached approximately the highest previous figures.

"The total yield of cotton this season will exceed that of last season, despite serious losses experienced from severe floods and heavy rains at critical stages of the development of the crop."

All showing that the season was particularly good, and the Speech talks about record returns from these crops. Then it goes on to say—

"Unfortunately, of late years the seasonal conditions throughout a large proportion of the sheep belt of Queensland have been unfavourable. Notwithstanding this temporary set-back it is gratifying to note that there are still 16,500,000 sheep depastured on the lands of the State.

"With the advent of good seasons, therefore, the State will soon be stocked again to its normal carrying capacity of 21,000,000 sheep."

In the last twenty years there have only been two years in which we reached 20,000,000 sheep. During the last ten years the average number of sheep depastured in Queensland for a single year has been 17,900,000. We now have 16,500,000 depastured in Queensland, which is only 1,000,000 less than the average for the last ten years; yet, despite that, we are told that unemployment in Queensland is due to the drought in the western parts of Queensland.

Mr. HYNES: How would you improve the position?

Mr. MOORE: If the hon. member will keep quiet, I will tell him, and I only hope he will take notice of what I say. That is the position we have got ourselves into; and the position in Queensland to-day is a most undesirable one. How is it going to be altered? The Deputy Leader of the Government has told the Government how

it can be altered. He has issued a pamphlet. Here it is. Why does he pick out the dairying industry, as exactly the same conditions obtain in every other industry as in that industry? Why should he pick out the dairying industry and say, "These people do not know how to manage their business"? Why should he point out what has to be done? Why does he not recognise that the same economic laws and the same natural laws appertain in every other industry?

The PREMIER: Perhaps he is doing it in connection with all industries.

Mr. MOORE: He is not doing it. The Government are talking and doing nothing. In this little pamphlet the Deputy Leader of the Government says—

"Review your position and find out where you stand."

The PREMIER: You represent the dairying industry, but you never make any suggestions.

Mr. MOORE: Never mind about that. I want to refer to this little pamphlet, and I say that the very factors and the economic laws that are stated in this pamphlet could be the salvation of our other industries in Queensland to-day, and I will tell you why. This pamphlet says—

"In many districts in Queensland dairying may be carried on in congenial circumstances; conditions generally are conducive to the production of a product of superfine flavour and of high good value.

"In view of these facts, it might generally be expected that the average yield of milk per cow in Queensland should be higher than the average yield in any of the other States; but what do we find?"

The hon. gentleman then gives figures to show that Queensland is last but one of the Australian States in regard to the milk yield. The pamphlet further says—

"Is it in the interests of the dairy farmers of Queensland that this State should have the second lowest average? Should not the objective be to secure for Queensland—the Queen Dairying State—pride of place? Would not the realisation of this objective result in substantial gain to the dairy farmers?"

Quite so. Now let me take this. This is in Mr. Theodore's speech—

[4.30 p.m.]

Mr. BRUCE: Keep on with the other one.

Mr. MOORE: I bring this in to show that none of the European countries can compare in natural resources with our own State. Mr. Theodore said—

"Here we have millions of acres of fertile land—easily made available, convenient to ports, and capable of production in golden abundance. Here we have mineral wealth which makes Queensland a veritable Golconda. Here are coal deposits so extensive and rich as are destined to make our country the envy of the whole world. We possess iron ore deposits which will be of immeasurable economic value in the manufacturing industry of Australia. We possess timber lands and pastoral areas, the products of which are every day becoming more and more essential to satisfy the require-

ments of friendly nations overseas. All that is required to enable Queensland to take advantage of her unique position is increased population, combined with the resolution and industry of our people, and the judicious employment of capital to provide machinery, plant, and transportation facilities."

That is all we require—the judicious employment of capital, confidence, and stability in the Government. Why have we not got it? Because there has been a continual harassing of capital ever since the Government came into power, because they have taken all they can out of the pockets of the people by imposing increased taxation until there is no possible chance of new industries starting.

The PREMIER: Show the true position.

Mr. MOORE: I am going to show it. The Deputy Leader of the Government has pointed out what has been the result in the dairying industry. I am pointing out what has happened. Why is it that, with all our natural resources, Queensland is absolutely the lowest State in the Commonwealth for production?

Mr. HYNES: And has less unemployment. Don't forget that!

Mr. MOORE: Why is it that the Queensland factory statistics show this position?—

"FACTORY STATISTICS TO 1927.

"Increase in Factories from 1914 to 1927.

New South Wales	2,957
Victoria	2,040
South Australia	484
Western Australia	429
Tasmania	164
Queensland	81 "

Queensland is the lowest of all the States.

Then contrast the factory employees per 10,000 of mean population in the different States—

"Movement from 1910 to 1914.

	Increase.
Queensland	67
Victoria	35
Western Australia	24
New South Wales	15
	Decrease.
South Australia	62
Tasmania	72 "

From 1910 to 1914 Queensland showed the biggest increase of any State in Australia. Then take the—

"Movement from 1914 to 1927.

	Increase.
New South Wales	137
South Australia	116
Victoria	97
Tasmania	81
	Decrease.
Western Australia	1
Queensland	107

Mr. FOLEY: They all have their unemployed.

Mr. MOORE: Of course they have. Why is it that from 1910 to 1914 Queensland showed the biggest increase of any State in Australia and the greatest decrease compared with other States from 1914 to 1927? We have primary products, such as wool and cotton; we have the raw materials for manufacture, yet from 1914 to 1927 we show a decrease in the number of our factories. Queensland showed the greatest progress

Mr. Moore.]

from 1910 to 1914 under previous Governments, but an astounding retrogression during the period from 1914 to 1927 under the present Government. Then take the following comparisons:—

“FACTORY COMPARISONS FOR THREE YEARS,
1924-25 to 1926-27.

(a) Number of Factories—

	Increase.
New South Wales	320
Victoria	265
South Australia	96
Tasmania	92
Western Australia	28

	Decrease.
Queensland	13

(b) Number of Factory Employees—

	Increase.
New South Wales	17,409
Victoria	7,481
South Australia	3,811
Tasmania	696

	Decrease.
Queensland	789
Western Australia	1,334

(c) Value of Output—

	Increase.
	£
New South Wales	19,653,171
Victoria	9,220,553
South Australia	4,734,476
Western Australia	1,742,878
Tasmania	262,041

	Decrease.
Queensland	7,814,869

Now, let us come to the reasons. One of the reasons, I say, is this enormous, burdensome, hampering taxation. We have the Commissioner of Taxes searching the pockets of the people throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, tearing at the very vitals of industry, sucking the very life-blood out of it. Look at the fact that in 1924 the present Premier and Treasurer said that Queensland had reached its limit in taxation and that, if it went any further, there was going to be unemployment. Mr. Speaker, we have the increase in taxation and we have the unemployment. I am just going to show that in 1922-23 Mr. Theodore increased taxation by £89,411, and in 1923-24 there was a decrease of £286,316.

The PREMIER: Caused by what—legislation or earning capacity?

Mr. MOORE: That is what was taken from the people. Mr. Gillies in 1924-25 increased it by £296,960. The present Premier in 1925-26 increased it by £189,961, in 1926-27 by £398,218, and in 1927-28 by £475,742. Of the total increase of taxation during the last six years of £1,163,976 the present Premier has been responsible for £1,063,921, or 91 per cent. Yet this is the man who in 1924 said that taxation had reached its limit in Queensland!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: The taxable income has increased.

Mr. MOORE: It is not because the taxable income has increased. Since 1915 the taxable income in Queensland has decreased by 3½ per cent.

The PREMIER: Income tax has not been increased.

Mr. MOORE: What is the good of talking about income tax when the hon. gentleman has stamp duty and gift duty and every

kind of tax you can lay your tongue to? He said in 1924 that taxation had reached its limit in Queensland.

The PREMIER: There has been no increase since.

Mr. MOORE: And he said that, if it went any further, he thought it would cause unemployment. And it has caused unemployment. I have pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the taxable income of Queensland had decreased in the last thirteen years—not increased. How then can he make out that taxation has increased because earning capacity has increased? Will he take the report of the Commissioner of Taxes and say whether I am right or wrong? It has decreased. In Victoria it has increased by 88 per cent. The hon. gentleman knows that the situation in Queensland to-day is hopeless. He cannot defend his administration.

The PREMIER: The position is very hopeful.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know what there is to be hopeful for. There is not much hope for the unemployed. There is no suggestion in the Governor's Speech as to what steps are to be taken to relieve it.

The PREMIER: If you have unemployed and Communists waiting on you—

Mr. MOORE: Nothing is to be gained by talking about Communists. The hon. gentleman said that if more legislation were needed to deal with Communism, he would bring it in. I say that we will help him under those conditions; but I also say that because a man happens to be out of work that is no reason why he should be called a Communist. I do not know what the men who waited on me this morning were, but I am perfectly satisfied that some of those men who came to see me were genuine unemployed. (Opposition cheers.)

The PREMIER: You say we are responsible for unemployment. That is an important charge.

Mr. MOORE: It is. I say that the Government are responsible, because ever since they have been in power there has been a sort of vendetta against capital. The whole time they have been searching the pockets of the people. They have said so. The Socialist objective is to take away from people by taxation gradually; that of the Communist is to take it away in one fell swoop. It is production for use and not for profit.

The PREMIER: You say that the effect of the policy of this Government is to be seen in unemployment?

Mr. MOORE: The effect of it is here for everybody to see.

The PREMIER: There have been much more capable men than you investigating it.

Mr. MOORE: I am not saying that there have not. I am pointing out the effect. It is no use talking to me about droughts or the war. When I see industry being taxed out of existence—

The PREMIER: You talk about income tax, but you will not go any further.

Mr. MOORE: There is not one word of suggestion in the Speech of His Excellency as to how this can be combated. There is not one word as to whether there will be any rebate in taxation on industries that

[Mr. Moore.]

are prepared to expand or to invest additional capital. There is not one word about any system of co-operation.

The PREMIER: You are not telling us how taxation is affecting us.

Mr. MOORE: I am giving some reasons for the present situation, and the Premier cannot get away from those reasons. The Government have taken £30,000,000 in taxation in the past ten years, which has operated to the detriment of the expansion and establishment of industries.

The PREMIER: You would not take that money?

Mr. MOORE: No.

The PREMIER: You would carry on the whole of the public service for love and affection?

Mr. MOORE: I did not say that. The Premier tries to make some little point because he knows he is in a hole. He knows the position he is in, and he cannot defend that position.

The PREMIER: I know that, if you were here, you, like Bavin, would not be able to reduce taxation.

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Bavin made an attempt to deal with the unemployed question.

The PREMIER: He has borrowed more than Lang borrowed.

Mr. MORGAN: He has restored confidence in his State.

The PREMIER: He does not say that he has solved the problem.

Mr. MOORE: When it was suggested by the Federal Government that a conference between employers and employees should be held with a view to discussing the grievances and the difficulties that exist, and ascertaining the exact position in which they stood, organised labour throughout the whole of Australia was not game to face such a conference.

Mr. BRUCE: The spider and the fly.

The PREMIER: They have not refused to meet the employers with the politicians out of the way.

Mr. MOORE: When the Secretary for Agriculture was in Mackay he said that the people had the right to refuse so long as there was on the statute-book of the Commonwealth an Arbitration Act with which they did not agree.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I stick to that statement.

Mr. MOORE: Why should that legislation not be placed on the statute-book? The Federal Government were returned by an enormous majority to enact that very legislation.

Mr. BRUCE: For the capitalists.

Mr. MOORE: They were returned by the workers. The Federal members were elected on a democratic franchise, and considered it their duty to pass legislation embodying the will of the people.

The PREMIER: How quickly the unions met the employers in Melbourne when the politicians were out of the way!

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Prime Minister said that the conference would be held entirely free from any political influence. He knows

that the Prime Minister's sole desire was to have the organised forces of industry meeting in conference and discussing their difficulties.

The PREMIER: The British Government were not so foolish as to butt into the matter.

Mr. MOORE: That is one vital mistake that we make in Australia. Because a member of a party endeavours to do something in the interests of the community there is always some antagonism on the part of the other party for fear that the person taking the initiative may gain some credit by his actions. There is willingness and tolerance all over Australia, and there is a sporting instinct on the part of the people to hear both sides of the question; but, when something of vital importance to industry is suggested, organised labour refuses to meet, and even refuses to discuss the question. How can we discuss the question unless something along these lines is adopted? We must ascertain where our difficulties are.

I find that the wages per employee have increased in five years to 1926, to the following extent:—

	£
New South Wales	14.83
Victoria	16.98
Queensland	17.21
South Australia	24.08
Western Australia	5.96
Tasmania	16.93

But the value of output per employee in the same time has increased by—

	£
New South Wales	84
Victoria	51
Queensland	46*
South Australia	120
Western Australia	23
Tasmania	103

* Decrease.

These are the figures showing the value added in process of manufacture per employee:—

	£
New South Wales	58
Victoria	14
Queensland	18*
South Australia	28
Western Australia	20
Tasmania	39

* Decrease.

And the drift is still continuing, as the output per employee has dropped from £910 in June, 1926, to £859 in June, 1927, or by £51 per employee, making a total decrease of £97 in six years.

Everybody must know what happens when hours are reduced, wages increased, and output decreased. Everyone knows that industry must suffer, as no one can stand it. That is exactly what the Secretary for Agriculture points out in his pamphlet.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a good pamphlet.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, but why not make its application general?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have never stood for anything else in any industry.

Mr. MOORE: In case it may be said that the capitalist or the employer in Queensland has not made the most of introducing modern machinery into industry, I would point out that the increase of machinery in industry

Mr. Moore.]

in Queensland has been greater in proportion during the last five years than in any other State of the Commonwealth.

The PREMIER: Don't destroy your argument.

Mr. MOORE: I am not doing so. The employers in Queensland have increased the amount of machinery employed in industry in an endeavour to give employees every benefit possible and turn out a better job. The following figures show the increase in the amount of plant and machinery for each employee in industry in the various States during the last five years:—

New South Wales	£	28
Queensland	93	
Victoria	54	
South Australia	50	
Western Australia	49	
Tasmania	31	

The employers of Queensland, therefore, have endeavoured in every way to increase their output and foster the jobs of employees; yet Queensland is the only State which shows a decreased output. The pamphlet issued by the Department of Agriculture and Stock states—

“Official figures prove indisputably that a very large number of Queensland dairy farmers are carrying on their operations with cows that are definitely unprofitable.”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Isn't that true?

Mr. MOORE: Is that not true of every industry? Is not the diminution of output a proof of that? This pamphlet also has this—

“Unprofitable business leading to financial disaster.”

“Profitable business leading to financial prosperity.”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is better than I thought after I hear you quote it.

Mr. MOORE: The sentiment is admirable.

The PREMIER: Take an ordinary industry, and show how taxation affects it. I have gone to a lot of trouble in that matter.

Mr. MOORE: The pamphlet also states this—

“The capacity of each cow to produce is the fundamental and dominant factor in making dairying profitable.”

That is quite right, but the same argument applies in every other industry. Why was something not put in His Excellency's Speech by which this could be brought about, and by which we could get a greater output per employee? Not a word is suggested in that direction—

“The price of dairy products has an important influence upon the cost of living in the community, and the community should not be expected to pay a price which will permit of inefficiency.”

We find by a question asked in this House last session by the hon. member for Wide Bay that the cost of construction of three schools 21 ft. by 18 ft. was £649, £642, and £609 respectively. The sinking of the post holes was good, but the putting up of eight posts per man in a day is worse than inefficiency.

[Mr. Moore.

We also find this in the report of the Beef Cattle Industry Commission—

“The companies state that, in addition to the wage increase, other working conditions and practices have been introduced into the meatworks which have tended to increase the cost of operating, and that the number of employees is greater than that necessary for the efficient performance of the work.”

The report later on goes to show that the companies are forced to engage too much labour and, as a result, costs have increased by 25 per cent.

Mr. HYNES: You would settle that by putting employees off.

Mr. MOORE: I would settle it in the same way that the Premier said he would settle it at the Labour Convention, Townsville, where he said—

“In spite of all the talk against piece-work in industries like cane-cutting and shearing”—

He might have said State coalmining also—

“if they would establish a proper organisation which would prevent the employer exploiting the worker, as he did in other countries, and prevent the employee from exploiting himself physically, such a system would solve many of their problems.”

I quite agree with him.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Didn't the Premier say that over-taxation acted like a boomerang and came back on the worker?

Mr. MOORE: There is the policy that is advocated in the pamphlet that is issued by the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

The PREMIER: What is wrong with my making that statement at the Labour Conference?

Mr. MOORE: Nothing; only I wish that the hon. gentleman would make a similar statement here, and endeavour to put his words into practice. It is all right for the hon. gentleman to go outside and talk in that strain, but why should he not give an opportunity to the employees to put that in practice?

The PREMIER: My job is to educate the people of this State to understand the difficulties.

Mr. MOORE: The objective of the Premier should be to introduce such legislation as will permit of the greatest production per unit in the State. Continuing with the report, we find the following remarks made by the hon. gentleman:—

“The question of capital was one which could be got over if they had the will to do it. Capital could be found for tin hare races and liberty fairs. He wanted to close the cleavage between the political and industrial wings, and if they put the same amount of energy into establishing and controlling industry by the people engaged in that industry, instead of calling each other all the names they did, then they would be doing something constructive. Nationalisation of industry was not such a good process as the co-operative principle, and purely Government economic control would not benefit the workers at all.”

Have we not been hammering at that very fact from year to year? Surely the hon.

gentleman will remember that we have on all occasions suggested that the co-operative principle should be more fully availed of. Every time a discussion has taken place on legislation affecting the primary producers members on this side of the House have suggested an extension of the co-operative principle.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: As a matter of fact, you have moved amendments calculated to destroy the usefulness of many measures.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: What about the arrow-root industry?

Mr. MOORE: It is all very well for the Premier to make statements about co-operation; but why does the hon. gentleman not make it possible for this co-operation to be brought about? There is no suggestion of doing anything like that; yet that would be one of the greatest factors in the solution of the unemployment problem.

The PREMIER: If we make any such move, your party immediately appeals to the prejudice of the workers.

Mr. MOORE: I do not think the hon. gentleman can attribute that to me.

The PREMIER: I am not applying it to you personally.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Is your cheese factory a co-operative concern?

Mr. MOORE: No; but I am not averse to its being run on co-operative lines if suitable arrangements can be made. The position we have reached in this State was ably illustrated by the Deputy Premier when he said—

“It would be idle to expect dairy farmers to replace immediately all the unprofitable cows in their herds; but they could introduce a gradual elimination process by breeding from selected dams mated with approved sires.”

There is the opportunity for eliminating the unfit in some industries and placing them in others where there would be a greater opportunity of increased earning capacity. When one is confronted with a decrease in the output of the State amounting to £97 per employee, then one must take notice of the situation and endeavour to find a solution. Such a state of affairs is responsible for our unemployment.

The PREMIER: Do you seriously believe that?

Mr. MOORE: I do.

The PREMIER: Then you do not know the economic factors operating.

Mr. MOORE: I do know that the taxation burden of this State is more than double that in other States, and that such a position can only mean a transference of industry from this State to other States.

The PREMIER: There is more unemployment in the Southern States than there is here.

Mr. MOORE: There may be more unemployment in some industries, but not generally. The policy enunciated by the Government when they took office has been a miserable failure. It was stated that State sawmills would be established, which would result in the supply of cheap timber with

which the workers could build their homes. What has happened? Timber is dearer to-day than ever it was. Then the Government said they would establish State enterprises so that borrowing might be reduced and the incidence of taxation lower. The reverse is the position. In the last fifty years borrowing has been increased by over 100 per cent., and taxation by over 400 per cent.

They said they were going to start State butchers' shops so that they would be able to give the people cheap meat, but, as a result, it has cost the people a tax of 4d. per lb. more for this meat. They said they were going to start a State fish shop so that the people could get cheap fish, and, as a result, fish has been dearer than ever. They have all failed. They said they were going to introduce a land settlement policy under which there would be flocks of people going on the land and they would be able to spend what capital they had by way of improving it. Yet we see that land settlement in Queensland is less than ever before. They said they were going to establish a grazing policy in Queensland which would make for the success of the small holder, instead of which the conditions have been made harsher than ever. They said they were going to give the right to work to every individual. What have we got to-day? Why, people have to go round and purchase the right to work from some union secretary before they are allowed to make a living at all, and sometimes they cannot get into a union. All these policies have been failures. The whole of the policy that they have put on the statute-book has failed. The Premier himself recognises that. He has pointed out that he wants to get rid of these State enterprises. He has stated that he is not going to keep anything going that results in a loss to the taxpayers of the State. Before the last election he said, “If you want to keep Chillagoe, vote for Mr. O'Keefe.”

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

Mr. MOORE: I desire to move an amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I have no objection to the hon. member being granted an extension of time to allow him to conclude his speech.

Mr. COSTELLO (*Carnarvon*): I beg to move—

“That the hon. member for Aubigny be allowed an extension of time in order to enable him to complete his speech.”

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member for Aubigny be allowed an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: I do not desire to trespass on the time of the House. I have endeavoured to show the position as I see it, and because I think the Government have failed in the policy that they put forward, and because I think it is absolutely essential that a different policy should be instituted forthwith under different conditions, by which enterprises may be encouraged, by which taxation may be reduced, and by which assistance can be given to industries to enable them to expand and not allow them to be

Mr. Moore.]

taxed out of existence. I beg to move the following amendment:—

“After the word ‘State’ at the end of the motion, add the words—

‘but we desire to inform Your Excellency that the Government does not possess the confidence of this House.’”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Will you take a vote now?

The PREMIER: Do you want to continue your speech?

Mr. MOORE: I do not desire to trespass any further on the time of the House. If I had known that my time was so close, I would have moved the amendment earlier.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I desire to second the amendment, and I intend to be quite brief in my remarks in support of what the Leader of the Opposition has said. Any wise person listening to the remarks of the hon. gentleman must come to the conclusion that there is something radically wrong with the present Administration in Queensland. He has very definitely pointed out exactly where the Government have lamentably failed in regard to production in this State of ours. I am not seconding this amendment formally, because I consider that it is an outstanding necessity in Queensland that a vote of no confidence in the Government should be carried in this House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I believe, irrespective of any other factor, that a change of Government in Queensland is desirable. The psychological effect alone would be an incentive to increase business in this State and create greater production, resulting in wages to more people. Sufficient wealth

[5 p.m.] would be produced to increase the wages of the employees.

There is a fundamental difference between the policy of the Government and that of the Opposition to-day. We believe in the policy of increased production for Queensland, and it is only by increased production that we are going to give the people of Queensland an opportunity to work. The Government have been satisfied to create a basic wage by legislation, whether there is sufficient production to pay that basic wage or otherwise. The only idea that the Government have is that any man who happens to be working should receive that wage. They have no regard to the fact that before that wage can be paid there has to be more production. The Leader of the Opposition has made this the basis of his charge against the Government. I cannot see any concrete proposal in the Governor's Speech to indicate that conditions are going to be any better than they have been during the last few years. Everyone recognises that something has to be done—that new ideas have to be put into practice. The Government have absolutely lost their initiative. They are sitting behind closed doors, and showing such a lack of activity that the affairs of the State are stagnated.

Let me quote some statistics to prove that Queensland is not progressing. It is only fair to compare Queensland with the other States of Australia. We are an integral part of the Commonwealth, which is the wealthiest country in the world. Are we making the most of our natural resources? It has not been possible to do so under the

administration of this Government. I will quote the position in the clearing-houses of Australia.

Mr. HANLON: Give us the trade balance.

Mr. KERR: There are no figures obtainable with regard to Queensland to make a comparison in that regard.

Mr. HANLON: It is pretty healthy.

Mr. KERR: Statements have been made by hon. members opposite in regard to imports and exports of Queensland. They know there is no record kept of a vast quantity of imports which come into Queensland. With regard to the clearing-houses of Australia, it is interesting to know that so far as Brisbane is concerned, in comparison with Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, and Perth, this is the only capital city in any State where there has been a decrease in the amount of money going through the clearing-houses. Is this State going on as it should? If it is not—we say it is not—an alteration is desirable. The figures with regard to the various clearing-houses in Australia during the last five years are as follow:—

	£
Melbourne	128,000,000
Adelaide	26,000,000
Perth	28,000,000

while in Queensland there has been a decrease of £2,000,000 in the amount of money going through the clearing-house.

Mr. BRUCE: There are more importations in the other States.

Mr. KERR: It is not a question of importations only; it is a question of both exports and imports. Both are going through the banks. I require no further indication whatsoever as to the amount of money that is coming in and going from Queensland than I have given. This State yearly produces in primary products something in the vicinity of £44,000,000 sterling. All that money, speaking broadly, is deposited in the associated banks. Business is only conducted by getting advances from those banks.

Mr. BRUCE: How do they get it under a Labour Government?

Mr. KERR: They get it from the primary producer of the State, not because there is a Labour Government in power, for it was going on for many years before they were thought of. Let hon. members consider where that money is going to. It is not going to the people of Queensland to provide for the expansion of business, the creation of industries, and more employment for our men and boys. It is surprising to note that in Western Australia to-day over 100 per cent. of the deposits—139 per cent., to be exact—are being advanced in that State for industry.

Mr. BRUCE: What are you quoting from?

Mr. KERR: From figures compiled by the Commonwealth Statistician.

Mr. HANLON: If they can advance 139 per cent. of their deposits they are pretty slick.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member cannot sidetrack me in that way. The facts are that all the deposits which have been paid into the associated banks in Western Australia have been advanced again in that State—to the wheat farmers, for instance, who have freehold tenure—and, in addition, 39 per cent.

[Mr. Moore.

of the amount of the deposits in that State— which amount has come from other States. Where is that 39 per cent. coming from? The money is coming from this State of Queensland, and it is going into the development of other States in Australia. If the deposits in our associated banks in Queensland are being used to develop other States in Australia, there is some reason for it, and I strongly suspect that it is lack of confidence in this Government of ours.

Mr. HANLON: You said that in Western Australia they lent 139 per cent. of their deposits.

Mr. KERR: Not only is the whole of the deposits in Western Australia going back into that State, but there is, in addition, a large sum going from other States in Australia. Hon. members must analyse these figures. They mean that £30,000,000 are being invested there by the people in the rest of Australia. This State is losing by that movement. Is it possible for us to examine the position and arrive at the reason? I say it is. I say that the reason is lack of confidence. The security is not there, because in Queensland every investment is taxed more than it would be in the other States. We have heard to-day that the drought is responsible for the falling off in the prosperity of the State; but there has been a very great falling off in activity on the part of investing people. If the State is suffering, the people will sooner or later recognise the effects and the Government will have to get out; and I believe that the Government know now that there is a feeling throughout the community that such a happening would be the very best thing for this State. I believe that the result would be to increase business activity in this country.

The Government have unblushingly claimed that progress has been made in our primary industries, which, of course, is quite wide of the truth. If we are returned to power, a most drastic change for the betterment of primary production will be established in this State. The pernicious legislation of the present Government will be seriously amended, and in its place will be substituted encouraging legislation providing for freehold tenure, improved advances by the Agricultural Bank, and for a decrease in land rentals. In every conceivable way efforts will be made by organisation and by other means to create a strong incentive to people to remain on the land, and in this way arrest the drift to the cities. I recognise that in the present age of elaborate machinery it possibly means that where one man is employed in the country ten are employed in the city, as against probably one in the country and two in the cities before the machinery age; but co-operation between primary production and our secondary industries has not received the serious thought that such an important subject merits. When we realise that the basis must be one employee in the country and ten employees in the city, it is imperative that a greater filip should be given to our secondary industries.

The vote of censure is being moved because the Government have failed in connection with the four basic means of production—in the field, in the forest, in the workshop, and in the mining fields. By the forest I mean our timber resources, and by the workshop I mean our secondary industries. In all

these spheres of activity the Government have failed dismally. There has been serious depression, a decrease in production, and a consequential increase in unemployment. It is our intention, when returned to power, to place before the people of this State our programme of progress, when a new era of progress will be ushered in to the general approval of all. The quicker we are given that opportunity the better it will be for this State.

Recently a controversy has taken place in the press with reference to the question of migration, and the inference always to be gained from hon. members opposite is that they are not responsible for any of the immigrants who are induced to come to Queensland.

The hon. member for Gregory recently asserted that a statement I had made was incorrect, but actually he proved that my statement was correct. The statement has always been made by the Labour Government that they are not responsible for immigrants coming to this State. I have my own opinion about that, and we have our own policy in regard to it. The statement has been made on the other side that the effect of immigrants coming in here is to take work from our own people already here. If that is so, any hon. member on the Government side could go further and insist that no nominated immigrant—and over 2,000 came in last year—should come into this State unless the permission carried the signature of the Premier or his officials.

The PREMIER: The greater proportion of that number was Italians.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows that all immigrants other than those who are nominated come here at their own expense. Has he done anything to stop that flow? The Commonwealth Government did something to stop it. They entered into an agreement—and a very fine one, too—to limit the immigrants coming into Australia.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Do you not admit now that the control of immigration is a matter coming within the control of the Federal Government?

Mr. KERR: No. The hon. gentleman knows that, if any immigrant arrives in Queensland, a list of those so nominated is supplied by the State Government to the Federal Government, who take charge of it.

Mr. BRUCE: That is untrue.

Mr. KERR: Over 700 nominated immigrants entered Queensland last year. My position in this matter is clear. If money is available—and cheap money at that—to enable us to absorb immigrants and Australians as well, then we have a right to bring immigrants into Australia. This country has to progress. It is strange that history proves that the more immigrants who come to Australia the less the unemployment. Statistics will show conclusively that the year when immigration was greatest the amount of unemployment dwindled.

The vote of censure which has been moved should receive the keen consideration of every hon. member. Every hon. member knows that the conditions in this State are not what they should be, and that production in comparison with other States is not satisfactory. We are all acquainted with the reasons. The Leader of the Opposition

Mr. Kerr.]

has pointed them out. I have pointed them out. Some are to be found in the restrictions contained in the various awards. Men on the basic wage are dissatisfied with the insecurity of their employment, and are desirous of a change of Government. The instability of their jobs forces them to press for that change of Government in order that confidence may be restored. If the amendment were carried, I believe that confidence would be restored, and that the tide of stagnation which has now set in would be turned.

In conclusion, let me say that is the basis of our policy. Many side issues have been brought in, but the principal factors are that, if production is to increase, conditions will have to be stabilised.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. McCormack, Cairns): It was not my intention to speak if an amendment had not been moved, and the Leader of the Opposition did not show his usual courtesy and let me know that he intended moving an amendment.

First of all, I desire to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. I offer to the hon. member for Mitchell my congratulations on his first speech in this House. I was rather surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should spend a quarter of an hour in chastising the newest member of the House and another hon. member who has been here for a comparatively short period. Without casting any reflection on these two members, I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition felt capable of dealing only with those two young members.

Mr. TAYLOR: They asked for it.

The PREMIER: Surely the common courtesies of life are not to be forgotten even in Parliament! It is so easy to criticise a new member. I well recollect listening to the maiden speeches of members of this House who made reputations later, although their initial efforts were poor. I have always a certain amount of sympathy for the member who comes in here, amidst strange surroundings and in a nervous state; and I know full well his disabilities. I know that the hon. member for Mitchell has a thorough knowledge of the needs of his district, and that he is particularly well versed in the requirements of the pastoral industry. I hope that valuable advice in dealing with important matters affecting the industry may be given to me by the hon. member.

During the speech of the Leader of the Opposition I could not help being struck with the shallowness with which his investigations have been conducted, the carelessness with which he has approached some of the big economic questions he made reference to. It reminded me of the hon. gentleman's attitude on previous occasions; it is his usual practice. He went to North Queensland recently and made a charge against the Government—I mention this in passing—that they were using imported timber to build the railway workshops in Cairns.

Mr. MOORE: So you did.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman relied for his information on the tittle-tattle he had heard in the train.

Mr. PEASE: Somebody was "pulling his leg."

The PREMIER: Yes.

[Mr. Kerr.

Mr. MOORE: What about the station at Mareeba; what did the Government do there?

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman is too prone to believe any story that is told him. The unfortunate part, however, is that he makes a statement in a public place accusing the Government of an action which is so easy to disprove. As a matter of fact, the following day the Railway Department showed that the hon. gentleman was wrong. I will leave the details of that matter to the hon. member for Eacham; I merely use it as an illustration of the way in which the Leader of the Opposition proceeds in his investigation, and to show how shallow his inquiries are in those questions which are of vital importance to the State.

Mr. SIZER: Do you say the Government are not using imported timber?

The PREMIER: The hon. member should keep out of the argument. I am not blaming the Leader of the Opposition except for listening to the tittle-tattle of somebody, and using it to base a charge against the Government. It must be that he thinks everybody is aboveboard. Well, they are not. Many people are quite willing to misrepresent members on either side; and for a member to base a criticism on such misrepresentation is bad for everybody, because the story gets abroad, and the fact that it is not true does not matter. It is very difficult to chase it. The hon. gentleman himself, I feel sure, would be the last to make an assertion if he did not believe it to be true. That is my experience of him, so I would suggest that in these matters he should be a little more careful. If I listened to every story that I heard about the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and used them, probably I would be in the same foolish position that he finds himself in to-day.

I want to deal now with the charge that we are ruining this State. Let us first examine the financial position of Queensland. I do not want to say anything against my predecessors, but I took charge of this Government after two very important financial obligations had been placed on the State without any provision being made to meet them. One was the 44-hour week; the other was the increase in the basic wage. That was known to everyone, and it was a most difficult problem for me, because I believe that Governments should balance their budgets. After a difficult task, extending over two years, I have succeeded in getting Queensland to live within her means.

Mr. KELSO: You don't mean that?

The PREMIER: I do mean it. Without any extra taxation except increased stamp duties, with no increase in regard to income tax, we have been able to meet our obligations and to finish the year with a surplus.

Mr. KERR: A number of people paid income tax who never previously paid.

The PREMIER: In addition to that, I am the only Treasurer in the Commonwealth who has definitely and decidedly reduced loan expenditure. The only one, and I am rather proud of having done that. Everybody knows the effect on revenue that a large expenditure of loan money has. If you spend loan money as it is being spent in some of the other States, the revenue returns immediately show buoyancy. In Queensland, with a reduced loan expenditure, we have been

able to balance our budget, and I say the Government deserve to be congratulated upon having done so.

Let us investigate what has happened in other States during the same hard times. The Commonwealth Government who my friends opposite try to impress upon us are geniuses, finished with a deficit of £2,642,000. What is the reason?

Mr. KERR: You know the reason. Take the previous two years.

The PREMIER: What is the reason?

Mr. SIZER: A falling Customs revenue.

The PREMIER: What causes a falling Customs revenue?

Mr. PETERSON: A lesser spending power in Queensland.

The PREMIER: That is not right. You cannot develop that argument, because Queensland is in the best position of all the States in regard to exports and imports. We are one of the States that keep the Commonwealth solvent. (Opposition dissent and laughter.)

[5.30 p.m.]

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Rubbish!

The PREMIER: Surely you do not deny that, and deery your own State, when it is an actual fact!

Mr. SIZER: There is a great quantity of imports from the other States.

The PREMIER: The balance of trade is millions of pounds in favour of Queensland. It is a thing we all ought to be proud of; and the difference goes to make up the great adverse balance that is created in other States, which are not governed by Labour.

Mr. KELSO: What does our own Government statistician say?

The PREMIER: The hon. member is determined to prove that this State is not exporting more than it imports—I will leave it to him. Neither the Commonwealth Government nor any other State Government in the Commonwealth will say that Queensland does not help them in regard to the balance of exports and imports. All of them say we are helping them in regard to this trade balance.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: What we want you to do is to carry out what you say on the floor of this House.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member will allow me to develop my argument, I shall have something interesting to say.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Say the right thing.

The PREMIER: Yes, and I do it. The hon. member does not do anything.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I did it; my record is there.

The PREMIER: We will erect a monument to the hon. member. (Laughter.) New South Wales, where a Nationalist Government has now been almost twelve months in power, had a deficit of £1,094,000.

Mr. KELSO: The aftermath of the Lang Government.

The PREMIER: I was in New South Wales on my way back from England during the election campaign, and I heard Mr. Bavin say that they must reduce loan expenditure; that they could not go on spending

money as it was being spent; yet he has spent more money than Mr. Lang spent. His programme for the future is greater than ever Mr. Lang's was.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Because he is going on business lines.

The PREMIER: He was definitely elected to spend less loan money. He finds now—and I am not blaming him personally—that he can only retain power by going in for more loan expenditure, with the Country Party wanting railways in every direction, with the city group wanting the harbour bridge and the continuation of the underground railway—neither of which the Labour Party instituted or are responsible for.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: They did. Be fair! (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: Sir George Fuller was responsible for the building of the Sydney bridge and the underground railway. Both those works are Nationalist commitments, and not Labour commitments. I want to point out how easy it is for anyone in opposition to criticise the Government in power.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: You used to do that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I hope the hon. member will give me a chance—his voice is much bigger than mine. It is very easy to criticise a Government, but much more difficult to carry on the task of government. New South Wales has finished the year with a big deficit, for which I am sorry, as it affects all of us; but the point is that a Nationalist Government, in the biggest and most wealthy State of the Commonwealth, without any reduction of taxation and with a bigger loan expenditure, has had a large deficit. We must pay attention to that. Victoria also is suffering. It also has had a deficit.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Under a Labour Government!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I ask for your protection, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member for Albert. I do not mind interjections, but I do mind continual interruption.

The SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members are entitled to be heard without interruption, and I do not want to have to call the hon. member for Albert to order again.

The PREMIER: I do not mind interjections, but the hon. gentleman is not interjecting—he is interrupting. Mr. Hogan, the Labour Premier of Victoria, is in office, not in power. He has passed no legislation that affects the financial position of Victoria, yet everyone who knows anything about it—even Nationalists in Victoria—admits that he has done excellently since he has been in office, and his Administration has been a splendid change from the extraordinary chaos which existed under the previous Government.

Hon. J. G. APPEL again interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I hope the hon. gentleman will go back to the bar. I say that Victoria has had a big deficit, and Victoria is a much more easily-governed State than Queensland. It has a big population, a small area, and most of its railway construction was completed in days when loan money could be secured at 3½ per cent. South

Hon. W. McCormack.]

Australia, on the other hand, is in a somewhat similar position to Queensland, and finds itself with a deficit of £277,000. And even Western Australia, with all its prosperity and its tremendous wheat crop, was unable to finish the year with a surplus.

Hon. J. G. APPEL again interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I shall refuse to proceed until the hon. gentleman behaves himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to obey my call to order.

The PREMIER: All the States except Queensland have found themselves unable to pay their way. Let us for a moment examine the reason for this—because I am not blaming any particular Government for being lax. I am not like the Leader of the Opposition. I am not going to say that it is because a Nationalist Government is in power in a certain State, because that would be an insult to the intelligence of the people outside.

Mr. MOORE: I did not say it was because a Labour Government was in power.

The PREMIER: Of course the hon. member did. His whole argument was that the Labour Government was responsible. I want to tell the House the causes of this difficulty which is facing Australia, so far as I can find out with the intelligence I have. I realise that the importation of goods has been stopped, not because we have got any better in regard to buying our own goods, but for some other reason which is solely economic in its operation, and it is this reason that Governments must seek if they want to solve the problem which faces them.

Mr. KELSO: Increased protection.

The PREMIER: No. If the hon. member only knew how big firms rushed millions of pounds worth of goods into Australia last year, thinking there was going to be an alteration in the tariff this year, he would realise the situation.

Over and above that, there are definite economic reasons for the difficulties throughout Australia. It is most difficult to put your finger on the spot and remedy the evil. One of the reasons is that we have been spending too much loan money. (Hear, hear!) It is obvious to any thinking man that any country which overborrows, which has an adverse trade balance, and makes up that adverse trade balance by the importation of money in the form of goods, is bound to land itself in difficulties sooner or later.

That the Labour Party are responsible for that is the gravamen of the charge made by the Leader of the Opposition, and upon that hinges the question of unemployment and everything that it affects. The question of unemployment has been investigated in almost every country in the world—not in the manner in which the Leader of the Opposition has investigated it, by making a political speech and attempting to score off the Government, which is all right in its way—but it has been investigated by the highest trained minds in the community—by men who have made a life study of economics—and few of them mention taxation as the cause of unemployment, except as a negligible factor. It is a factor, but to say that because this Government has obtained £3,000,000 from the public in the form of taxation, and to say that, if we

were to return £500,000 to industry in Queensland by way of reduced taxation that would solve the problem would be to make a most foolish assertion. It has little to do with the real problem, and I believe the Leader of the Opposition knows that. It reminds me of the "Telegraph," which, in a leading article the other day, said that Mr. Jolly had solved the unemployment problem because he had borrowed more money so as to obviate discharging more men. Did you ever hear anything so foolish? He is going to borrow money—not to employ some of the unemployed, but to avoid dismissing more men. I am using that only by way of illustration, and do not wish to criticise Mr. Jolly at all—that is not my business—but it shows the loose way in which newspapers as well as politicians approach this difficult question, merely to make political capital. The article proceeded to show that Mr. Jolly's action was going to solve the unemployment question. I am pleased that he is able to go on with work. If it is needed, then it is a good thing to keep the men employed. I consider he has dismissed enough men already—he may have dismissed too many. I sympathise with anyone in authority who has to carry on in these difficult times, and I am not going out of my way to criticise him.

The Migration Commission investigated this question of unemployment, and dealt with the question of taxation. It simply said that it is a factor, nothing more and nothing less. The report states—

"While the incidence of taxation is not the major cause of unemployment in Australia, the Commission desires to draw attention to the necessity for a study of the taxation laws with a view to determining what effect taxation has upon unemployment."

Here we have a group of men—whatever their political opinions may be—who have investigated this question, and they refer to taxation in a casual way like that, whereas the Leader of the Opposition says that taxation is the cause of unemployment.

Mr. MOORE: Oh, no; I did not.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman did not say anything.

Professor Copland, a very eminent economist, made an investigation into the question of unemployment in Australia. The causes he attributes for unemployment are—

"Deflation in England and America, and the heavy fall in domestic prices.

"The over-issue of credit beyond the limits allowed by reserves.

"The stringency of the money market and the action of the banks in respect of credits.

"The drop in the prices of metals, causing great difficulties to mining companies.

"The heavy fall in the prices of agricultural products and meat, and later on of dairy products.

"The bad harvests.

"Heavy importations, due largely to the supply of orders long overdue.

"Difficulties in regard to regulating industrial costs to the changing price level.

"The psychological reaction from a boom period."

[Hon. W. McCormack.]

He gives those nine reasons as the causes of unemployment, and not one mention is made of taxation as the cause of unemployment.

Mr. Gepp, in the report of the Migration Commission, has made quotations from world-wide reports. That gives me the opportunity to use these quotations from one single report. One of the outstanding factors to which the Commission attributes unemployment in Australia is the adverse trade balance and balance of payments. Imports exceeded exports to the extent of nearly £13,000,000, and the deficiency in the balance of international payments to holders is about £27,000,000. The effect of such a position in regard to credit conditions has already been referred to, and is fully reported on by Professor Copland.

Here are some of the causes of our difficulties. Mr. Gepp goes on to point out that a direction in which trouble is being caused is the fact that in 1922-23 Australia bought motor vehicles to the value of £12,500,000, while in 1926-27 that figure had increased to £24,000,000. The value of oil products and fuel to drive those motor vehicles in 1922-23 was £3,500,000, while in 1926-27 it was £7,750,000.

Mr. TAYLOR: Sixty per cent. of the cost of a motor car is absorbed in material and labour in Australia.

The PREMIER: Provided the bodies and accessories are made in Australia.

Mr. TAYLOR: They are made in Australia.

The PREMIER: They are not all made in Australia. Hundreds of bodies are imported. That is a fact well known to hon. members. The point I want to make is that we sent out of Australia last year in this way £24,000,000 to the United States, while America only purchased products to the value of £10,000,000 from us. This is a much more important factor than taxation. Surely everyone recognises that! I can give hon. members half a dozen economic factors that have more effect on unemployment than the whole case put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. In the particular industry that I have mentioned not only do we send good Australian money out of this country to the extent of £30,000,000—that sum, if used in industries here, would solve all our problems—but the article we import prevents the employment of labour in Australia. Those imported motor vehicles compete with the transport article that was previously constructed here. That is to say, the locomotive, the railway truck, and the railway carriage. I do not wish to stop the use of motor cars; I merely mention these facts. What I am seeking are the causes of unemployment.

Mr. TAYLOR: You are on the wrong track.

The PREMIER: Not at all. Take, for example, this position: The fuel used by

our locomotives is produced by our own people in this State, whereas an imported product, produced overseas, is used to provide the power for the motor cars and motor trucks in evidence everywhere. No wonder we are affected, as we undoubtedly are, in two directions—in the money that goes out of the country for the benefit of the workers in other countries, and the fact that men who otherwise would be engaged in industry are thrown out of work.

Mr. EDWARDS: How much encouragement do you give the secondary industries by your taxation policy?

The PREMIER: It is no use the hon. gentleman telling me that taxation is causing this difficulty. I appeal to hon. members to consider whether taxation is the main factor, or whether the position is not due to the factors which I have mentioned. Had the Leader of the Opposition used taxation as a factor I should have agreed with him; but the hon. gentleman uses it as his whole argument. If the hon. gentleman's amendment were left for decision by an outside body, even wholly opposed to Labour, the Government would win on the hon. gentleman's argument, because no other intelligent course would be open.

Mr. EDWARDS: You are side-stepping the whole question.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman evidently does not understand these things.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is you who do not know.

The PREMIER: My political opponents think I know a little about these matters, but I do not think any of the hon. gentleman's political opponents give him that much credit. On the question of unemployment I do believe that there are factors over which we have control, and those are the things to which we should attend. I am not one of those people who think that, if a reduction of taxes were made to-morrow—and I wish I could make such reduction—the problem of unemployment would be solved, and that everybody would find work immediately. The Leader of the Opposition will find, as Mr. Bavin has found in New South Wales, where he is actually carrying on the State enterprises, that it is easy enough to use one argument on the political hustings but much more difficult to carry it into effect.

The hon. gentleman tried to prove in regard to unemployment that the Queensland Labour Government had created a worse state of affairs than any Nationalist Government in any other State of the Commonwealth. His statements, however, were not supported by figures, and to show that the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken in his contentions, let me quote the following figures showing the unemployed registered by the trades unions in various parts of the Commonwealth:—

	1927.				1928.
	1st Quarter.	2nd Quarter.	3rd Quarter.	4th Quarter.	1st Quarter.
New South Wales	13,340	13,171	10,379	16,533	19,807
Victoria	6,539	8,963	10,001	12,044	13,261
Queensland	3,052	2,676	2,619	3,162	4,138
South Australia	1,633	2,700	4,151	4,797	5,683
Western Australia	1,441	1,255	1,930	1,340	1,490
Tasmania	275	452	911	965	1,254

Those are the numbers of unemployed that are registered by the trades unions, and Mr. Gepp, who has made an investigation, says that these figures, although they are not the total number of unemployed—and I am not asserting that they are—are in direct ratio to the unemployed that exists, and they show that in Queensland there is actually a lesser percentage of unemployed than there is in any other State of the Commonwealth. Mr. Wickens, the Commonwealth Statistician, has given the percentage figures for the various States of Australia as late as July this year. They are—

	Per cent.
New South Wales	10.9
Victoria	12.2
Queensland	7.1
South Australia	15.1
Western Australia	9.5
Tasmania	10.7
Average for Australia ...	11.2

The charge that Queensland is in such a horrible position is not sustained. I repeat again that I do not blame any Government in connection with unemployment. I never did. I know that the economic factors operating are all-powerful, and as a whole are beyond Governments; but I say that these figures show the failure of the Opposition's case—that we are the worst-governed State in Australia. When we have less unemployment, how can that be true? It cannot stand investigation.

Mr. MOORE: We have the biggest natural resources. (Government laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are changing your ground again.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman's case is that we are the cause of unemployment—that we have ruined this State. If that is true, how much more have Mr. Bavin, Mr. Butler, and other Nationalist Premiers ruined the other States?

Mr. KELSO: They have only been in power a few months.

The PREMIER: It is all very well to evade the question in that way. What I am saying is that the Opposition, instead of trying to make political capital out of unemployment, should try to help us, because I do not think there is any political capital to be made out of it. Unemployment is a difficult problem to solve, and the appeal to prejudice by politicians makes it still more difficult. The running of bogus unemployment demonstrations on the eve of elections—and the Opposition Party are guilty of that—

Mr. KELSO: That is not true.

The PREMIER: I do not say that the leaders are guilty. I do not think they are. But the Opposition, as a party, are guilty of running unemployment campaigns during the elections.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: That is not true.

The PREMIER: In doing that they are building up trouble for themselves in the future. They might make a small amount of political capital for the time being; but no man who considers this country and its interests should be a party to the running of bogus unemployment demonstrations. I say with a good deal of knowledge that the leaders of the organised unemployed are shrewd Communists, who are using some of these people who are out of work to create

[Hon. W. McCormack.

a feeling of prejudice against our present social system.

I am giving a good deal of attention to the question of unemployment, because the Leader of the Opposition made it the main and distinctive factor in his attack upon the Government and the Labour

[7 p.m.] Party. I think I can conclusively prove that the charge that the Labour Government of Queensland are responsible for unemployment, which is a wrong charge to make, cannot be sustained. I am sorry I came away without my glasses this afternoon, and have some difficulty in quoting some of the authorities on unemployment. My main contention is that unemployment is due to economic factors over which Governments have only partial control. Unemployment throughout the world is due to factors over which Governments in various countries have only partial control, and it cannot be entirely laid at the door of any Government except a Government which is Bolshevik and is ruining industry altogether. Industrial disputes were mentioned as another factor by the Leader of the Opposition—recurrent industrial trouble—and that affects everybody. The taxpayer who makes £20,000 in an industry which employs 500 men, and who pays £3,000 in the form of taxation, still has £17,000 to expand his industry; and to say that to give him back £500 of the £3,000 which we take from him is going to solve the unemployment problem is to assert something that is not true. If you dislocate his industry by industrial disturbance, instead of showing a profit of £20,000, you can make that business a losing one in that year. On those lines Australia will have to do everything to encourage those who are aiming at peace in industry.

Mr. EDWARDS: You cannot brush that away.

The PREMIER: I am not attempting to brush it away. I have realised my responsibility as Leader of the Labour Party for a number of years of dealing with this question. While I am here I intend to do as much as possible in order to alleviate the unfortunate position which obtains; but I realise that parliaments and Governments are creatures of circumstance, and whatever party is in power is affected by the economic changes which are taking place in the world. When I was in New York I went into a bottle factory in which they had introduced one of the most ingenious machines for automatic bottle-making. Two men were working a machine which threw out a stream of bottles. Two machines threw out of work 1,000 men. In the long run that benefits society in the form of cheaper production in industries. I realise that these modern inventions, although they cause unemployment cause it only temporarily, but the ultimate result is for the betterment of mankind; but during those periods of change there is great suffering in the industrial world. I give that illustration only to show that the Opposition's contention that the Government are responsible for unemployment is wrong.

I want to refer again to the report of Professor Conland, quoted by Mr. Gepp, on this point. He went very seriously into the question, and said—

“Briefly, it may be stated that business conditions pass through well-defined phases in the cycle of activity. At the

present moment Australia is passing through a period of depression which was preceded by active business conditions over the whole of 1926 and the early part of 1927. It will, of course, be followed eventually by a period of activity, developing into active conditions. We cannot say how long each of these phases predominates, nor is there any definite length to be ascribed to the cycle as a whole. Four phases of the cycle may be distinguished—(i.) Steady recovery and healthy business; (ii.) great prosperity, sometimes leading to a boom; (iii.) the process of deflation and liquidation; and (iv.) a period of stagnation. Briefly, these four points may be defined as those of recovery, prosperity, recession, and depression. On some occasions there are great contrasts between conditions that obtain during these phases of the cycle."

How differently he deals with it from the Leader of the Opposition! He is an expert, tackling the question without any thought of attacking the Labour Party, the Nationalist Party, or the Country Party. He distinctly outlines in simple words what each one of us probably knows, but which we have never put into that form—that these reactions are as inevitable as night follows day, and the task facing Governments is to attempt so far as possible to guide the reactions so that no great boom or depression will occur. He gives as the reasons for unemployment—

- "1. Weather conditions;
- "2. Price movements;
- "3. Imports;
- "4. Exports;
- "5. Credit conditions;
- "6. Exchange movements and the balance of payments."

He never mentions taxation. I think I can let it go at that, and assert with a good deal of truth that the case of the Opposition in regard to taxation is completely exploded.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS: You flatter yourself.

The PREMIER: Well, I leave it to you.

Mr. MORGAN: The taxpayers will not view it in that way.

The PREMIER: It is for the hon. member to combat my argument.

There are other things which the Leader of the Opposition touched upon. I never have any objection to criticism. Constructive criticism in this House would help me and the Government, and not hinder us at all. A good Opposition, basing its arguments on sound economic grounds, is helpful—I admit that readily—but many members of the Opposition are carried away by a desire to score politically—to benefit themselves politically.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are yourself.

The PREMIER: I try to be good to myself politically. Such hon. members do no good to themselves, but rather do injury. During the Mitchell by-election I read some wonderful speeches by members of the Opposition.

Mr. KERR: You made some, too.

The PREMIER: I made some very good speeches there. Hon. members opposite may complain when I use a little imagery; but

it is a very fine thing to illustrate a point, and everyone of my temperament can and does use it. I mention this to show how difficult things are in politics to-day. Everyone realises that the Government were doing a good thing, a necessary thing, and a wise thing in excluding from land ballots men without capital. The Government themselves knew that they were going to offend many of their own supporters, but there is not one hon. member in this House who would say that it is not a proper system to provide that men who take up large areas of land must have capital or financial backing, and that the land shall be brought into production.

Mr. MORGAN: It is all right in moderation, but you went to extremes.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Nundah—both experts on the land question—(laughter)—visited Longreach, and there the hon. member for Toowong held himself out as an expert on the carrying capacity and living areas of land.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is not true.

The PREMIER: He was told that the biggest holding in his electorate was the Toowong Cemetery, and that no doubt his knowledge of carrying capacity was based on his knowledge of that particular holding. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: That is not true.

The PREMIER: I am not going to say that the knowledge of some other members of the Opposition on these questions is limited in the same way as that of the hon. member for Toowong, because some of them do know something of the land question. The hon. members for Toowong and Nundah made a special appeal to the prejudices of the people who usually support Labour, urging them not to vote for a Government that excluded them from the land ballots.

Mr. KELSO: I did not mention the land question. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: Neither did I. (Loud laughter.)

The PREMIER: I make reference to the matter only in passing. The hon. members are touchy about this particular question. The hon. member for Toowong takes exception by way of interjection to my statement that he was told that one holding in his electorate had the greatest carrying capacity of any in the State. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: I did not say that. You said that yourself.

The PREMIER: Whoever said it spoke the truth, because the hon. gentleman does not know anything about the carrying capacity of Western Queensland, and it is true that the Toowong Cemetery is the largest holding in his electorate.

Mr. MAXWELL: Don't be silly.

Mr. KERR: You are not serious.

The PREMIER: No, I am not serious. I always take the opportunity to ridicule ignorance. It is a fine thing to do—not to argue against it, but to ridicule it, and show it up in its proper light. It is a very effective form of argument to ridicule ignorance. There was a piece of legislation passed by this Government without any thought of political gain, because the

pastoralists, as a rule, do not vote for this party.

Mr. SIZER: They do now.

The PREMIER: That legislation was passed wholly in the interests of Queensland, and not merely in the interests of the pastoralists. It was held up to political prejudice by my friends on the opposite side merely to gain a few votes. Would the Leader of the Opposition alter that law if he were in power? I am sure he would not; and I am sure he would say now that he would not.

Mr. MORGAN: I am sure he would alter that law. He would not exclude good Australians for the benefit of foreigners, which you did.

The PREMIER: We did not exclude any good Australians, and the hon. gentleman knows that my statement is true.

Mr. MORGAN: I will prove it when I speak.

The PREMIER: You won't prove it.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is true, and you know it is true.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The PREMIER: It would be no gain to this Government to do it. Hon. members opposite boomed the Land Settlement Advisory Board up by saying that everything it did and said was right, and, when we disagreed with some of the recommendations of the board, they said we ought to be trounced.

Mr. MORGAN: You went to extremes.

The PREMIER: We altered the recommendations of the Land Settlement Advisory Board in the direction of making them more liberal. We won a by-election on the legislation we introduced in a year when 80 per cent. of the electors interested were absent from the electorate. Anyone who has visited Longreach or any other town in the Mitchell electorate knows to what a terrible plight the drought has reduced the district. In places where usually ten, twelve, or sixteen men were working one only is now engaged. Yet the Opposition go round and tell the people what a great victory they had because of the reduced majority the Government received in that electorate.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was a big surprise to you, at all events.

The PREMIER: All I have to say is that I do the job I am paid for. A member of my party and one of the electorates usually represented by a member of the Government party were involved in an election. Where was my place in that fight as Leader of the Government?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Where was the Leader of the Opposition? Echo answers, "Where?" (Opposition interjections.)

Mr. KELSO: You went back to the electorate twice. You had the "wind up."

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. KERR: There would have been a different tale to tell if he had gone up.

The PREMIER: Then hon. members opposite do not want to win seats?

Mr. KERR: That is not true.

The PREMIER: The hon. member said that there would have been a different tale

[Hon. W. McCormack.

if the Leader of the Opposition had gone there. Then I am perfectly right in saying that they do not want to win seats, and it is well that the country should know it.

Mr. CORSEB: Did you go to the Stanley electorate?

The PREMIER: No; we did not contest it.

Mr. MOORE: Did you go to the Balonne electorate?

The PREMIER: I was away in England at the time. (Opposition laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The PREMIER: One of the complaints in regard to the Balonne by-election was that the whole Government were out there. Mr. Speaker, there can be no complaints against the leader of a political party who takes politics seriously, and who, when his party is engaged in a fight, is there putting the case for the Government on behalf of the Government candidate.

Mr. KERR: We don't complain about you going out there.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition asks what we are doing in regard to unemployment. He never offered one suggestion as a solution of the problem except to reduce taxation.

Mr. KELSO: Did you offer any?

The PREMIER: We are doing it.

Mr. KELSO: What are you doing?

The PREMIER: I want to outline a few things we are going to do.

Mr. MOORE: I suggest you should do what you advocated at the Townsville Labour Convention.

The PREMIER: The attack made on the Government by the Leader of the Opposition consisted mainly of statements we had made. Why not give us something original? I hold that the Government have done much in industries in electorates represented by hon. members opposite. My colleague, the Secretary for Agriculture, spends the whole of his time and a very active life in working on problems that can bring no political gains to this party at all. None at all! Surely that work is recognised! We have done something in Queensland to help the man on the land to organise.

Mr. MORGAN: You drove him off it.

The PREMIER: We hold none of the seats in electorates where that work is carried on.

Mr. EDWARDS: You tried to make political gain, but it fell through.

The PREMIER: It is no use trying to change the political opinions of a community who return a member like the hon. member for Nanango. (Opposition dissent.) We know and recognise that the whole community is interested in getting these people organised and giving them a better opportunity of marketing and handling their produce than they possessed in the past, and to remove them from the influence and control of the middlemen who, under previous Governments exploited them. Is not that constructive work in the right direction, and that, too, without any hope of political gain? We have done excellent work.

Mr. KERR: Have you removed one middleman?

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman has developed into a middleman, I suppose. We are all more or less middlemen.

Mr. KERR: The middlemen are increasing every day under your jurisdiction.

The PREMIER: I do not know whether we have removed them, but I do know that the co-operative organisations which we have established have caused these middlemen a tremendous amount of worry.

Mr. KERR: You call on them every day for help under your pooling scheme.

The PREMIER: It is surely a commentary upon the members of the farming community if they are still compelled to go to the middleman. We have given the farmers an organisation for handling and marketing their own produce, and I say definitely that they have taken advantage of that to a very great extent, with results entirely beneficial to the great bulk of them. Only to-day the members of the Wheat Board approached me for financial assistance to enable them to build additional grain sheds. We know that the Wheat Board is an organisation which operates from year to year and that it may be dissolved at any time; yet the Government took the responsibility of lending them a large sum of money to enable them to make alterations that would increase their storage capacity. We have no hope of winning the Darling Downs seats, where the wheat will be stored, but we know that the work must be done.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a Government function.

The PREMIER: Why did your party not do the work when they were in office? (Government laughter.) The hon. gentleman's party, when it was in power, asked the Commissioner for Railways not to disclose information about the sales of produce.

Mr. CORSER: That is not true.

The PREMIER: It is perfectly correct. (Opposition dissent.) I do not mind interjections; they at least enable me to nail the hon. members on the other side to something definite. The point I make is that, when a Government was in power composed of members from the other side of the House, their ranks comprised a great number of farmers, but none of the improvements to which I have referred was effected. On the other hand this Government have made an organised attempt to help the farmers in the Atherton district, where large sums of money have been spent in the erection of silos, although the Opposition told us at the outset that expenditure in that direction would be money wasted.

Mr. CORSER: Not at all.

The PREMIER: To-day the farmers in that district are handling their own maize. Another example is the egg pool, the control of which is vested in the people who produce the commodity.

Mr. MOORE: There are dozens of persons who do not sell eggs to the egg pool.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. gentleman believe in co-operation?

Mr. MOORE: Yes.

The PREMIER: Then the hon. gentleman believes in the egg pool.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, under a proper system.

The PREMIER: The hon. member either believes in it or he does not. I can understand that the hon. member for Wynnum

might have an objection to these things; but why the members of the Country Party, who talk so much about co-operation for the farmers, should object in practice to the farmers co-operating to sell their produce is beyond my comprehension. The lion lies down with the lamb. (Laughter.)

Mr. TAYLOR: According to the hon. member for Wynnum, he still sells their eggs.

The PREMIER: Well and good.

Mr. TAYLOR: He is a middleman.

The PREMIER: He is a middleman, but I have no complaint to make because of that. He is a man for whom I have a very high respect. I do not want to bring any personal business into this argument. He performs a service well and truly for the people who send their produce to him. I believe that is true, but the point is that a question of policy arises. If that is the correct way to handle this business, then the Opposition party should say so and stand up for it. This party does not believe in that policy. We believe co-operation among the producers and the selling of their commodities without the intervention of agents to be the correct policy.

Mr. CORSER: That is our platform.

The PREMIER: That is your platform!

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

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I beg to move—

“That the Premier be allowed an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech.”

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the Premier be allowed an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Another point made by the Opposition, and one which has been made frequently in the press, is that we have been storing up loan money in order to make a splash prior to the elections. The Leader of the Opposition has made that statement, and many of his followers also have made it.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is what you did before the last election.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. Publicly and in this House I have clearly defined the attitude of the Government in regard to the expenditure of loan money. I believe that the theory that we can end the depression by spending more loan money is a wrong one, and I hope no one will ask me to do it, because I will not do it. I believe such a policy will get us into more and more difficulties. In any year since I have been at the head of the Government we have never spent the amount we budgeted for; but we have endeavoured as far as possible during the depression to divert loan money into work that gave employment as against the purchase of materials; and by that means, even with a reduced expenditure, we have actually kept more men in work than in years when we spent a million more money. The Leader of the Opposition again and again has made that statement when there was no warrant for it, and I want to say now—that is the first opportunity I have had—that,

Hon. W. McCormack.]

election or no election, the loan expenditure has been laid down, and will be followed out no matter what happens in regard to this party at the election. I believe in that policy, and I appeal to the people to support me on those grounds; and I think it is a good appeal. If the Opposition believe that they can solve the problem of unemployment by spending more and more loan money, then they are welcome to that policy, but it will keep them in opposition.

Mr. KELSO: Who said that was our policy?

The PREMIER: I do not know what your policy is.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: I know what your policy is. Your policy has been one of extravagance in the extreme.

The PREMIER: Because of economy I think we shall be able to get through this election year with the expenditure of about £4,500,000 of loan money—which is lower than last year—and with having to go on the market—and this is the important point—for £2,500,000 only, while other States governed by the friends of hon. members opposite are asking for more money than they ever spent before. I want to say that clearly and definitely, because I do not want people outside Queensland to believe that we are going to embark again upon a disastrous loan policy.

[7.30 p.m.]

Hon. W. H. BARNES: We have an effective answer to you in regard to loan expenditure, all the same.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman goes back to 1915 and lives in the past, forgetting that to-day the £1 which he had when he was Treasurer would only buy me 12s. worth of material.

Mr. SIZER: Then what about the workers' £1?

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition made a cry this afternoon about the increase in railway freights compared with 1914, and then he ridiculed the idea of talking about war and drought; but it was just as ridiculous for him to talk about 1914—the pre-war period. The conditions of the world have changed owing to the inflation of money values. The hon. member for Wynnum, when he was Treasurer, figured that he would spend £2,000,000 of loan money, but he spent a good deal more than that. He spent £4,000,000 of loan money in his last year of office, which is equal to about £7,000,000 to-day. That was before the election of 1915.

Mr. TAYLOR: You got £6,000,000 of value for it.

The PREMIER: There were sixteen railway proposals in the last session of that Parliament, including the Via Recta, which would have cost £1,000,000, and we would then have had three railway lines to Sydney instead of two. The Government, although they have reduced their loan expenditure, have devoted the money to jobs where the bulk of it was spent in labour to enable us to carry on during the depression.

Mr. TAYLOR: In mining?

The PREMIER: No. To give the House and the country an idea that we have not been retrenching the public service and dismissing public servants to get a surplus and to keep our loan expenditure within sane limits, the number of employees in the

[Hon. W. McCormack.

Government service last year was 39,337, and this year it is 40,000.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Have you got work for them all?

The PREMIER: See how the hon. member changes his ground again.

Mr. MOORE: Pooling and short time!

The PREMIER: There is some short time on the railways. We have 2,892 men on construction work now, while last year we had 2,943. There is a reduction there of 51, but that reduction is more than made up as we had only 1,120 men on main roads work last year, whereas this year we have 2,311. That is work where the bulk of the cost is for labour. In the Irrigation Department we have a few less employees, and in other departments of the Government service the position is practically the same; there were, for instance, 12,359 salaried officers in the public service last year as against 12,563 this year, and so on. To give the country an idea of the truth that we are not dismissing men, safeguarding or hoarding loan money, as the Leader of the Opposition said, to have a splash at the elections, I wish to have this table inserted in "Hansard"—

NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT.

(As at 30th June, 1928.)

Public service—			
Salaried officers	12,563
Wages, day labourers, etc.	2,316
			14,879
Railways—			
Permanent staff	19,624
Construction workers	2,892
			22,516
Irrigation—			
Salaried officers	38
Wages, etc.	345
			383
Central sugar mills	7
Main Roads—			
Permanent staff	206
Wages, etc.	230
Main roads construction and maintenance	1,875
			2,311
			40,096

I believe in a continuous policy, without alteration and with the least possible dislocation.

Mr. FRY: You are discharging men from the railway service.

The PREMIER: We have discharged some. Does the hon. member say that we should not discharge anybody?

Mr. FRY: No; but you are trying to convey the impression that you are not, and I am pointing out that you are.

The PREMIER: Our policy is that we do not keep a man if he is not wanted. That should be the policy of any Government. The hon. member complains that somebody is discharged, whereas frequently members of his own party have said they would discharge 2,500.

Mr. FRY: You have never heard me say that retrenchment was a remedy.

The PREMIER: You are too shrewd.

Mr. FRY: I have a better policy than that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Oxley has frequently made the statement

that, if he were given his way—(Opposition interruption)—and he is a powerful force—one of the leading members in the Opposition party—(Opposition laughter)—

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: And one of their finest speakers.

The PREMIER: He is one of the finest speakers in this House. He puts a very fine case for his party. He has said that, if he had his way, he would solve the unemployment complained of by the leader of the party by dumping tens of thousands of migrants into Queensland. (Opposition interruption.)

I do not want to weary the House any further. I rose really to reply to the Leader of the Opposition, but I had so little to reply to that I have had to deal with other matters. (Government laughter.) The Opposition did not even have the courtesy to listen to the seconder of the amendment, for they all went out—or all but one. I really like to hear the hon. member for Enoggera—he is a wonderful chap. These financial speakers are worth listening to; they are an education; yet his own party left him to carry on. I think we showed some courtesy by all remaining here and listening.

It is a curious thing that the people who support the Opposition are the big taxpayers of this State. Who find their election funds?

Mr. MOORE: We haven't any. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KERR: Your people have got them all.

The PREMIER: I understand—I am open to correction—that the Opposition spent thousands of pounds last election in fighting the Labour Party.

Mr. MOORE: No.

The PREMIER: Didn't you?

Mr. MOORE: We did not.

The PREMIER: Well, I will read the Country Party's balance-sheet. (Laughter.) Just follow this and see how much hon. members spent. This is a circular sent out by the Mitchell branch in regard to the late by-election—

"However, the conduct of election campaigns costs money, and we regret to say that our finances have been greatly depleted by the cost of the recent fight, so much so that in this instance our expenses have been approximately £100 more than our receipts."

That is a deficit. Now listen to the form of taxation. (Laughter.)

"The stock levy is at the rate of 10s. per thousand sheep and pro rata for cattle and horses."

This is what is causing the unemployment! (Laughter.)

"We now ask you to let us have your quota by return mail."

Mr. MOORE: Did they get it?

The PREMIER: There is no question that they got it. This is signed by W. Farquhar Fraser, president, and F. R. Cory, secretary.

Mr. KERR: It must be a frame-up.

The PREMIER: Somebody said something about election expenses, and I want to confirm a statement with regard to election expenses made by Mr. Theodore during a recent inquiry in Sydney, and I am going to confirm it by a statement from a

Nationalist organisation. The statement says—

"The Federal electorates are very big, and a lot of unavoidable expense is involved in contesting them which it is not fair, nor in our interests, to expect candidates to bear wholly on their own."

The law provides that a candidate must not expend beyond £100 in election expenses. The statement continues—

"If this were to happen our candidates would be tremendously handicapped in the struggle and their chances of success greatly prejudiced."

The Federal Nationalist Government attempted to make capital because Mr. Theodore spent a couple of hundred pounds in an election, whereas they supply money to their candidates to break the law.

Mr. MAXWELL: Who finds money for your party?

The PREMIER: I have here a copy of the balance-sheet of one committee alone—a finance committee of the pastoral organisation—an organisation which supports hon. members opposite. This committee is wholly composed of pastoralists, and this is what they say in regard to the State elections—

"Our expenditure in connection with the State campaign amounted to £8,572."

That is from one organisation. No wonder this precious party opposite desired to grant an extension of leases to the pastoralists!

Mr. MORGAN: You know that John Wren paid £10,000 to your party during the last State elections.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to the statement of the hon. member for Murilla, that Mr. John Wren gave our party £10,000 at the last State elections.

Mr. MORGAN: That was definitely stated.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement.

Mr. MORGAN: If the statement is objectionable, then I shall withdraw it, but it was stated publicly. I made the statement outside on the platform.

The PREMIER: You stated it outside this House? I invite the hon. gentleman to make the statement outside.

Mr. MORGAN: I have already stated it.

Mr. TAYLOR: Let us have all the particulars.

The PREMIER: Surely you are in possession of all the particulars of your own balance-sheet.

Mr. TAYLOR: Give us the date of it.

The PREMIER: Do you say that you did not get this money?

Mr. TAYLOR: You have not got the date.

The PREMIER: Of course I have.

Mr. TAYLOR: Read it out.

The PREMIER: I will not read it out.

Mr. TAYLOR: Of course you will not. I knew you would not read it out.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman wants the date so badly, then I can tell him that it bears a date just prior to the last elections.

Mr. TAYLOR: Read it out.

The PREMIER: It is dated 11th October, 1926.

Hon. W. McCormack.]

Mr. MAXWELL: I presume you will lay it on the table of the House?

The PREMIER: I will give it to the hon. member to read if he likes. This is not secret.

Mr. MORGAN: Why all this waste of time?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The PREMIER: This circular gives the details of the expenditure. It says that £222 was disbursed in office expenses and £8,350 in general organising work.

Mr. KERR: What for?

The PREMIER: The circular goes on to say—

“This committee regrets that the result of the campaign was not satisfactory.”
(Government laughter.)

Just listen to the sting in this—

“However, there is satisfaction in knowing that the campaign did not fail owing to want of funds.”

(Government laughter.)

Mr. BRAND: You are not reading a balance-sheet at all. You are only reading a statement.

The PREMIER: I take it that the statement over the names of the gentlemen I have quoted is a correct one and aboveboard. There is nothing secret about the circular. Copies were sent out to everybody. They sent one to me. (Laughter.)

Mr. BRAND: It is not our organisation at all.

The PREMIER: This is the point I want to make: In that letter it says the grazing farmers did not subscribe. They did not. Who subscribed, and what did they subscribe for?

Mr. SIZER: For the extension of leases you gave them.

The PREMIER: The extension we did not give them. I have proved conclusively that the Opposition have no case. They have not been truthful in stating that they had no money at the last election, because I have quoted one organisation which assisted them, not to speak of business people.

Mr. SIZER: You spend £10 for every £1 we spend.

Mr. KERR: You had eight motor cars engaged in the Enoggera electorate for every one I had.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The PREMIER: The Labour party is always able to get voluntary workers.

Mr. KERR: And motor cars.

The PREMIER: There is no such thing as paid canvassers or organisers. Our balance-sheet is published and signed. We have not to wait to get it in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not a balance-sheet.

The PREMIER: Our balance-sheet is referred to our conference, and has to be approved of. That is well known, and is no secret.

Mr. MOORE: This has been a secret to us.

The PREMIER: Then they spent nearly £9,000 on you without your knowing it.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know where it went to.

The PREMIER: I can safely leave the case to the electors of Queensland, and I think there will be only one result. The Government are carefully and resolutely facing the situation. We may be unpopular in certain quarters, but I have no doubt that the majority of the thinking community are standing behind us.

Mr. MOORE: They can stand behind you as much as they like so long as they don't vote for you. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: They won't finance the hon. member.

Mr. MAXWELL: You just said they were doing so.

The PREMIER: Am I to understand that hon. members opposite have tried them and have failed? (Opposition dissent.) If they have, I will read the other side.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Read it.

The PREMIER: I said I can safely leave the case to the electors.

Mr. KERR: Read the balance-sheet.

The PREMIER: Keep quiet! You had your say, and your side would not listen to you. The Leader of the Opposition failed lamentably in his attack upon the Government. He did not prove that any of the difficulties he mentioned were due to any act of the Government. He certainly did prove to this House and the country that he has not even the most elementary knowledge of the problems confronting the State. (Opposition laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

Resumption of the debate made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 7.52 p.m.