

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 31 JULY 1928**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**TUESDAY, 31 JULY, 1928.**

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

QUESTIONS.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN QUEENSLAND.

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

“Owing to the great amount of unemployment that exists in Queensland today, is it the intention of his Government to take the necessary steps to have it considerably reduced by—(a) reducing taxation; (b) removing restrictions from the investment of capital in secondary industries; (c) introduction of legislation giving individuals the right to work?”

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

“(a) I refer the hon. member to my speech on the Address in Reply. (b) Would the hon. member give a definite case of restriction and also give the secondary industries in which capital is to be invested. (c) Does the hon. member suggest that employers be compelled to employ men who are out of work? It is quite evident he is not now an employer.”

TAXATION OF BOOKMAKERS AND REVENUE FROM TOTALISATORS.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Treasurer—

“1. What was the total number of individual bookmakers who purchased betting tickets during last financial year?”

“2. What was the total taxation paid by bookmakers (including license fees) for the year?”

“3. What was the maximum amount paid by any one bookmaker?”

“4. What was the total revenue received from totalisators?”

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

“1. 419.

“2. £34,975 4s. 9d.

“3. £704 16s. 3d.

“4. £63,421 10s. 11d.”

REVENUE FROM “GOLDEN CASKET,” 1927-28.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Home Secretary—

“What was the total revenue received from the ‘Golden Casket’ during the last financial year?”

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

“£251,490.”

MONEY INVESTED THROUGH TOTALISATOR AT ALBION PARK RACECOURSE.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Treasurer—

“1. What amount of money was invested through the totalisator at Albion Park from 1st July, 1923, to 30th June, 1927?”

“2. How much of the amount was received by the Government?”

“3. How much of the amount went to the proprietors?”

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

“1. £982,526 10s.

“2. £66,681 2s. 10d.

“3. £85,971 1s. 4d.”

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF MATERIALS AND GOODS PURCHASED BY RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. What was the value of materials and goods of all descriptions purchased by the department—(a) manufactured or produced overseas, giving countries of origin; (b) other States of Australia?”

“2. What was the total value of materials and goods of all descriptions manufactured in Queensland and purchased by the department?”

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

“1 and 2. The information is in course of preparation.”

EXAMINATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF APPRENTICES.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“In connection with apprenticeship, what was the number during last financial year of—(a) applicants; (b) those who sat

for examination; (c) those who passed the examination; and (d) those who secured employment?”

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

“(a) The number of applicants for apprenticeship was 1,311.

“(b) Entrance examinations for apprenticeship are not necessary.

“(c) For a minor to register in the electrical trade he must produce evidence of having passed the high school entrance examination, State scholarship examination, or some other recognised examination of at least equal standard. For the other trades the standard of education is as follows:—

For the undermentioned trades, fifth class first half-year in State schools:—

Carpentry and joinery, plumbing, confectionery, coopering, dental mechanics, fitting and turning, motor mechanics, cabinet-making, piano and reed organ tuning and repairing, pipe organ building and tuning, composing, retail butchering, watchmaking, jewellery, and optometry;

and for the following trades, fourth class third half-year standard in State schools:—

Boot, bricklaying, painting, sign-writing, stonemasonry, plastering, coach and motor-body building, clay-working, tailoring, cooks, electroplating, blacksmithing, moulding, boilermaking, patternmaking, copper-smithing, french polishing and staining, wickerwork, wood machining, venetian blind making, bedding making, upholstery, glass bevelling, picture frame making, leather, letterpress machining, lithography, process engraving, bookbinding, sheet metal.

“(d) 526 minors secured employment as apprentices.”

FIRST SECTION, SOUTH BRISBANE-KYOGLE RAILWAY.

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

“1. What was the cost of resumption in regard to the first section of the South Brisbane-Kyogle line, from South Brisbane to Kyogle?”

“2. What is the distance of the first section?”

“3. On what date was work commenced, and when is it estimated to be finished?”

“4. What is the cost on the latest available date, and how much is it estimated will be required to complete the job?”

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

“1. The net cost—after allowing for sale of houses and rentals received for resumed properties—was £186,589 5s. 7d.

“2. The length of the first section—day labour—is 7 miles 65 chains.

“3. Work was commenced 19th January, 1925. The Railway Council expects to complete the section next year, but date of completion is largely dependent upon the availability of funds. The

Federal Government restricted the funds for this work during the latter half of the past financial year.

"4. The expenditure upon work performed to 23rd June, 1923, is £256,000. The additional amount required to complete the work is, approximately, £237,000."

QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT CONTRACT FOR FIRST SECTION, SOUTH BRISBANE-KYOGLE RAILWAY.

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

"In regard to the South Brisbane-Kyogle-Grafton Railway, will he state—

1. As contractors for the building of the second section of the abovementioned railway, what amount has the Queensland Government received?

2. Is it likely that the section will be completed by March, 1929?

3. What is the estimated amount, based on the conditions outlined in the agreement, required from all sources to complete the job?

4. Is he still satisfied that the tender price of his Government—viz., £1,130,142—subject to certain conditions in regard to wages and hours, will not be exceeded?"

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

"1. The amount received by the Queensland Government as contractors to 23rd June, 1923, was £798,166.

"2. It is expected that the work will be completed next year. Excessively wet local weather during the past two years has retarded the progress of the work.

The Queensland section will be completed before the New South Wales construction is finished.

"3. The amount will depend upon the quantity of work yet to be executed and measured; also upon Award rates of pay, etc.—vide conditions of agreement.

"4. See answer to No. 3."

ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL COST OF VARIOUS GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

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

"1. What was the estimated and the actual cost of the following works:—

(a) General Hospital—New wards and the remodelling of lavatory block?

(b) Additions, etc., to Roma Street police barracks?

(c) Reconstruction of Ipswich Railway Workshops?

(d) Erection of new fire station, South Brisbane?

(e) Erection of new building, Cairns Ambulance?

(f) New dormitory block, Gatton College?

(g) Additions, night nurses' quarters at Goodna?

(h) Erection of Toowoomba Hospital Maternity Ward?

(i) Maternity ward and nurses quarters, Townsville?

(j) Parramatta State School, Cairns?

"2. Were public tenders called for any of these jobs?"

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

"1.—

| —  | Estimated Cost.  | Actual Cost.          | Excess.   | Saving.   | —   |
|--|--|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
|  | £ s. d.  | £ s. d.               | £ s. d.   | £ s. d.   |   |
| (a) General Hospital—<br>New Ward  | 63,963 5 0   | 64,632 17 9           | 669 12 9  | ..        | Excess due to variation of Building Trades Award.   |
| (b) Additions, etc., to<br>Roma Street Police<br>Barracks                  | 16,047 13 0  | 24,312 14 9           | 8,265 1 9 | ..        | Excess due to variation of Building Trades Award, and additional work carried out during progress of job, including retaining wall, garage, &c. |
| (c) Reconstruction of<br>Ipswich Railway<br>Workshops                      | The Hon. Member might address this question to the Minister for Railways |                       |           |           | ..  |
| (d) Erection of New Fire<br>Station, South Bris-<br>bane                   | 24,761 4 6   | 25,390 16 5           | 628 11 11 | ..        | Excess due to variation of Building Trades Award, and extra excavations for foundations   |
| (e) Erection of New<br>Building, Cairns<br>Ambulance                       | 9,730 0 0  | 8,845 12 9            | ..        | 884 7 3   | ..  |
| (f) New Dormitory<br>Block, Gatton<br>College                              | 2,576 16 0   | 2,100 17 4            | ..        | 475 18 8  | ..  |
| (g) Additions, Night<br>Nurses' Quarters,<br>Goodna                        | 5,969 0 0  | 4,246 19 10           | ..        | 1,722 0 2 | ..  |
| (h) Erection of Too-<br>woomba Maternity<br>Ward                           | 25,189 14 0  | 17,950 6 8            | ..        | 7,239 7 4 | ..  |
| (i) Erection of Maternity<br>Ward and Nurses'<br>Quarters, Towns-<br>ville | 23,344 13 6  | 22,000 0 0<br>to date | ..        | ..        | Work not yet completed  |
| (j) Parramatta State<br>School   | 9,235 17 0   | 9,493 17 2            | 258 0 2   | ..        | Excess due to wet weather conditions and extra cost of septic tank, &c.   |

"2. No."

EXPENDITURE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS, DUNWICH AND DIAMANTINA STATE INSTITUTIONS.

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

“1. What was the total expenditure for last financial year on the Dunwich and Diamantina State Institutions, and the total contribution of the Federal Government on behalf of pensioner inmates?”

“2. What is the amount of the Federal Government's contribution per pensioner inmate?”

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

|  | £      | s. | d. |
|--|--------|----|----|
| “1. Expenditure—   |        |    |    |
| Dunwich .....  | 47,627 | 15 | 8  |
| Diamantina Hospital .....  | 17,908 | 14 | 6  |
| Contribution by Federal Government on behalf of pensioner inmates— |        |    |    |
| Dunwich .....  | 13,450 | 11 | 0  |
| Diamantina Hospital .....  | 1,899  | 5  | 5  |

“2. The Federal Government pay to the State Government 10s. 6d. per pensioner inmate per week, and to each inmate 4s. per week, making a total payment of 14s. 6d. per week.”

REVENUE FROM CROWN TIMBER AND REVENUE EXPENDITURE ON REAFFORESTATION, 1927-28.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“What was—(a) the total revenue derived from Crown timber during last financial year; and (b) the total expenditure from revenue on reafforestation?”

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

| “Receipts.                               |          | £       |
|--|----------|---------|
| Revenue .....                            |          | 236,725 |
| Forestry and lumbering recoupments ..... |          | 107,897 |
| Harvesting and marketing .....           |          | 117,761 |
| State sawmills .....                     |          | 180,204 |
|  | £642,587 |         |
| “Expenditure.                            |          |         |
| Revenue—                                 |          |         |
| Salaries .....                           | 27,193   |         |
| Travelling and incidentals .....         | 5,495    |         |
| Extra living allowance .....             | 398      |         |
| Loan—                                    |          |         |
| Reafforestation .....                    | 30,995   |         |
| Reconstruction, State sawmills .....     | 10,666   |         |
| Trust—                                   |          |         |
| Forestry and lumbering fund .....        | 95,689   |         |
| Harvesting and marketing fund .....      | 117,761  |         |
| State sawmills—                          |          |         |
| Salaries and wages .....                 | 41,030   |         |
| Purchases .....                          | 143,607  |         |
|  | £472,834 |         |

ESTIMATED COST OF DAWSON VALLEY IRRIGATION SCHEME.

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

“What is the estimated cost of the Dawson Valley irrigated land settlement

scheme, including the construction of the Nathan Dam, apart from that pertaining to railway construction?”

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

“£1,968,000.”

COST OF RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, DAWSON VALLEY IRRIGATION SCHEME.

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

“1. What has been the cost to date of railway construction in connection with the Dawson Valley irrigation scheme?”

“2. Is there still further work to be done in this connection, and, if so, what is the estimated cost?”

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

“1. Baralaba-Castle Creek (Theodore) —£396,729, including land resumptions and surveys.

“2. No.”

NEGOTIATIONS FOR PURCHASE OF MEATWORKS FOR ABATTOIR PURPOSES.

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

“1. Is the Government negotiating for the purchase of a meatworks for abattoir purposes?”

“2. If so, from whom?”

“3. Has any agreement yet been reached?”

“4. If so, what is the arranged price, and is it payable in cash or securities?”

“5. Has any independent valuation been obtained? If so, who are the valuers?”

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

“1 to 5. The Government are not negotiating for the purpose of purchasing a meatworks for abattoir or any other purpose. The Nationalist and Country Party, who are in control of the city of Brisbane, gave a definite promise to the electors that they would establish municipal abattoirs in the Brisbane district. The Government are not anxious to relieve the Nationalist and Country Party of their solemn obligation to provide a clean and hygienic method of slaughtering the city's meat supply.”

DUTIES OF VISITING JUSTICE.

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

“1. Briefly, what are the duties of the visiting justice who is under his jurisdiction?”

“2. Is he continuously employed, and if not, how many days has he been employed during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1928, and what amount did he receive?”

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

“1. The visiting justice visits the charitable institutions, hears complaints

and ascertains whether there has been a breach of regulations or by-laws on the part of inmates or of the servants of the institutions; he inspects the wards and ascertains whether they are kept in proper order, visits prisons once at least in every week, sees prisoners and hears complaints, examines clothing, bedding, and rations.

"2. He is employed continuously and receives a salary of £250 per annum. When travelling outside Brisbane, an allowance of 15s. per day is paid."

#### NOTICES OF RESUMPTION OF PASTORAL HOLDINGS.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. With respect to what pastoral leases have notices of resumption been served during the present year?"

"2. In which of such cases have the notices of resumption since been withdrawn?"

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

"1. The following resumptions from pastoral holdings were made under section 146 between 1st July, 1927, and 27th July, 1928:—

| Holding.         | Area Resumed.                    | Date of Notice. | Takes Effect. |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
|                  | Sq. Mls.                         |                 |               |
| Canobie ..       | 171                              | 7-7-27          | 1-2-28        |
| Canobie West ..  | 123                              | 7-7-27          | 1-2-28        |
| Mount Douglas .. | 28 <sup>9</sup> / <sub>16</sub>  | 14-7-27         | 1-2-28        |
| Woolerina ..     | 315 <sup>5</sup> / <sub>16</sub> | 1-12-27         | 1-6-28        |
| Beechal ..       | 149 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>16</sub> | 19-7-28         | 1-2-29        |

"2. Nil."

#### UNATTENDED STAFF RAILWAY STATIONS AND ACCIDENT AT ALICE.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. From what dates were unattended staff stations instituted at Alice, Beta, Taraborah, and Drummond, and what saving has been effected by such action?"

"2. What was the total cost of the smash at Alice in April, 1926 (including damage to rolling-stock and replacing on line)?"

"3. What accidents (if any) have occurred at any of the above stations since the Alice smash?"

"4. What was the cause of the accidents (Questions 2 and 3)?"

"5. Does he consider the stations mentioned safe to the travelling public?"

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

"1. Beta—4th April, 1924; Alice—26th March, 1925; Taraborah—29th June, 1927; Drummond—18th August, 1927. Total saving, £4,056.

"2. £805.

"3. Nil.

"4. Cause of the accident at Alice was the breaking of the gauge glass on the engine. The steam and water diverted the driver's attention from his duties.

"5. Yes."

#### FORFEITED MINERAL LEASES OF MUNGANA COMPANY, AND PRICE OF LEAD IN 1917 AND 1922.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. Referring to his statement that Mr. McClelland and party took up the forfeited leases of the Mungana Company in 1917, and subsequently in the same year abandoned them, is it not a fact that this party took up only the Griffith mine, while Reid and party took up the Girofla and Lady Jane?"

"2. Who were the partners with Reid in the syndicate prior to its formation into a company?"

"3. When the Government purchased the Mungana mines for £40,000 from the company, why did it not also purchase the Griffith mine from McClelland and party?"

"4. What was the price of lead in 1917 when the Mungana mines were taken up by Reid and party, and what was the price in 1922 when these mines were purchased by the Government?"

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

"1. The Griffith mine was one of the Mungana-Chillagoe Company's leases with the Lady Jane and Girofla, and they became forfeited at the same time. The Griffith mine was taken up by McClelland and party some time before Reid applied for the Lady Jane and Girofla, and the statement referred to was to show that these mines were available to any applicant before Reid applied.

"2. The lessee was Frederick Reid.

"3. There was never any such proposal before the Government.

"4. London market price of lead—September, 1917, £30 10s.; March, 1922, £20 15s."

#### WORKERS' DWELLINGS AND WORKERS' HOMES, 1927-28.

Mr. KING (*Logan*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. What was the total number of completed dwellings and homes respectively during the last financial year, and the approximate total cost in each case?"

"2. What was the number of applications made, the number approved, and the amount applied for workers' dwellings and workers' homes respectively during the last financial year?"

"3. What was the number of applications refused and/or held over?"

"4. What was the total amount appropriated for such homes and dwellings for the last financial year?"

"5. What is the maximum amount advanced for a worker's home?"

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

|   | Workers' Dwellings. | Workers' Homes. |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| "(1.) Buildings completed ..                                  | 745                 | 400             |
| Total cost ..   | £461,870            | £230,008        |
| "(2.) Applications dealt with ..                              | 912                 | 629             |
| Applications approved ..                                      | 817                 | 555             |
| Amounts applied for ..  | £538,490            | £361,016        |
| "(3.) Applications refused                                    | 8                   | 11              |
| Applications withdrawn ..                                     | 18                  | 40              |
| Applications held over ..                                     | 69                  | 23              |
| "(4.) Total amount appropriated for financial year 1927-28 .. | £414,000            | £286,000        |

"(5.) As a general rule £600, but applications are dealt with on their merits."

BOURKE-BARRINGUN RAILWAY, NEW SOUTH WALES, AND EXTENSION OF QUEENSLAND BORDER RAILWAY.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Has he noted, or is he aware of, the proposal of the Government of New South Wales to push on with the construction of railway from Bourke to Barrington?"

"2. Is he aware that New South Wales Works Committee is engaged in or contemplates an inquiry on the subject at certain Queensland centres with the object of obtaining information in support of the above railway and the North-South Railway?"

"3. Is he aware that the construction of the North-South Bourke-Barrington section will tap and secure the bulk of Queensland south-western border trade?"

"4. Have the Government given consideration to, and what means do they intend to adopt to protect, Queensland trade for Queensland ports?"

"5. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of the Border Railway section from Dirranbandi, which was recommended and approved by Parliament in 1914, and is it the intention of the Government to proceed further with this strategic border railway till it junctions with New South Wales railway proposal?"

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

"1 to 5. These questions involve consideration of Government policy, and should be addressed to the honourable the Premier."

MICE PLAGUE OF DARLING DOWNS, AND LOSSES TO MAIZE AND WHEAT GROWERS.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. Is he aware of the great loss sustained by maize and wheat growers on the Downs this season by mice plague,

and which is also responsible for a number of cases of mice fever among farmers?"

"2. Is he aware that on account of enormous losses caused by rats and mice in France, United States, and other countries, an International Conference was held in Havre in May as the first allied movement to check mice and rat depredation and distribution of filth and disease?"

"3. Will he cause inquiries to be made as to the conclusions arrived at, and ascertain course recommended to be adopted to check such depredations and disease?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. No official intimation.

"3. Yes. The department has advocated the use of calcium cyanogas, which has proved efficacious in the destruction of rodents and similar vermin attacking cereals. Further, the Government has agreed to advance the sum of £36,000 to the Wheat Pool Board for the purpose of enabling the board to store wheat under more satisfactory conditions than those now prevailing; £20,000 of this amount is now available to the board."

FLOUR, BRAN, AND POLLARD RECEIVED AT WALLANGARRA, 1927-28.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. What tonnage of the following commodities was received at Wallangarra from 1st July, 1927, to 30th June, 1928—(a) Flour; (b) bran; and (c) pollard?"

"2. To what railway destinations were such commodities railed?"

"3. Is the Government aware that an extraordinary concession is made by the New South Wales Railway Department by which flour is railed from Sydney to Wallangarra at approximately 6s. 5d. per ton, and bran and pollard at 5s. per ton?"

"4. Is it the intention of the Government to adopt means to meet such unfair exploitation of Queensland's trade?"

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

"1 and 2. I would refer the hon. member to the Minister for Railways.

"3. Yes.

"4. The Queensland Government has no control of freights charged over the New South Wales railways."

IMPORTED FLOUR PURCHASED BY STATE STORES BOARD, 1927-28.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) asked the Premier—

"1. What is the total number of tons of imported flour purchased by the Stores Department for year ended 30th June, 1928, and what is the average cost per ton of flour so purchased?"

"2. Is it a standing regulation not to purchase Queensland flour if imported flour is procurable at 5 per cent. less?"

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

"1. The only Southern flour that has been purchased by the State Stores Board for the year ended 30th June, 1928, has been a total quantity of 36 tons from Townsville and Cairns merchants and Brisbane agents for issue to State stations in the northern part of the State. For all other supplies of flour for Government institutions and services only Queensland-made flour has been purchased, and the business has been equally divided between the different Queensland milling companies. All flour purchased has been at the ruling market rate on day of purchase.

"2. No."

#### CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL PUPILS AND SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. LLEWELYN (*Toowoomba*), for Mr. FARRELL (*Rockhampton*), asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. What was the number of correspondence school pupils who sat for the last scholarship examination?"

"2. How many passed the examination?"

"3. Under what conditions are the examinations held?"

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

"1. 22.

"2. 13.

"3. The conditions are the same as for all scholarship candidates, except that the miscellaneous paper is not taken by correspondence school candidates."

#### SCHOOL INSPECTORS DUE FOR RETIREMENT.

Mr. LLEWELYN (*Toowoomba*), for Mr. FARRELL (*Rockhampton*), asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. What are the names of the district inspectors of schools who are due for retirement under the Public Service Regulations?"

"2. On what date was each due for retirement?"

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

"1. (i.) Fowler, Joseph Longton, B.A.; (ii.) Kemp, Charles; (iii.) Taylor, William.

"2. Mr. Fowler attained the age of sixty-five (65) years on the 10th November, 1927; Mr. Kemp on the 25th January, 1927; and Mr. Taylor on the 22nd March, 1927."

#### PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS OF SUGAR FOR SIX YEARS, AND PRICE PAID TO PRODUCERS.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"For each of the past six seasons, what has been—(a) the total production of sugar; (b) the quantity exported; (c) the average price per ton paid to producers?"

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

"(a), (b), and (c)—

| Season. | Sugar Purchased (Actual Tons). | Quantity Exported (Actual Tons). | Average Price Paid to Producer per Ton 94 N.T. |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 1922 .. | 287,785                        | 2,205                            | £ s. d.<br>30 6 8                              |
| 1923 .. | 277,922                        | 16,415                           | 27 0 0   |
| 1924 .. | 419,312                        | 78,779                           | 26 0 0   |
| 1925 .. | 499,390                        | 211,062                          | 19 10 7  |
| 1926 .. | 401,638                        | 74,747                           | 24 10 10                                       |
| 1927 .. | 490,061                        | 152,384                          | 22 0 4   |

#### NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN RAILWAY DEPARTMENT, 1927-28.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"What was the total number of employees in the Railway Department on 30th June last—(a) Open lines; (b) construction?"

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

"(a) 19,624; (b) 2,892."

#### PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulations and Orders in Council under the Irrigation Act of 1922.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

#### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST ALLOTTED DAY.

Question stated—

"That the following Address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this, the Third Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of Queensland:—

"May it please Your Excellency,—

"We, His Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

"The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it will be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State."

On which Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) had moved—

"That the question be amended by the addition of the following words—

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

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I rise to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and I feel that at no time has an amendment been more aptly moved nor at a more opportune time. I know perfectly well that, in all probability, the amendment will be defeated in this House; but that does not signify anything because, although machine politics may defeat the amendment in this House, it is perfectly obvious to anyone who is but a casual observer that the Government has lost the confidence of the people one hundred times over.

I intend, more or less, to direct my attention for a while to the address which was delivered by the Premier in defence of his Government. The hon. gentleman started off by saying that he had nothing to reply to, and then it took him an hour and a-half apparently to say nothing. (Opposition laughter.) There is one point upon which I would like to compliment the hon. member, and that is his modesty. I think his modesty was quite becoming—particularly that sort of modesty which asks "Who is the King?" and replies "No other than I; although I say so myself." That is the sort of modesty to which I refer, and it was most marked when he was dealing with the question of maiden speeches. At the time I could not help thinking of Mark Twain when he said "Julius Caesar is dead; Napoleon is dead; and I'm not feeling very well myself." (Laughter.) That is the sort of modesty he showed, which was no doubt due to the fact that he respected the charges of the Leader of the Opposition and realised the seriousness of the position. I can only say that his speech generally could be described as as clear an enunciation of the Government's position as was his own explanation at the time the "Courier" was calling him their commander-in-chief and the "Standard" was placing him in the category of Billy Hughes—he made his speech as clear as he did on that occasion.

When he got into the realms of finance entered into by his Government—particularly that portion dealing with his taxation proposals—he reminded me of the Pharisee, who turned his eyes to heaven, and said, "Thank God I am not as other men are." He made an apology for his predecessors; but just exactly as, when you analyse the Pharisee's statement, so when you analyse the hon. gentleman's statements they cannot be borne out by facts.

I intend to start to deal with the point which the hon. gentleman raised with regard to taxation. He tried to convince the House, and apparently he intends to try to convince the country, that he is a wizard of finance—a new Pierpont Morgan. (Government laughter.) Let us look at his record. Since he and his Government came into power they have taxed the people to the extent of £42,426,379. The hon. gentleman cannot be held responsible for the whole of that amount, but he has been a Minister and a supporter of the Government who have been responsible for it. They have taxed the people by £34,296,593 more than any other Government taxed them in a similar period. It shows clearly that there has been no dearth of taxation since this Government have been in power.

Let us deal more particularly with the hon. gentleman's record—that is what we are reviewing at the moment. He had last year a record revenue of £1,820,814 more than his immediate predecessor. It is quite

a simple matter to finance if you have an everlasting supply of money, no matter whence it comes. If his financing had been based on the policy which he so often professes—economy—there would have been something in the argument; but the fact remains that whilst his revenue has increased so has his expenditure. The expenditure during his period of office was £1,827,276 more than that of his immediate predecessor, despite all his talk of economy. When the hon. gentleman took control in 1925-1926 the expenditure per head was £16 11s. 1d.; in 1926-1927—the first year after he took control—the expenditure was £18 2s. 4d. per head; and in 1927-1928—that year when he claims such rigid economy took place—we find it had increased to £18 11s. 10d., proving clearly that the surplus of which he is now talking did not result from any economy. It came from another source altogether, which meant that he had a record revenue as well as a record expenditure. And then the hon. gentleman claims—"I have lived within my income!"

The PREMIER: So I have.

Mr. SIZER: He claims "I have not increased taxation; I have not done this; I have not done that." Well, let us look at his record.

The PREMIER: Every State of the Commonwealth got more money last year.

Mr. SIZER: Let us compare the record of the hon. gentleman with that of Mr. Theodore. In 1922-23, Mr. Theodore increased taxation by £89,411, whilst in the next year he decreased it by [11 a.m.] £286,316. In Mr. Gillies' reign as Treasurer in 1924-25, there was an increase of taxation of £296,960. Now let us deal with the hon. gentleman. In 1925-26, he increased taxation by £189,961; in 1926-27, he increased it by £398,218; and in 1927-28, by £475,742. In other words, he has been the most extravagant Treasurer that this State has ever had. Of the total increase in taxation during the past six years—which has amounted to £1,163,976—the present Treasurer has been responsible directly for £1,063,921, or 91 per cent.

The TREASURER: Without any increase in the taxes.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman has been responsible more than anybody else, yet he cries, "Thank God, I am not like other men."

But that is not all. This enormous increase has gone on since 1924, when the hon. gentleman said taxation had reached its limit in Queensland. Since then he has increased it by over £1,000,000 in the aggregate, and has increased the per capita rate from £4 9s. 2d. to £5 10s. 9d. What is the cause of that? The cause is that the hon. gentleman will say anything at any time that happens to suit his argument at that time, and in 1924 it suited him to say that Queensland had reached its limit of taxation.

The PREMIER: So it had.

Mr. SIZER: Then why did the hon. gentleman not stop there? The hon. gentleman has to bear in mind that his total debit balances, amounting to £850,000, prove that in his own individual financing as Treasurer he has shown himself the worst this State has had. I say frankly that a Government must balance its ledger; but the greatest

*Mr. Sizer.]*

spendthrift in the world can show a surplus if he has an inexhaustible supply of money to draw from. Even Monty Brewster could not get rid of his millions. Can anyone for one moment say that that is good financing? The hon. gentleman reminds me of the extravagant spendthrift who commences the year with a debit, secures a windfall in the middle of the year, then enters upon a bacchanalian financial jazz, and at the end of the year with a pound in his pocket exclaims, "What a wonderful financier I am!" It is preposterous on the part of the hon. gentleman to attempt to lay claim to being a wonderful financier.

Let me now deal with his claim that he has not increased taxation.

The PREMIER: I have not increased the incidence of taxation.

Mr. SIZER: The incidence of taxation, in the first place, must have been iniquitous and wrong if, after the budgeting for certain balances, it is discovered that the prophecy on the part of the Opposition has come to pass—that the taxation imposed has created a burden beyond the power of the community to bear. The hon. gentleman claims that there has been no increase in the incidence of taxation, and that the increased revenue is derived from increased taxable income. Of course, the revenue derived is from taxation based on the incidence imposed. The hon. gentleman has increased railway charges and freights from 10 per cent. to 50 per cent.; he has imposed the gift duty; he has increased the stamp duty; he has increased licensing fees; he has increased motor fees; he has imposed a heavy vehicle tax; he has increased the contributions to the Unemployed Workers' Insurance Fund from 3d. to 5d. per week; he has reimposed the super land tax, and maintained the super income tax. Yet he claims to have balanced the ledger without increasing taxation! When the hon. gentleman was speaking the other night he was not sure whether he was prophetic or romancing when he remarked, "When the Opposition get on this side of the House." I am inclined to think that he was prophetic.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Echo answers "When"?

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that there will be a time, and that time is very close at hand. (Government laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER: It is quite obvious that the surplus which has been produced was not produced as a result of economy. I have shown that it has been derived from increased taxation; but having bled the people white, created a depression in Queensland to an unprecedented extent, his lust for money was not yet satisfied, and he had to make a wanton and merciless attack upon the poor innocent little "Teddy Bear," thereby outraging public sentiment, and from such a source providing nine-tenths of his surplus. The poor innocent little "Teddy Bear" was responsible for providing nine-tenths of the surplus! What did the hon. gentleman care about the "Teddy Bear"? What did he care about public outcry? Not a whit! The "Teddy Bear" was the means for producing a surplus, and that was all he cared for. It is a sorry plight when this State has to produce a surplus

[Mr. Sizer.

under such conditions. I have trenchantly dealt with the claim of the hon. gentleman and his record as a "heaven-born financier."

The other night the hon. gentleman proceeded to build up a case on half-truths, and they were most apparent when he was dealing with trade balances. I intend to deal with that subject, and I hope that I shall be infinitely more accurate than was the hon. gentleman when dealing with it. I will agree that since the hon. gentleman assumed the reins of the Premiership he has introduced an atmosphere of inaccuracy, and it may be contagious. I intend to avoid falling into that trap which the hon. gentleman has laid. In dealing with trade balances he attempted to build up a case to prove that Queensland had a favourable trade balance. That is to say, our exports exceeded our imports. He referred to the figures—

|                | £          |
|----------------|------------|
| Imports ... .. | 11,000,000 |
| Exports ... .. | 19,900,000 |

The hon. gentleman then proceeded to build up the case that, because of this fact, Queensland was like Horatio holding the bridge, as she was supplying wealth to the whole of Australia. The hon. gentleman knows that these figures were inaccurate.

The PREMIER: I did not give figures. You quote my speech.

Mr. SIZER: I am giving the figures. The hon. gentleman based his argument on those figures, and attempted to draw the inference that we had a favourable trade balance of £8,000,000 odd. That was one of the half-truths which the hon. gentleman tried to get away with. I am going to explain that fully. Only last session we asked the hon. gentleman for information dealing with interstate trade, and he told us that no figures were available. That was the truth. The figures regarding the trade balance which he attempted to quote only deal with overseas trade, which does not in any way reflect the true position of the trade of Queensland.

The PREMIER: Do you say that we import more than we export?

Mr. SIZER: I intend to go through the figures, and the hon. gentleman will find very soon where he stands. It is a well-known fact that Customs duty is paid in the State into which goods are imported. I further intend to show that the manufactures of Queensland are declining, therefore the manufacturing wealth of Queensland must also be declining. That is met by Queensland being an agency State for the goods imported into Victoria and New South Wales, in which States the Customs duty is paid.

The PREMIER: Would that Customs duty amount to £4,000,000?

Mr. SIZER: I say it amounts to more than £4,000,000.

The PREMIER: The Customs duty collected in Queensland does not represent the whole of the duty payable on goods coming into Queensland.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman can say so, and argue that point.

The PREMIER: Do we not export any sugar or meat?

Mr. SIZER: Might I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is making this speech,

The SPEAKER: The hon. member appears to be inviting interjections.

Mr. SIZER: It is fairly clear that, if our own manufacturing interests are declining, goods must be coming into Queensland from somewhere. If not, the people of Queensland cannot be enjoying the same standard of living as the people in the other States. If that is so, then it is a fair assumption that the figures showing the imports per head would be fairly general all over Australia, and the extraordinary point is that in Victoria and New South Wales, where the greatest industrial progress is being made, the greatest imports are shown by the Customs returns. This fact clearly shows that they also export. Let me give the figures per head of the imports by several States during the last three years—

|                     | £  |
|---------------------|----|
| New South Wales ... | 82 |
| Victoria ... ..     | 88 |
| Queensland ... ..   | 44 |

These figures are from the Customs statistics.

The PREMIER: The information is not accurate.

Mr. SIZER: Then the hon. gentleman has answered his own argument. He states that the figures are not accurate, and I say that his argument is not accurate.

The PREMIER: What about the £9,000,000 trade balance?

Mr. SIZER: If there is a balance of £9,000,000, then the figures I have quoted are accurate; if not, the people of Queensland are on a much lower standard of living than the people of New South Wales.

Mr. HYNES: You are up a gum-tree.

Mr. SIZER: If the hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed, I will endeavour to show him that my argument is correct.

Mr. HANLON: Yours is a "Teddy Bear" argument.

Mr. SIZER: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is very "bare" of argument. As a further illustration of the position of Queensland, let me give the following figures showing the factory employees per 10,000 of population in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland:—

| N.S.W. | Vic. | Q'ld. |
|--------|------|-------|
| 763    | 929  | 534   |

I have shown that there are fewer employees in industry in Queensland, and, if the hon. gentleman is correct when he says we are importing less, then the position is either that the figures are not accurate or our standard of living is much lower in Queensland. We know that the manufacturing industries in Queensland declined to the extent of £4,573,101 in added value last year. It is reasonable to assume that goods to that extent will be imported from the other States or from overseas; and, if that is so, then the amount must be added to the trade balance.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You must also add the exports from Queensland to those of the other States of the Commonwealth.

Mr. SIZER: If the trade balance figure stated by the Premier is correct, then we are in an excellent position, because, on his argument, we have created a large surplus of money overseas. The hon. gentleman

has stated that we have a trade balance amounting to several millions of pounds. If that is so, then our external interest debt is only £3,000,000; then in those circumstances why stop borrowing? How does the hon. gentleman reconcile that position with his statement that we are over-borrowing? Surely, if we have ample money overseas and our loan expenditure has given a profit of millions of pounds, we should not discontinue making a profit!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are badly bogged.

Mr. SIZER: If any business man can borrow £1,000 at 5 per cent. and on that amount make a profit of from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent., why should he stop borrowing? Similarly, if, through our trade, we have established the credit balance to which reference has been made, there is no need for us to be in any difficulty so far as further borrowing is concerned.

But there is another aspect of the question of over-borrowing to which I wish to refer. When the present Government assumed office, the public debt of Queensland was £57,000,000; to-day it is £112,000,000. In other words, hon. members opposite who have said so much about over-borrowing are responsible for the public debt of Queensland being doubled in the course of thirteen years. In the face of those figures, it appears to me that the Government themselves pass the greatest condemnation on their own policy when they preach the necessity for ceasing to borrow.

The hon. gentleman also dealt with his loan policy. If his loan policy has been sound, what is the trouble? It will provide a profit if we accept his argument in regard to the favourable trade balance. But the hon. gentleman ought to know that his loan policy, instead of doing that, is not earning a fraction of the interest on the money which he borrowed. The Government have wasted their assets. There is no asset left in many cases. Their loan policy has been a colossal blunder from beginning to end, and the reason why there is so much unemployment is because the money borrowed has been squandered and wasted, and there is no tangible asset left. There is no earning power in those things upon which the money has been invested—not even a fraction—to meet the interest which is payable overseas. The hon. gentleman has been forced to argue that we are over-borrowing—not because Queensland could not borrow more. I am not one of those who think that Queensland is done. Queensland is a wonderful State to be able to stand all the impositions of the present Government. The reason why Queensland cannot borrow more is because the Government have squandered their loan money on unproductive works. They cannot afford to borrow more because Queensland cannot afford to pay more interest. If the Government had to borrow more, we would have to pay much more interest, and that interest would have to be met out of increased taxation. Apparently the Government are not prepared to impose more taxation. That is the reason why the hon. gentleman states that the Government have been over-borrowing. He has been responsible for it, and he cannot afford to borrow more, because, roughly speaking, £10,000,000 of Queensland's revenue is required to pay the public servants; £5,000,000 is required to pay the interest

Mr. Sizer.]

bill; and there is very little left with which to carry on.

Therefore, if the Government wish to increase the loan indebtedness without earning some interest on reproductive works, they have either to decrease the number of public servants or they will have to tax the people further to make up the additional interest. That is the position.

I now come to probably the most extraordinary portion of the Premier's speech. His most extraordinary statement was that "taxation is only a minor factor in unemployment." That was the most remarkable utterance ever made by a responsible man. It is the most unsound utterance that ever came from a responsible man. When the hon. gentleman made that statement and developed his argument, I wondered whether I was listening to the hon. member for Cairns of to-day or to the same member for Cairns in 1924, when he said the Government could not go on with certain schemes because, if they did, they would have to impose further taxation, and they could not impose further taxation, as they had already reached the danger zone for employment. I did not know, and I do not know now, whether the hon. gentleman was serious in 1924, or whether he was serious the other night. I am rather inclined to think that he simply says anything that comes to his mind at the moment to suit his argument. I think that even the Deputy Leader of the Government would not make such an assertion as that, nor would anyone else.

Then he went into realms of fancy in an academic discussion on the causes of unemployment. He referred to the weather conditions, to the heavy rains—it was practically an argument that, if it rains, it will be wet, and there will be no drought. How does that bear on the subject? Then he flew to Mr. Gepp, and said that Mr. Gepp laid it down that one of the causes of unemployment was an adverse trade balance. The hon. gentleman claimed a favourable trade balance. How does that argument affect the position? He claimed also that unemployment was an incident over which the Government had no control, and that it was controlled by an economic law which he could not discover. The hon. gentleman and other hon. members opposite were elected on the policy enunciated in 1915 by the late Mr. Ryan.

Mr. COLLINS: And we are still here, and likely to remain here.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman and his party said that in three years they would solve the problem of the unemployed.

Mr. COLLINS: We are still here and waiting.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member is still there and waiting for the solution. What has the hon. member's leader given us? Miles of statistics! The hon. member for Bowen was promised many things—iron and steel works, for instance—for which he is still waiting. Hon. members opposite were all elected on the policy enunciated by Mr. Ryan at Barcaldine in 1915—

"The Labour Department will include bureaux in all the principal centres. The primary object of the establishment will be to find employment for all who seek it. A special department of the bureaux will be devoted to the interests

of women workers. No fees will be charged for the services rendered by the bureaux."

This is the point—

"This establishment, working in conjunction with the various State enterprises, will be the means of coping with the unemployed problem, and will in itself be a distinct and much needed reform. The Labour Party considers it the duty of the Government to see that every citizen is given the opportunity to work and earn a livelihood."

Mr. HYNES: Hear, hear! We are doing it. That is our policy.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member for Townsville says they are doing it! The Trades and Labour Council say that is not true; they say there are 20,000 unemployed in Brisbane. Honourable members opposite were elected to solve the problem of unemployment. They said they could do it, and got the confidence of the people through saying it. The Leader of the Government now comes down and says that he cannot find the causes of unemployment—that there is some mythical economic law—some "elusive Pimpernel"—of which he has no knowledge. Will the Leader of the Government say that his gem policy did not cause unemployment on the gem fields?

The HOME SECRETARY: I don't know. (Laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman does know that an urgent wire was sent by the hon. member for Leichhardt, imploring the Government to remove the embargo on the gem industry, because the people on the field were starving. If the policy was right, why did the hon. gentleman alter it? The Government altered it because they knew it was wrong. Will they tell me that the policy of going to England for locomotives was not a factor which caused unemployment?

Mr. PEASE: We have explained why that was done.

Mr. SIZER: You cannot explain it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. SIZER: Honourable members opposite cannot explain that policy. Can anyone say that the sending overseas for twenty locomotives, which could be made at our own workshops when the men were on half-time, or were being put out of work, did not encourage or cause unemployment? Will they say for a moment that if those locomotives had been made here hundreds of men would not have been absorbed in employment? If they could say that, why are they now letting contracts in Queensland? It would find work for the unemployed—and quite right, too! We contend they did it then simply because of their short-sighted policy of allowing themselves to run out of rolling-stock and not having time to repair it. Any boy in college could have foreseen the result. Could there be a greater condemnation of administration?

To allow the condition of their [11.30 a.m.] rolling-stock to get so run down—sitting in their offices, playing with the situation, and at the same time failing to give work to men who needed it, and denying it to them when they appealed for it—and then in the next moment find themselves compelled to rush overseas for

[Mr. Sizer.

new locomotives when the inevitable demand for them occurred! It must have been heart-breaking to the unemployed. Would not such bungling make anybody ask himself where the Government were heading? If ever a bunch of carrots was hung before the people's noses it was the promises of the Government that they would solve the problem. Apparently they have grown callous. The Premier apparently cannot even meet a deputation. Evidently his conscience pricks him. He cannot stand up to these people, whom he told on the hustings, or as a union organiser, that he would solve the problem. He cannot stand up to the election pledges he made—those sworn pledges to which he has referred this morning—because he has lied to them—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER: I withdraw that. He has misled them, and he is now realising that he is not able to give them what he promised. The Secretary for Mines was going to solve the unemployment problem.

Mr. MAXWELL: In three months.

Mr. SIZER: Yes, in three months; but to-day his silver lining to the cloud is blacker than it has ever been in the history of this State.

Mr. HYNES: No one State can solve the unemployment problem.

Mr. SIZER: Why do not the hon. gentleman and his Government be honest with the people on the hustings and say they cannot solve it?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER: Why say, "Return us to power, and your unemployment will disappear"?

Mr. HYNES: I would abolish the capitalistic system. That is the only way to do it.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman says that taxation is only an incident—only a minor factor in causing unemployment. If that be so, even in spite of this unemployment why not go on taxing? He has promised childhood endowment and all sorts of things. He has said, "We are in favour of these laudable schemes, but the only thing that is holding us up is finance." If, as the hon. gentleman has said, taxation is only an incident in unemployment, why not impose more taxation and give the money to the people?

Mr. O'KEEFE: Do you believe in it?

Mr. SIZER: Of course I do not; but that is a favourite argument of hon. members opposite. I want to expose the hollowness of the hon. gentleman's argument—his barrenness of ideas. Why is it, I ask him, that they have stopped? Of course, it does not matter to him that in a previous speech he has said, "In the last analysis the great bulk of taxation is paid by the great bulk of the people." How can he reconcile those two statements?

Mr. HYNES: By the wealth producers; that is true.

Mr. SIZER: My point is that the Premier stated "In the last analysis the great bulk of taxation is paid by the great bulk of the people," who are the workers. To put the argument the other way round, the hon. gentleman has increased taxation by £1,000,000. Why impose that on his own workers? (Government dissent.) The hon.

gentleman wants it both ways. He says that the great bulk of the taxation is paid by the great bulk of the people, and then he proceeds to increase taxation, raising the taxation payment per family of five from 2s. 9d. to 10s. 9d. per week.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true.

Mr. SIZER: It is true. The hon. gentleman has imposed that fresh taxation on them after he had said that the great bulk of the people bear the great bulk of the taxation. If hon. members opposite are as solicitous for the great mass of the people as they claim, why impose these increased taxes on them?

If, as the hon. gentleman claims, taxation is not an incident in the question of unemployment, then why not proceed to impose further taxation, thereby solving this very important problem?

Mr. FERRICKS: He did not say that taxation was not a factor. He said, that it was not the cause of unemployment.

Mr. SIZER: I am going to show very clearly that the hon. gentleman says anything to suit his own case, and on that point I intend to quote from the speech by the Premier contained in "Hansard" for 1924, when the hon. gentleman occupied the position of Secretary for Public Lands. This is the report—

"Then it may be argued that we should increase general taxation. There is certainly no other way. It is very easy to say, "Tax the other fellow," but there is a point at which taxation becomes so heavy that, instead of bettering the position, it actually makes it worse for the very men you wish to benefit. I will give an illustration. Every man who has surplus money after paying for his immediate needs and those of his family, invests the rest of it in industry, if he does not put it into Government securities. That is a truism. If we take that money from him, he cannot invest it in industry. No doubt the hon. member for Fitzroy can quote many instances where taxation does not have that effect, but I am giving an instance of where it does. If we take that money out of industry to pay an increase in wages, what will be the effect and who will suffer? That is a reasonable question.

"Opposition Members: The worker.

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Employment will suffer, or at least we think it will. The hon. member for Fitzroy may be right. I am giving my opinion. I think that, if taxation gets to a certain stage—and it is fairly high in Queensland—

"Mr. Weir: What is that stage?

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is 10s. in the £1 in some instances.

"Mr. Weir: Is that the danger zone.

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is the danger zone for employment. We can all be honest in our opinion and not question the other man's motives at all. I have nothing to gain by making this speech. I am talking to the people, and I want those people who believe in me to know that I am not taking up the stand that I have taken up merely through 'cussedness.' It is because my experience points to the fact that the

Mr. Sizer.]

action proposed may have a boomerang effect and injure those who I desire should not be injured.

"The practical side must have knowledge behind it. Whatever may be the opinions of hon. members on this side, some think that the necessary money can be secured. I do not think that it is impossible to secure it. I know it can be secured. I am stating my opinion because I think that in the securing of it there will be involved a boomerang effect upon the very people we are trying to protect. That is my point. If we do that, then we have to face the consequences. It is no use saying we are not learning. We are learning."

Of course he is learning; but what the hon. gentleman learned was all unlearned on Thursday night—if I may use such an expression—and he has performed a complete financial somersault worthy of any financial acrobat, and now claims that taxation is not an incident in unemployment. I say again, the hon. gentleman will use any statement to suit the particular case; and his views on economics are as elusive as the "elusive Pimpernel." That fairly well describes the hon. gentleman and his desire in connection with unemployment. He quoted some figures showing the number of unemployed unionists; but he knows perfectly well that those figures are not correct. Will he say—will any hon. member say—or do the people outside believe that there are only 3,000 unemployed in Queensland? That is what the Premier tried to make out. He ought to know better. The hon. member for Chillagoe knows only too well that he could find nearly half that number in his own electorate

Mr. O'KEEFE: Don't be silly.

Mr. SIZER: The Trades and Labour Council recently stated that there were 20,000 unemployed in Brisbane alone. That figure is much nearer the mark. If there were only 3,000 unemployed in Queensland, why has it been found necessary to increase the premiums to the Unemployed Workers' Insurance Fund from 3d. to 6d. per week? Why has it been found necessary to pay nearly £400,000 from that fund to unemployed workers, in addition to extra money granted for relief? Every hon. member on the Government and Opposition sides of the House knows that unemployment in Queensland is unprecedented. Why? Simply because the policy which the Government have pursued for years has been one of squandering loan money in State enterprises. They now wish to abolish those enterprises. They have wasted their substance in riotous living, and have led the people into the wilderness. They are unable to lead them out again, and the people are crying for bread. What is their reply? Simply millions of statistics! How are they going to help to put an end to unemployment? All that they have done with the question is to show the unemployed workers who are crying for work that there are tens of thousands in the same boat as themselves. That is the only solution the Government have to offer. The position is one of which the Government and all Labour Governments should be ashamed. They should bow their heads in shame for having brought this fair State of Queensland into such a state after thirteen years of rule, and for having dragged her down to the very depth of degradation and created such a position in regard to unem-

[Mr. Sizer.

ployment as we have never had before. The Government can neither show hope for the future nor offer a scheme for the solution of the position. They are floating helpless on the sea of opportunity, hoping that some favourable wave will pick them up and deposit them on a better shore. They have become devoid of ideas; they have lost their initiative and grip of the situation. They can only turn to the report of the Migration Commission and some academic statement of Professor Copland to defend their position in regard to unemployment. This was the party that held up such high hopes to the people of their ability to solve unemployment. They have failed miserably, and the people of Queensland will deal with them at the first opportunity for the failure of that policy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER: I think I have fairly well disposed of the argument of the Premier that the incidence of taxation does not affect unemployment. (Government laughter.)

The hon. gentleman then proceeded in a very subtle way to try to drive in a wedge amongst the members of this party. He referred to the middlemen in the party, and said that they were lions lying down with the lambs. He criticised this party by attempting to appeal to prejudice, and added that they would have to solve the problem. His whole speech was an appeal to prejudice, and, as I have said, a subtle attempt to drive a wedge between the members representing country and city electorates. Let me deal with that point. Let me quote from the same policy speech from which I quoted earlier in my remarks—it was their first policy speech, and I am using it because that was their fixed policy, and Labour says that its policy never changes, and it has had thirteen years to evolve that policy and put it into operation—

"As a concomitant of a sound policy of land settlement, it is necessary to provide suitable markets for the producer in order to secure for him an adequate return for his products. With that object in view, an Act was passed last session providing for the establishment of a State produce agency which will serve the dual purpose of protecting producer and consumer alike, by eliminating the middleman. Branches of this agency will be established in the other States of the Commonwealth and also overseas, and thus the producer will have the advantage of the world's market for his products."

If that was a sound policy, and if the Labour Party were really sincere, why have the Government not dealt with the middleman? Surely hon. members opposite mean what they say!

Mr. KERR: These things are only said to gull the public.

Mr. SIZER: That is so. The Government know perfectly well that they could not do what they have promised with regard to establishing agencies in other States. Where are the agencies in the other States? Where is the agency overseas? Where is the middleman? The middleman is still here, although the Government have had thirteen years in which to deal with him. It is perfectly clear that the Government know they cannot do these things. Yet we hear the Premier saying that "the lion lies down with the lamb." Let me say that the primary producers of the State would much prefer that to the wolf in

sheep's clothing, which promises them everything, and, in the end, imposes upon them an iniquitous rural award which robs them of any benefit they might otherwise get. I warn the farmers of Queensland that the same treatment is to be meted out to them as has been suffered by other industries in the State. The Government are putting in the thin edge of the wedge, and very soon we may have the farmers of this State being presided over by union lords who will decree how many furrows shall be ploughed each day, and, I suppose, how poor old Brindle shall march the goose-step to the tune of the union bosses. (Opposition laughter.) The farmers of Queensland know the Government only too well; they have been selected to bear special taxation, and are now burdened with an iniquitous, unworkable rural award. The position now is that the farmers not only battle against elements which are beyond their control, but are also bludgeoned by an award which imposes conditions over which the Government have control. The farmers, however, are not likely to be led away by the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HYNES: Would you repeal the rural workers' award?

Mr. SIZER: Most certainly. The hon. gentleman who has just interjected cannot logically argue for an award for general farming, because that is economically unsound. It is illogical for the hon. gentleman to say that the sugar industry can carry on satisfactorily under an industrial award, because I would remind hon. members that the sugar industry is highly protected, and that the fixed price which obtains in that industry is not given to the general farmer. A rural workers' award cannot be justified unless the farmer is given a fixed price for his commodity; and that cannot be done.

I was astonished to see the Premier holding up his hands this morning about the reference to solemn pledges. I would ask hon. members opposite: Where is the childhood endowment scheme that was promised by the hon. gentleman? I recall the statement made by the Premier that, if the Commonwealth Government did not immediately introduce a childhood endowment scheme, the Queensland Government would do so. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: Another bunch of carrots.

Mr. SIZER: Further, in his policy speech at Cairns, the Premier stated that, if the Government were again returned to power, there would be established a Barron Falls hydro-electric scheme, which he considered would be an economical solution of all the trouble.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Who said that?

Mr. SIZER: The Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIZER: In his policy speech, delivered at Cairns in 1925, the Premier said—

"I am convinced that great economic advantages will accrue from the proposed harnessing of the Barron Falls, and a similar development at the Tully Falls. The Government will endeavour to bring these schemes to fruition without delay."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is quite different.

Mr. KELSO: That is not a promise. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. SIZER: Of course that is not a promise. I forgot that there is a question of degree in regard to Government promises. I shall now quote what the hon. gentleman said at Cairns on 1st April of this year—

"It was easy to say that the Barron Falls should be harnessed, but it was a hard thing to prove that it could be done with success."

Then, speaking at Cairns on 1st April last—at the same place and on the same subject—the hon. gentleman said—

"While I am Premier I will not allow you to fall into any scheme that is not first class and sound."

(Laughter.) Of course, there was no election pending then. Before the election he said, "I will do this," but after the election he said, "I am not going to allow you to do this." Where are these saltworks; these fertiliser works which were promised in the policy speech? Where are the ship-building yards which the Government promised in their policy speech? They have been importing ships and materials from other countries. Where are the State shipbuilding yards; where are the railway workshops? Twenty locomotives were imported from England! Where are the agricultural implement works? Where is the organised milk scheme? Where? Broken promises! Those are some of the solemn promises made to the people, upon which the Government were elected to power. They have broken every one of them.

Mr. KELSO: He was talking with his tongue in his cheek when he said that.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member for Bowen was promised State iron and steel works.

Mr. COLLINS: And still hopes to see them established.

Mr. SIZER: He was promised State iron and steel works by Mr. Theodore, who said, "We will proceed without delay." And in his next policy speech he said, "We have prepared the plans. We are going on with them. We have selected the site." That was all quite true; but the hon. member for Bowen is still waiting for his iron and steel works. The hon. member, like so many members of his party, is up in the clouds. He will come to earth some day. But there is one thing about it all—there are members of that party who unquestionably wish to carry out that programme. They believe in it. The hon. member for Bowen believes in these things. He believed at the time the Government came into power that the Government would carry out their policy.

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

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*): I beg to move—

"That the hon. member for Sandgate be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech."

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

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SIZER: I thank hon. members very much for their courtesy in allowing me to continue my speech. The hon. member for Maryborough was one of those members who believed those things. He believed that,

*Mr. Sizer.]*

if the Labour Party got control, they would give all the work in Queensland; that they would never send overseas for material; that they would build these new works and keep the people employed; and that they would introduce State enterprises. But he has been deluded, and he has attempted and is attempting to keep the Government up to their responsibilities. With what result? He is to be put to a plebiscite. (Laughter.) It may be the voice of Jacob, but behind it I can see the hand of Esau. That is the penalty paid for honesty of purpose. Other members of the party who have been attempting to keep the Government up to their responsibility are not out of the wood yet. It seems to me that the only result of honesty of purpose in the ranks of Labour and of trying to keep the Government up to what they promised the people is the penalty of political death. That seems to me to be the only crime of which the hon. member for Maryborough is guilty. He has given support to the Government on every occasion; other hon. members opposite have supported the Government, who have misled the people with regard to the things they promised them. Hon. members opposite supported the hon. member for Bowen in regard to the proposed iron and steel works at Bowen, also the hon. member for Fitzroy and other members in their requests, and, because the Government have fallen down on it, the hon. member for Maryborough is to be cast aside. That is the reward of loyalty in the ranks of Labour. It shows the penalty suffered on the opposite side of the House for having honesty of purpose. It is iniquitous that the Government should delude people on those lines. I much prefer the outspokenness of the hon. member for Maryborough, the hon. member for Fitzroy, and other hon. members. I do not agree with their economics or their politics; but they believe in them, and attempt to carry them out; I prefer those hon. members to the leaders of a Government who tell the people one thing and do entirely the opposite when they have the power to carry out their promises. Surely there is something due to consistency and honesty of purpose.

The Premier the other night seemed to me to be rather delighted because he had discovered what he called the balance-sheet of this party. If he has no better case than the balance-sheet which he read the other night, I do not think he has much to talk about. He said that balance sheet disclosed that this party got £9,000 from somewhere at last elections.

Mr. HYNES: You do not deny it, do you? What are you making a song about?

Mr. KING: Your leader made a song, and you joined in the chorus.

Mr. SIZER: Does the hon. member realise that £9,000 is only about £100 per electorate? Does he realise that hon. members opposite and the Labour Party have spent £100 for every £1 which has been spent on this side? (Government dissent.) They spent more money on printing pictures at the last election than this party had to organise their whole campaign. I have just come upon a balance-sheet of the Labour Party which I think is of interest. It only deals with one branch of Labour—that is the A.W.U. They have a fund of £107,508.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Sizer.

Mr. SIZER: Hon. members opposite say "Hear, hear!" How did they get it? By putting a poll-tax on the workers to provide it. Of that amount £70,888 was wrung from the workers by the raising of that poll-tax. Before a man has a right to ask for a job he has to pay his share of that levy of £70,000 odd to keep the hon. gentleman's party in power and enable them to reduce his wages.

[12 noon.]

Mr. POLLOCK: That is not true.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member knows it is true.

Mr. POLLOCK: Read out the particulars.

Mr. SIZER: "Operating costs, £45,000; members' fees, £70,000." The hon. member for Gregory graduated from the Australian Workers' Union, and so did the Premier. That is where the money goes to. Operating costs amounted to no less than £45,000; yet the hon. gentleman says, "We have no organisers in the Labour Party!" Has Mr. Joseph Silver Collings become such a lover of Socialism that he works for nothing?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: He is a union organiser.

Mr. SIZER: Every union organiser is a political organiser. According to this balance-sheet, £15,819 was paid in wages to organisers, and £2,870 in expenses. What was done with that money? The Australian Workers' Union has levied and spent £29,000 on the Labour daily newspaper. Is that for the good of the workers? (Opposition laughter.) It is for the good of hon. members opposite. It is to put them into Parliament and to keep them in Parliament. Last year they paid an additional £4,740 to the Labour daily. Yet hon. members opposite say, "We have no organisers in the Labour Party"! They have spent £15,000 in wages to organisers, yet the Premier complains of a modest contribution of £9,000 to this party, which, after all, was voluntary.

Mr. POLLOCK: What is the difference?

Mr. SIZER: The difference is this: I am not arguing that political parties have not to get money. Of course, they have; but the point is that hon. members opposite are conscripting it from the workers. Before a man can get a job he has to pay his union dues, which go to a political levy to keep the Labour Party in power; and thousands of men have to pay that levy—a conscripted payment—to a party they do not believe in. Moreover, no matter how long they may be out of work, they cannot go to work until they pay that levy. The difference, therefore, is that hon. members opposite get their funds by conscription; we raise ours by voluntary contribution. That is the only difference. But I say it is a great difference. They argue that this money is paid to the unions by the workers on the understanding that they will get them higher wages. The unions conscript that money from the workers for that purpose; yet the Premier, in his speech the other night, told us that, compared with 1914-15, £1 to-day is only worth 12s., which actually means that the basic wage of £4 5s. is only equivalent to about £2 10s. So the Premier's own statement broke down the claim of the Labour Party that it has given so much higher wages to the workers. (Government interjections.) You cannot get away from

it. They are not my words; they are the words of the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member address the Chair, and not interjectors.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman said that £1 to-day is only the equivalent of 12s. of 1914-15, and therefore the basic wage of £4 5s., of which hon. members opposite speak so much, is worth only £2 10s., so that they have not done anything for the workers in that respect.

Mr. FERRICKS: On your own argument, we have.

The PREMIER: You will have a job to convince anybody on your case.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman will have a job to convince anybody on his case.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HYNES: The obvious result is that we are here.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask hon. gentlemen on my right to refrain from interjecting and allow the hon. member for Sandgate to proceed with his speech.

Mr. SIZER: It is a very simple matter to gain the Ministerial benches when the electorates are "gerrymandered." So far as political funds are concerned, the Premier has the matter entirely in his own hands, and I suggest that he pass legislation this session making it compulsory for all political organisations to disclose their balance-sheets.

The PREMIER: I am not interested in your balance-sheet.

Mr. SIZER: You were very interested the other night.

The PREMIER: I was only—

Mr. SIZER: You were just "only." In the one breath the hon. gentleman claimed that we had received so much, and in the next breath told the Leader of the Opposition that our people would not finance us. He contradicted himself.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman could pass the legislation I have suggested providing that balance-sheets of all political funds shall be subject to audit by the Auditor-General. I challenge him to pass that legislation. If that were done, the hon. gentleman would realise perfectly well that for every £10 available to our party £100 is available to the Labour Party; and it would disclose the manner in which the election funds are expended and the methods by which they are secured.

The PREMIER: I don't think you got that money.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman will say anything to suit his case for the moment. After making an attack on the Leader of the Opposition, he now says that he does not believe that we got the money.

The PREMIER: I am prepared to accept your statement that you did not get it, but that your organisers got it.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman has shifted his ground so many times that he does not know exactly where he stands; but he has convinced this House and the people generally that he is the prince of sophistry. He says one thing to suit one set of circum-

stances, and then another thing to suit another set of circumstances. We had an illustration of that the other day when he informed the Mayor of Brisbane that it was not the function of a Government to collect taxation and permit it to be expended by another authority, whereas the hon. gentleman places himself in exactly the same position as any other spending authority when he accepts a contribution from the Federal Government in connection with the construction of main roads. On the occasion that the mayor waited on the Premier, it did not suit the Premier to mention the grant from the Commonwealth. With him it is a very different argument when he receives the money to be expended by his Government. The hon. gentleman has proved himself a typical Shylock tax-gatherer, and, if ever a new Shakespeare were looking for a new character of Shylock, I am sure the Leader of the Government could well fill the role, and outshine the Shylock of old.

The hon. gentleman has also established himself as a wonderful Vicar of Bray. When he is amongst the elite of the community—the wealthy members of this community—he speaks on a higher plane, and tells them exactly what they want to know—that they will have this, and that they will have that. When he is talking to the workers, he talks in quite another way. He says to them, "You must have this. I am anxious to do this for you. If you only return me, all in the garden will be lovely." We have all seen what has happened since he was returned to power. He has done nothing. In one breath he talks about going to do this and that, and clean up the "Red" element, and then almost immediately afterwards he signs the same pledge as the "Red" element signs. He was very interesting when he was telling us that it was no use hon. members saying that they were not learning—that they were all learning. If his education is going to be so slow, and is going to cost so much—over £1,000,000—to teach him that ten and ten make twenty and that 10 cwt. and 10 cwt. make a ton, I am inclined to think that before he learns the rules of simple division we shall all be financially embarrassed and Queensland will be suffering from a much more serious depression than at present. He seemed to me the other night to be airing some new-found knowledge and adopting the role of a budding professor of economics because he had discovered that two and two make four. After his Government have extracted £34,000,000 from the people, the hon. gentleman has developed a broad statesmanlike view, and has discovered that 20 cwt. make a ton. Surely that is a discovery of some magnitude!

In attempting to deal with unemployment, the hon. gentleman has led the people into the wilderness, and has now adopted another role of Moses, and is going to leave them there. (Government laughter.) That is typical of him. If you, Mr. Speaker, have read the story of Moses, you will know how typical his end was of that of the hon. gentleman. Moses led the people into the wilderness, died in the wilderness, and his bones were buried in the wilderness. The Premier is going to meet the selfsame fate as did the Moses of old. (Government laughter.)

There is yet one other role which the Premier fits. He unquestionably fills the role of the Pooh-Bah of the Labour Party. He is apparently the lock, stock, and barrel of the party. At the Townsville Convention he had

*Mr. Sizer.]*

a packed jury. He was the prosecutor, the defender, and the jury, while the hon. member for Gregory was the coroner. (Government laughter.) They finished up by acquitting the prisoner to the accompaniment of rounds of applause. It is interesting to note that the Deputy Leader of the Government was also present supporting the Premier—not as the accredited representative of his own electorate, but of another electorate which could not secure a representative to make the trip.

I say that the Premier has not produced one argument which will uphold the policy of the Government or which has shaken the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. His Government have failed to live up to their promises, and have no solution to offer for the difficulty the State finds itself in. Therefore, they need to be passed out of office at the earliest opportunity.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEASE (*Herbert*): I am sure we have all been amused at the speech of the hon. member for Sandgate. It is the first time since I entered this House that I have heard the Premier at the commencement of a speech called "Mussolini" and then at its conclusion likened unto Moses.

It is very difficult indeed to understand the logic of the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman's no confidence motion is based upon unemployment and bad finance; but these two questions are answered by the performances of the Government, who have shown that Queensland has the lowest percentage of unemployment, and is the only State in the Commonwealth to show a surplus.

I am pleased to notice that the Leader of the Opposition is in his seat, because I wish to refer to some of the statements which he made on the hustings during his recent tour of North Queensland. The hon. gentleman spoke at Malanda with reference to the new railway workshops at Cairns, and, according to the report appearing in the Cairns "Post"—which, by the way, is an anti-Labour publication—he said—

"The new railway carriage shed at Cairns was being erected with imported Oregon pine."

When the Premier was speaking the other evening, the Leader of the Opposition said that he did not refer to the workshops at Cairns, but to the workshops at Mareeba. Now, Mr. Crowther, the general manager of the Northern Division of the Railways Department, was told of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, and later he issued an official statement to the effect that the hon. gentleman's remarks were entirely without foundation—that the only timber used in the railway workshops at Cairns was local timber. My point is that the Leader of the Opposition, when he found that his statement was incorrect, should have made a public explanation to that effect. As the Premier pointed out, the hon. gentleman is too prone to accept any statement made to him. The hon. gentleman goes North, and on the public platform makes a statement which he has taken no trouble to verify, and which is made with the object of discrediting the Government.

I wish to deal further with the timber question, because the North is a large timber area and the timber industry has been languishing lately. That state of affairs is not

due to any fault of this party, but, as I shall proceed to show, to the Bruce-Page Government. As a matter of fact, the timber interests of the whole of Queensland approached the Federal Government to revise the timber tariff. The last revision was made in 1921, and, after a conference, the timber interests asked the Federal Government to increase the duty, which was totally inadequate to prevent timber from coming in from other countries. The amount of timber imported into Australia in 1926 amounted to a value of £5,250,000; that is to say, that amount of money went overseas for the purchase of timber. That is a dead loss, and, considered in conjunction with the losses pointed out by the Premier the other evening, when he referred to motor cars and petrol, is very serious. It was the duty of the Federal Government to see that the £5,250,000, or as much of it as possible, was retained in Australia. Unfortunately, they fell down on their job. I intend to quote the remarks of Mr. Scullin, the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, who, fortunately for us, followed the Leader of the Opposition here in visiting North Queensland. First of all, I would assure the Leader of the Opposition that Mr. Scullin considered that the hon. gentleman was a champion at making misstatements. Mr. Scullin dealt with this matter. He said that the timber interests had asked for an increase in the tariff duty of 4s. per 100 ft., and that, after a good deal of delay, the Federal Government dealt with the matter. We must realise that the trade know what they are speaking about. It was not political. The trade met and discussed the matter, and eventually asked for that protection. What did they get? They got an increase of a little over 1s. per 100 ft.—practically only one-fourth of what they asked—and the point Mr. Scullin made on the hustings was that they only got that increase by the aid of the Federal Labour Party. The friends of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament—the members of the Country Party—voted against this increase of duty. That is what I want to bring under the notice of the Leader of the Opposition—that his own party in the Federal House would not support the timber industry and voted against an increase in the tariff to protect the industry, and the protection was only granted by the vote of the Federal Labour Party. Mr. Scullin drove that home at Malanda, right in the heart of the timber industry, by showing the people at Malanda that not only was Mr. Moore making mistakes but that his own friends were responsible for not giving greater protection to the industry. Thanks can be given to the Federal Labour Party for whatever protection is given to the timber industry in Australia to-day.

But that is not all. The Leader of the Opposition in his speech was inclined to sneer at the Railway Department for having used imported timber, but in the North the people who are dealing in imported timber have complained again and again of the Railway Department increasing railway freights on imported timber. The rate of railage on Queensland timber from the Tableland to Cairns does not pay the Railway Department, and, when the department saw that imported timber was getting a hold, it got busy and increased the rates on this imported timber. That is the protection which the Railway Department gives to the timber industry in Queensland by seeing to

[*Mr. Sizer.*

it that the people who use imported timber pay increased railage on that timber. I have here a circular from the people who are dealing in that timber pointing out that the Railway Department has increased the freights on imported timber. That is quite right, because it is the duty of the department to protect local industry.

The other day I happened to be over at the dry dock, in South Brisbane, and I saw the Cairns dredge there. That dredge was purchased when the hon. member for Wynnum was Treasurer. I was a member of the Cairns Harbour Board at one time, and I want to tell members of this House that the Cairns dredge was bought in Germany. I happened to dig up an old circular, which states that in 1911 two dredges were required in Queensland. Tenders were not called, but seven firms were asked to quote. Quotations were received from Germany, and the result was that £45,800 was paid to Germany for the Cairns dredge, and tenders were not invited in Australia. I am just quoting that to show what would happen if members of the Opposition got back into power. They are telling the people of Queensland that they deplore the fact that the Government of this State got some locomotives built overseas at a time when they were not able to get them built here. At the time Walkers Limited and many of the Queensland firms were working full time, because the Government had already given them orders for material. They were not able to take these other orders, and the result was that, on account of increasing traffic, the Government had to get the locomotives from overseas. I have referred to the time when the Opposition were in power. The only way we can judge as to what they will do in the future is by seeing what they did when they were in power. When they were in power they got these dredges built in Germany, and did not invite tenders in Australia. If that is what they did when in power before, they will do the same thing if they get back into power. The Tully sugar-mill is an instance of a big sugar-mill involving a large amount of money. This Government called tenders from all over the world. When the tenders were received, it was found that some of the overseas tenderers were much cheaper than Walkers Limited. The Government decided that the money should be retained in Queensland, and, although it meant a much heavier expense, let the contract go to Walkers Limited. No finer compliment was ever paid to Queensland by any Government. When Walkers Limited were advised that the whole of the tender was to go to Queensland, which meant a year's work for some hundreds of workmen, they called a holiday in Maryborough, had the band out and the town beflagged because the Government had stood up to their obligations in the matter.

Mr. KELSO: What are they doing to-day?

Mr. PEASE: The Queensland Government want locomotives to-day, and they have given a preference of nearly 8 per cent to Queensland firms. We have done that, and we see exactly what would happen if this party does not get back to power again. It was the party opposite which denied the timber industry the right of protection—the party which is responsible in the Federal Parliament for bringing in outside timber to the extent of £5,000,000 every year. When hon. members opposite were in power they did not call for tenders, but asked people to quote. As a member of the Cairns

Harbour Board, I know that the dredge was a disgraceful piece of work; many of the bolts in it were dummies. One of the engineers told me last week that even now when the dredge comes down for overhaul they find dummy bolts in it. That is the sort of thing the Opposition stand for.

I know of another matter in which the Federal Government have neglected to stand up to their obligations in connection with machinery made in Australia. I have here a circular from Thompson and Company, who make road rollers. They appealed to the Federal Government to increase the tariff, pointing out that they had 500 men constantly employed to meet Australian requirements, but the Federal Government would not give them tariff protection. I, as a young man, sold tobacco grown and cured in Queensland at a factory established by Burt and Company. A good deal of it was sold in Brisbane. The Federal Government would not give protection to the tobacco industry, and it went out of existence. I quoted on one occasion the remarks of Mr. Burt, the managing director of the firm, who said that the tobacco industry would go out of existence in Queensland, due to lack of support by the Federal Government.

Mr. KELSO: What did the Federal Labour Party do?

Mr. PEASE: I consider that, as far as the Herbert is concerned, Mr. Scullin's visit to my electorate and his exposure of the Country Party's betrayal of the people of Queensland is going to win the Herbert seat back for Labour.

I am now going to deal with unemployment. The Leader of the Opposition also went North, and threw about his remarks that thousands of people were out of work. He said 11,000 were out of work in Brisbane, and in Mackay he stated that only 50 per cent. of the labour offering was absorbed.

Mr. Scullin followed Mr. Moore, fortunately, and he did not want any hearsay evidence, as he himself had visited Brisbane.

I met him in the North, and he [12.30 p.m.] said, "I have heard a good deal about your State. I am satisfied that it is more prosperous than I thought it was. I have seen in the papers that the Leader of the Opposition has been decrying your State, and pointing out that there are thousands of unemployed. I have failed to see them." (Opposition laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Of course.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Scullin got the figures from the Commonwealth Statistician—a man who knows his job—so that he would be absolutely correct. He was not like the Leader of the Opposition, who listens to gossip, and gives it on the hustings as established facts. Mr. Scullin quoted these figures in response to his inquiry from the Commonwealth Statistician, giving the percentage of unemployed in the various States for the first quarter of 1923—

|                       | Per cent. |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| South Australia ...   | 16.1      |
| Victoria ...          | 12.2      |
| New South Wales ...   | 10.9      |
| Tasmania ...          | 10.7      |
| Western Australia ... | 9.5       |
| Queensland ...        | 7.1       |

And Mr. Scullin concluded his quotation by saying, "So Queensland has fewer unemployed than any other State in Australia."

Mr. Pease.]

The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking on this unemployment question, said that the unemployment was due to unwise legislation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: Hon. members opposite endorse the statement. If that is so, and we are to arrive at a conclusion on this want of confidence motion along sound lines, they must come over here and vote with us, because this Government, with the lowest unemployment figures in Australia, must certainly be credited with the wisest legislation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: Everybody naturally is sorry for unemployment. There is no man for whom I have more pity than the man who has no job; and I realise that every member of this party is out to try to relieve unemployment in Queensland. And we have done something. I heard Mr. Scullin, in Townsville, praising this Government for having done something tangible in the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act. Yet hon. members opposite called it the "Loafers' Paradise Act." They did not want it. If this Government brought down any measure to relieve unemployment which took something out of the pockets of the people they represent, they would not want it. We stand for doing things, but any measure which is brought in to relieve the worker under which the money has to come out of the pockets of the people they represent is howled at by hon. members opposite. Let me remark here that one of the Northern papers, commenting on the Leader of the Opposition, said, "Mr. Moore's figures and facts astonished the gathering." I can assure you that they did. (Government laughter.) I could base the whole of my speech on the misstatements which the Leader of the Opposition made in North Queensland and other places on the hustings. They were corrected, but he was not man enough to acknowledge his mistake, even when it was pointed out to him that he was damaging Queensland when he said that the Queensland Railways were using imported timber. They were not. I say that a member of this party who goes out on the hustings and makes a mistake is man enough to correct himself when it is pointed out to him; but evidently the Leader of the Opposition is not, and I am satisfied that when he goes to North Queensland again—if he does—the people will say to him on this timber matter, "Why did not your party get behind the people who wanted increased protection, and why was it left to the Labour Party to secure that measure of benefit for the timber industry of Queensland?"

Mr. KELSO: You ought to get the other side.

Mr. PEASE: The hon. member for Sandgate has a motion on the paper before us. I tried to get something from his speech to reply to. It was a facetious speech—certainly very amusing—but there was very little in it that anybody could reply to, so I am going to stick to what he has placed before the House, evidently after consideration. He suggests a conference of representatives of employers and employees with the object of increasing wealth production and lessening taxation. The problem confronting Queensland to-day is not how to increase

production. How absurd it is for a member of the Opposition to advocate increased production when, in the big sugar industry, his party and the people controlling the industry are urging restricted production. If Queensland were to launch out with a gigantic scheme of increased production in the sugar industry, we could employ hundreds of thousands of people from Mackay to Cairns. Why do we not do so? Because we have not the markets for our sugar. There are many nations with millions of people to-day requiring sugar, but who are unable to buy it because they have not the money. Like the late lamented Mr. Gillies, I always claim that there is no such thing as over-production, but under-consumption. If we could market overseas all the sugar that we could produce in Queensland, and establish a market amongst the teeming millions of India and the East—people who never see sugar—the unemployment problem would be solved. It is a problem, the causes of which are far deeper than are imagined by the hon. member for Sandgate. To-day the Southern centres are selling maize under the cost of production. Why? Simply because there are no markets.

If there were no stabilisation scheme with respect to butter, in respect of which the people are taxed to meet any loss on the exported article, the butter industry would be in the same position. The same remarks apply to the meat industry. We could produce the total meat requirements of the world, and the same can be said of other commodities, but we have not the markets. It is not a question of production, it is a question of markets. If that could be solved, then the unemployment problem could be solved.

I, with other hon. members on this side, honestly endeavour to do my best to deal with the unemployment question. It is the biggest problem we have to face, and I know that every hon. member in this party is trying to face it; but the Opposition are concerned only about making political capital. Their troubles about the unemployed! I shall point out one way in which the Opposition can do something to alleviate the distress of unemployment. I have viewed the shop windows and the trade displays in Brisbane as well as in other cities in Queensland, and I find displayed for sale imported biscuits, imported confectionery, imported canned goods, imported jams and pickles, and imported hats and clothing. There is not one item there which is not made in Queensland, or perhaps Australia, and better than the imported article, yet the tradespeople tell me that they cannot sell the local article. The price of the Australian article is not dearer—in fact, it is cheaper and the quality better. Why should we import biscuits into Queensland? Why should we import any kind of foodstuff? A big American concern toured Queensland quite recently displaying by films the method of producing canned goods in America, and they were rushed by the trade, who bought thousands of pounds worth of such goods to be dumped into Queensland and consumed to the detriment of our local commodity. That is where the Opposition can get busy.

Mr. KING: What are you doing?

Mr. PEASE: Everywhere in Queensland when an opportunity presents itself, I say what I am saying here to-day. I am asking the people of Queensland from the hustings

[Mr. Pease.]

to support Queensland and Australian-made articles in preference to all others; and it is for the Opposition to do likewise. You cannot tell me that the man on the basic wage buys imported biscuits at a dearer price. He cannot do it. It takes him all his time to buy the bare necessities of life. That is not his fault. I noticed a local firm advertising an Australian-made hat at 25s., whilst the American Stetson is quoted at 55s. Who buys a Stetson hat? Not the toiler. The supporters of the Opposition are the people who can do something, because they are the class who buy these things. Who demands the imported goods? Who demands high-priced pickles, condiments, and canned goods? Not the worker. There is a policy which, if carried out, would bring immense relief to industry in this State. Just look at what it means! In order to show its effect, I want to develop my argument in regard to Stetson hats. The friends of the Opposition pay 55s. for Stetson hats, and, except for the duty paid and the profit which the storekeeper makes, the whole of the money goes out of Australia. Every penny of the 25s. paid for an Australian hat stops here. If the hon. member for Sandgate and his friends got busy in that respect—and I know something about the business—they would find a cure for the depression in industry. Never in the history of Queensland have I seen more imported goods displayed than are displayed throughout its length and breadth at the present time. Why? Because the Bruce-Page Government are an importers' Government. I showed hon. members on the other side how their policy was affecting the timber industry. Their trouble about the industry here! They are out to protect their friends who make the profits out of imports. The friends of my friends opposite have in the past, when they knew increased duties were to be imposed, imported three or four times the quantity of goods usually required. The hon. member for Sandgate stated that the trade returns do not reflect the trade returns of Queensland. As he said, goods are imported into Sydney and Melbourne, and then gradually filtered through to Queensland. If the seventy-two hon. members in this House and every member of the community were to use and advocate the use of Australian articles, we would all be surprised at what it would mean. I charge the Bruce-Page Government with being responsible for the present position. They are the friends of the importer, whose only salvation lies in imported goods. What is the head of the Bruce-Page Government? Is he not the head of one of the greatest importing firms in Australia?

Mr. KING: You know that is not true.

Mr. KELSO: You know he has not a share in the business.

Mr. PEASE: The Bruce-Page Government stands for the importer, and that is why the trade in Queensland and the other States is falling away. The hon. member for Sandgate, with his tongue in his cheek, talks about what they do for the manufacturer. His party and the Federal Party are the very people who are destroying the manufacturer. They have no sympathy for him. Look how they have destroyed the tobacco, timber, and other industries. All their thoughts are for the importer. The chief trouble of the manufacturer in Queensland is geographical. His trouble is to get

a market for his goods. In this respect I have only to quote that the freight charged by the steamship companies between Sydney and Melbourne is 11s. per ton, while from Brisbane to Sydney it is 22s., and from Brisbane to Melbourne 33s. per ton. How can any manufacturer in Queensland compete with the other States in the face of that fact? He cannot do it. There is a tax on him. The tax imposed on him by the wealthy shipping ring is a 100 per cent. increase on the cost of the carriage of his goods to Sydney, and the cost to Melbourne is three times as great as it is from Sydney to Melbourne.

Mr. KELSO: Taxation is too high in Queensland.

Mr. PEASE: I am glad my friend has made that interjection. Every hon. member of the Opposition has so far evaded this question. Taxation is only paid on profits, and, if every manufacturer made no profits, he would pay no tax. A manufacturer in Queensland making a profit not higher than 6 per cent. pays a rate of tax lower than is paid in any other State in Australia. I have figures here which were quoted by the Hon. Mr. Angliss, one of the greatest business men in Australia, and a member of the Upper House in Victoria. I have quoted the figures before, but I am going to repeat them so that I may drive home the incorrectness of the statement that we are taxing men out of business. Mr. Angliss is well known to hon. members opposite.

In comparing the income tax schedule of Victoria with that of New South Wales and Queensland, Mr. Angliss shows that taxation on a factory with profits of £9,500 the Queensland schedule is £299 less than that of New South Wales, and £367 less than that of Victoria. Mr. Merrick, another member of the Upper House in Victoria, showed that the taxation of manufacturers in Victoria averages from 14 per cent. to 15 per cent., whereas the Queensland figures show an average of 11.35 per cent. I have been interested to ascertain what section of the community felt the effects of the drought to the greatest extent, and for the purpose of my investigation I have compared the figures supplied by the Commissioner of Taxes for two years—1925-26 and 1926-27. After all, the best method of computing the income of the people is to take the figures which have been submitted to the Income Tax Commissioner. According to the official returns, the incomes of manufacturers in Queensland for the year 1926-27 increased to a greater extent than that of any other section of the community.

Mr. KELSO: What does the Commissioner of Taxes include?

Mr. PEASE: You ask the Commissioner; he will tell you.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Profits from the sugar industry are included in that.

Mr. PEASE: Hon. members opposite seem to think that one of our greatest industries should not be included. The figures also show that, compared with 1925-26, the gross income of Queensland manufacturers in 1926-27 showed an increase of £2,780,710. Yet the hon. member for Sandgate says that we have done nothing for the manufacturer, and that the latter is in a bad way.

Another pleasing feature in the income tax figures is the fact that the income of employees has also increased. That shows

*Mr. Pease.]*

that under the legislation of this Government both manufacturers and employees are benefiting. For the year 1926-27, the incomes of employees increased by over £2,000,000 as compared with the previous year. My point is that, under the system of taxation followed by the Government, first the manufacturers and then the employees benefit; that is to say, as a Government we have functioned for the people who have sent us here. We have, on the one hand, increased the income of manufacturers, and we have functioned so that any increased benefits in wages have gone to the people we represent. The increased incomes are 2.061 per cent. and 4.607 per cent. in the case of manufacturers and employees respectively.

Mr. KELSO: How much have they increased in the South?

Mr. PEASE: They have not increased in that ratio.

I want to deal now with an interjection made by the hon. member for Toowong, who, by interjection the other evening, stated that public opinion was behind the Federal Government in their handling of finance. The Premier has pointed out, and rightly so, that he was proud of the fact that the Queensland Government had squared the ledger despite the depressed times and the difficulties with which they had to contend. The Opposition cannot detract from that position.

Mr. KELSO: How did you do it?

Mr. PEASE: By wise legislation; by protecting the primary producer against the oppression of the middleman. I know very well that the Government have protected the manufacturers and the producers against the impositions of the gentlemen represented by hon. members opposite. The Government have stimulated production. That is the real factor behind the surplus in Queensland. What the Premier said is quite correct. I have proved that increased incomes have been received by the manufacturers and by the workers. Increased prosperity! That is what has happened. In spite of the depression, and in spite of difficulties, the Government have legislated in that fair way, and that is why, of all the Governments in Australia, we are the only Government to balance the ledger. It was not done by increasing taxation. We have not increased the incidence of taxation.

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL: Of course, you have.

Mr. PEASE: We have not. I have proved that the taxation in the other States is heavier on industry than it is in Queensland.

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL: That is not so.

Mr. PEASE: It is so. Queensland, by wise legislation on the part of the present Government, has so improved the earning capacity of the primary producers and of the people generally that we show this increased Budget. I am now going to criticise the Budget of the Federal Government, and I am going to criticise it out of the mouth of the editor of the Townsville "Bulletin," Mr. Green. The Leader of the Opposition knows him. Mr. Green is not a member of the Labour Party, and he is not a friend of the Labour Party. The hon. member for Toowong stated that public opinion was with a Federal Government in their handling of finance. This is what Mr. Green says in a leading article on 14th July in dealing with Earle Page's last Budget. He referred to Earle Page's Budget as a "Hard Luck Story." He says that in

1901-2 the Federal Government had a revenue of £11,000,000 odd. That in 1918-19 it had increased to £44,000,000, in 1925-26 to £72,000,000, and in 1927-28 to over £72,000,000, and that he showed a deficit in that year of £2,642,000. The hon. member for Sandgate criticised the Queensland Government because the Treasurer has shown an increased revenue. Yet the Federal Government—the same political party as hon. members opposite, no matter how they may try to dissociate themselves from the Federal Government—increased the revenue from £11,000,000 odd in 1901-2, when the Labour Party were in power, to over £72,000,000 last year, when they had a deficit of £2,642,000. Mr. Green says—

"Even the ingenious Dr. Page must find these figures very difficult to explain away."

I am making that comparison because the hon. member for Sandgate, in his attack on the Government, tried to make a point out of the fact that the revenue of Queensland had increased. That was not fair. I have compared it with the Federal increase, and I want to show that what the Premier interjected is correct. The increased revenue in Queensland is reflected in every State in Australia and in the Commonwealth to-day. The point I want to make is that the percentage increase in the revenue is not as high in Queensland as the Federal increase.

Mr. KELSO: Of course, it is not. What about the war?

Mr. PEASE: I repeat again what Mr. Green said—

"Even the ingenious Dr. Page cannot explain away these figures."

Instead of the Opposition attempting to discredit this Government because of increased revenue and increased expenditure, let them attack their own Federal Government. The hon. member for Nundah said something about the war. In three years, after allowing for the per capita payments—war, invalid, maternity, and old-age pensions—the Federal Government collected in Queensland £5,558,799 more than they paid away. There is the war! The Federal Government, if any, are to blame for the present position, as they collected more money in Queensland than the State Government. In three years the excess money collected in Queensland by the Federal Government was £2 1s. 11d. per capita. That is to say, the Federal Government collected in Queensland £2 1s. 11d. per capita more than they paid away in per capita, war, maternity, and invalid old-age pensions; or, in other words, the people of Queensland paid to the Federal Government £2 1s. 11d. per head more than they received—a tax on the people of Queensland. Then take the ordinary taxation, the figures for which are given in the "A B C of Queensland and Australian Statistics," which show that the whole of the State taxation in Queensland was £5 2s. 1d. per capita, whereas the whole of the Federal taxation was £5 11s. 4d. per capita. If the Opposition say that the burden of taxation imposed on the people of Queensland by the State Government—that is, £5 2s. 1d. per capita—is too great, what have they to say about their own Federal Government, who take £5 11s. 4d. per capita from Queensland? Their own Federal Government take nearly 10s. per head more from the people of Queensland than the State Government, who have all the services of government to perform;

[Mr. Pease.

yet hon. members opposite say we have taxed the people too much. Why do they not talk to their own supporters? Why do they not go to their own Federal Government, and say, "You are too hard on the people of Queensland." Surely the same argument applies. If hon. members opposite say that our Government take £5 2s. 1d. per head from the people of Queensland, which is far too much, why do they not talk to their own Federal Government, who take £5 11s. 4d. per head? When Earle Page comes here, why do they not say, "Look here, you are taking too much money away. In three years you have taken £5,500,000. What have you done with it?" One thing they did was to build a beautiful place in Canberra. Look at the money they have wasted on Royal Commissions. The Federal Government of hon. members opposite are responsible for this extravagance. Take the figures given by Mr. Green, the editor of the Townsville "Bulletin," which are a true reflex of what the people think of the Federal Government. The present Federal Government are the most extravagant we have had in the history of Australia, and they will not protect the primary products of Australia because they are a middleman's Government.

On 30th June, 1915, when the Labour Government came into power in Queensland, there was a debt of £62,823,539, without one penny piece to pay it back. The burden of interest on the people in Queensland to-day represents £10 a minute night and day, and that burden was left by the then Treasurer, the hon. member for Wynnum, and his party. When the Labour Party came into power, the previous Government did not hand them a clean sheet. We know that in commercial life when a man takes over a business he wants a clean sheet. Hon. members opposite gave us a debt of over £62,000,000; and they now ask the present Treasurer what he has done with the revenue. He has paid the interest on the debt which hon. members handed over.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The railways were paying concerns when you came into power.

Mr. PEASE: The financial difficulty to-day is caused by the debt which hon. members opposite handed over to us, without any sinking fund having been created for the liquidation of the debt.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: What are you going to hand over?

Mr. PEASE: We are going to hand over a sinking fund on a proper basis.

[2 p.m.]

The hon. member for Sandgate sneered at what he termed the academic speech of the Premier on the question of unemployment. There are many questions of the day which members of the Opposition are not competent to speak upon, and unemployment is one of them. Anyone can speak of unemployment, but it is always a pleasure to listen to anybody speaking on a subject who has surveyed the problem properly. Nobody anywhere has solved it, because it is common to all countries of the world; but every member of this party was glad to hear the Premier express the views he did upon it. It is world-wide. The Government of Queensland can no more stop it than could the Opposition get over here. Their Federal Government are in power in the Commonwealth Parliament; but what have they done to solve this problem? No Government in Australia could do more

to solve it than the Federal Government. Hon. members opposite will say, "What right have I to speak about what is done in the Federal House?" But, if a Labour Government were in power in the Federal Parliament, we would have hon. members opposite standing up here and asking what they were doing. Hon. members opposite now should appeal to the party in power in the Federal arena to do something to alleviate the evil. This morning I tried to show one or two ways in which alleviation might be brought about. First of all, better protection might be given to the trades and industries of Australia, particularly of Queensland. In this connection I want to quote from the "Australian Manufacturer"—a trade journal of the manufacturers of Australia. I am going to quote a leading article—that is, an article written by the editor of that paper, who sums up all the opinions which are given to him and puts them into that form, expecting it to receive proper support from all the manufacturers in Australia. He says—

"The world to-day is faced with grave problems as the result of an amazing economic fact—namely, the destruction of demand by over-supply."

I have been trying to tell the hon. member for Sandgate that the question is a question, not of producing more, but of finding suitable markets for what we can supply. The editor of the "Australian Manufacturer" says the same thing. He goes on to say—

"It is a remarkable fact that all nations that depend upon their exports, whether primary or secondary, are passing through hard times. In the United States of America and Australia the farming industry is in a parlous plight because it cannot dispose of its surplus after supplying the home markets. Last year over a million people moved off the land in the United States of America to seek work in the cities. Development of secondary industries in the outlying portion of the Empire is inevitable, and the only way the British can meet the situation is to export industries and capital to these Dominions to share in the benefits of the new development taking place."

It is not merely due to the legislation of Labour Governments, but to the economic fact of the destruction of demand by over-supply; and no State is more faced with that problem than Queensland. We are the greatest exporting State of primary products in Australia, and our trouble is that we cannot get a satisfactory market. If we produce more sugar than we require, we have to sell it overseas at half its cost. With butter it is the same. The great thing facing primary producers is to find markets. The London "Daily News," in a late issue, says—

"The total population of England on or near the poverty line is between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000."

Will the Opposition say that the Government of England are responsible for that? They do not say that because it is their side who are in power in Great Britain; but, if a Labour Government were in power there, they would throw it across to us that the Government were responsible. We on this side do not blame the British Government, because we recognise that this result is due to economic facts, and to solve them

Mr. Pease.]

is the problem facing all Governments. The London "Daily News" goes on to say—

"The weekly figures of the Minister for Labour deepen the impression that things are going badly with general trade. The coal output for the week is 500,000 tons less than the average for the same period of 1927. Unemployment had increased in the boot, pottery, wool, textile, and transport industries, and in conjunction with the heavy fall in railway revenues this suggests the effect of the enormous reduction in purchasing power in the chief industrial centres."

That is the way the editor of that paper sums it up. It is not due, then, to the action of the Government in Great Britain. The argument used by the Opposition is that our Government are responsible. I would direct the attention of the Opposition to a very fine article which appeared in the "Daily Standard" last evening. It says—

"In an article which was published in the 'Daily Standard,' on Saturday last, Mr. J. J. Davis, Secretary for Labour in the United States, was quoted as saying—

'Those who complain at the scale of wages, or who discharge their workers without a thought, forget that our prosperity derives from this home market of ours, and that in that market the millions of wage-earners are by far the richest and freest buyers! . . . If the spending power of the Australian wage-earner were reduced, among the first to feel the ill effect would be the producers.'

I specially quote that article because the Leader of the Opposition, when on the hustings in North Queensland, where he imagined he would be free from the press and could speak as he liked, dealt with high wages.

Mr. MOORE: What did I say?

Mr. PEASE: You said that the wages were too high.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOORE: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. PEASE: You said that the wages were too high, and that you required a better return.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MOORE: A better return—that is a very different thing.

Mr. PEASE: Therefore, you argue that the workers of Queensland are overpaid. I say that the workers of Queensland are not overpaid, and they will give their answer to the Leader of the Opposition at the proper time. I commend to hon. members opposite the article appearing in the "Daily Standard," and impress upon them that the solution of the unemployment problem is not a reduction of wages. If you destroy the purchasing power of the people, you immediately destroy your local market, which is the best market of the lot.

Mr. KERR: Who claimed that wages should be reduced?

Mr. PEASE: The Leader of the Opposition referred to the wages in Queensland as being high wages. The Opposition regard the wages of Queensland as high wages.

[Mr. Pease.

Where are the high wages in Queensland? Probably enjoyed by politicians, but by no one else. I will not admit that there are any high wages in Queensland. The wages in Queensland are not as high as they ought to be, but economic factors prevent their being increased.

Mr. MOORE: Who spoke of high wages in Queensland?

Mr. PEASE: You did.

Mr. MOORE: I did nothing of the sort.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Herbert to address the Chair.

Mr. PEASE: I wish only to tie the hon. gentleman down to the fact that he said that the wages in Queensland were high.

Mr. MOORE: I did not say that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has denied making that statement, and the hon. member for Herbert must accept his denial.

Mr. PEASE: If the method of solving the unemployment problem as advanced by the Opposition is one of reducing wages and discharging employees, then it is the worst possible method that could be adopted. The markets of Australia are provided only by the fact of the people of this Continent having money to spend. If you destroy your local market, then you immediately destroy all primary production. Take the case of low wage countries. Why can we not secure a market in China and India for the sugar that we could produce by millions of tons? The poor unfortunate individuals in India and China are unable to purchase our sugar because they have no wages; but, if they were to increase their standard of living, then the teeming millions of the East would provide a market for our sugar and our butter—common commodities that every human being is entitled to enjoy. The position is that the low wage countries are the worst countries in the world for the producer. The Opposition should see to it that our standard of wages and conditions in Queensland is maintained, otherwise the unemployment problem will be accentuated, and there will disappear the market for our primary products. The Leader of the Opposition talks of high wages. The position is undoubtedly—

Mr. TAYLOR: Very disquieting.

Mr. PEASE: It is disquieting. The Opposition are not trying to solve the problem, because, when we on this side of the House brought forward the Unemployed Workers Insurance Bill—which, although not perfect, is some measure of alleviation to the workless—they called it the "Loafers' Paradise Bill," and sought to destroy it as they have sought to destroy all the legislation which has for its object the benefiting of the people as a whole. One solution of unemployment is scientific management. In support of this statement, I have here a statement by Mr. Archibald, one of the directors of McWhirters Limited, who, in discussing the profits made by the firm, which amounted to £44,000 for the year ended 30th June, 1926, pointed out that the increase was more than double that of 1923, in spite of the fact that the increased working expenses amounted to £11,973, which were met by increased turnover and the co-operation of all the staff. He pointed out that in 1923 the liabilities amounted to £134,000, which were

reduced in 1926 to £83,600, and that the assets which in 1921 were £153,000 had in 1926 increased to £330,000. These results were in spite of the 44-hour week and increased wages. There was one instance where scientific management had been applied profitably.

So far as the workers of Queensland are concerned, I just want to quote one or two remarks to show, if it were needed, that the Government have functioned in the interests of the workers of Queensland. There are two facts alone which prove what we have done for the workers. When the Government took charge of the Treasury benches in 1915, the infantile mortality in Queensland was the highest of any State in Australia. Last year the infantile mortality of Queensland was the lowest of any State in Australia. That shows that the Government took over many legacies from the Opposition, and one legacy taken over was no thought for the care of the mothers and children of the State.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: That is not correct.

Mr. PEASE: Facts speak for themselves. In 1915 the infantile mortality of children—that is, the deaths of the children solely due to want of nourishment and care of the mother and the rest of it—was highest in Queensland, while last year it was the lowest. I heard Mr. Piddington—who is not a Labour member—deliver a speech in Brisbane a few years ago. What did he say? He said that of all the States in Australia Queensland had the highest standard of living and the best conditions for the workers. When we go to the polls next election the people of Queensland will remember that.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat has tried in a very plaintive way to make the people believe that no Government prior to the formation of the Government which he is supporting had any thought for those who needed most help in the community. That statement is entirely incorrect.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. H. BARNES: As a matter of fact, provision for pension for the aged and everything which had for its object the good of the community were introduced by Governments which preceded the present Government.

Mr. PEASE: And more children died then than now.

Mr. LEWELLYN: Remember the poll-tax.

Mr. MAXWELL: What about the Unemployed Workers Insurance?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: It is amusing to me that anyone should have the effrontery to come along now and make such a suggestion as the hon. member for Herbert.

Before continuing my speech, I want to deal with another statement made by the hon. member in connection with the purchase of a dredge for Cairns. What are the facts in connection with that matter? A dredge was required for the Brisbane River, and Mr. Cullen—an able officer—and if the Treasurer were here he would admit it—was sent to the old country to purchase one, it being impossible to obtain in Queensland a dredge suitable for the particular class of work, as no one here had the patent rights. He went to England and to Scotland, and he also visited Germany. On his return to Brisbane, Mr.

Cullen said that the only dredge suitable for the requirements of Brisbane was one that was manufactured by a German firm, and he made the strongest recommendation in favour of the purchase of the dredge which the Government eventually acquired. He said that, if the Scottish dredge or any other dredge that he had inspected were brought to Brisbane, the material which had been put into it would have to be taken out. That was his reason, because what Britisher would not prefer to purchase a British article? Mr. Cullen strongly recommended the purchase of the dredge which has done such splendid work on the Brisbane River.

Subsequently the Cairns people wanted a dredge, and, in view of what had transpired, they asked the Government to procure a dredge similar to the one which Mr. Cullen had recommended. In face of that fact, what is the use of the hon. member for Herbert coming here and making a statement which is only a quarter truth? I understand the hon. gentleman said something about bolts which had rusted.

Mr. PEASE: I said dummy bolts.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman on this particular argument is an absolute dummy himself.

Mr. PEASE interjected.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member has had his say; I am going to have mine. As a matter of fact, the dredge which was bought for Cairns, like the dredge purchased for use in the Brisbane River, was the best in the market at the time. The Government of the day would not have done their duty had they not accepted the advice of their experienced and expert officer. What would have been the position of a Treasurer who had not accepted such advice?

There is another matter to which I would ask leave to address myself. I think that everyone is prepared to admit that, no matter on which side of the House a man may sit, there is a pronounced feeling of regret when death comes along and takes away a public man. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I desire to record how deeply we regret the fact that an old colleague of ours—Mr. E. B. C. Corser, a member of the Federal Parliament—passed away this morning. The deceased gentleman did magnificent work for the constituency which he represented, and I am pleased that the opportunity is given me to express what I believe to be the general regret of the House at his death. (Hear, hear!)

It is my intention to reply to some of the statements made by the Premier. I do not know whether I shall get into trouble for doing so. Did hon. members notice how the hon. gentleman went for the Leader of the Opposition in a manner that suggested what a naughty man the Leader of the Opposition was for criticising him? I was expecting every moment that the Leader of the Opposition would apologise for daring to come into the august presence of the Premier. (Laughter.) One could almost imagine the Leader of the Opposition saying, "I want to apologise for being so indiscreet." It was said once of a leading member of this House that he had grown too big for his hat. I am wondering whether the Premier lately has not had to go for a bigger hat, because there is one thing that one must not do—that is, criticise the hon. gentleman. Of course, the

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

hon. member for Fitzroy and the hon. member for Bowen may do it. Last year I stated that Socialism in an extreme form had been introduced, pandered to, and fed by the Government. This is what the hon. member for Fitzroy said, at page 313 of "Hansard," last year—

"The hon. member for Wynnum put the cap on the right head when he said that a great deal of the Labour trouble at the present time was the outcome of seed sown at certain times by hon. members on this side of the Chamber. That is true. The present Premier, Mr. Theodore, the Home Secretary, myself, and others are responsible for the methods employed at the present time in industry, and I am going to give one or two examples."

MR. WINSTANLEY: There is nothing very naughty about that. (Laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: Oh, no. No one would accuse the mild hon. member who interjects of being very naughty. Some people might think he is very good, but I am sure no one would regard him as being very naughty. He would not slip, as I have done, and damage his arm. The hon. gentleman is too careful in that regard. The reply of the Premier was a very extraordinary one. Did you notice how he replied? When I saw the late Premier in the gallery the other night, I wondered what he thought. Did you notice how the Premier spoke of his predecessors? They were the men who were responsible for all the trouble. The hon. gentleman spoke of the 44-hour week, and he led one to believe that there has been a break in the happy family, so strange was it. He said, "These predecessors of mine brought me into a position which I have to face." Was he not a member of the Cabinet that had to do with all these things? Any hon. member who knows the present Premier will know that he is not going to be in a Cabinet and simply look on and say, "Thank you, I will do whatever you wish." As a matter of fact, we know the hon. gentleman is one who would assert that he was going to do certain things. He might have gone a little further and told us whether he opposed these things which so displeased him when they were brought in by his predecessors, or is it a late conversion? Was it something that happened just on the spur of the moment which led him to change his attitude in connection with these things? I do not know. The splendid speech delivered this morning by the hon. member for Sandgate showed that the hon. gentleman is a real Sir George Reid—sometimes "No" and sometimes "Yes." With the Premier sometimes a thing is good, and at another time it is bad, according to circumstances, and according to the locality in which he is speaking.

MR. COLLINS: You used to support George Reid.

HON. W. H. BARNES: And probably I would support him again if he came to life again, but never the hon. gentleman who interjected. And let me say that once he nearly got to be leader. What a pity! Had he continued, the Bowen iron and steel works, which he did not get, would have eventuated. I may be going over some of the ground which the hon. member for Sandgate went over, but we know there was a very estimable member of this Chamber, who has since joined the great majority, who said, "Say it over

and over and over again," and I may be saying it "over and over again." The Premier said, "I have not increased taxation. My, have I not been good?" Of course those railway freights that went up must have been the fault of the Secretary for Railways, who did not consult anybody in the Cabinet. They went up, but he could not have consulted anybody. Let me draw attention to this fact: The revenue in 1921-22 from stamp duties amounted to £604,739, and in 1926-27 it amounted to £960,236. Someone may say that these figures are not correct. If any hon. member doubts these figures, I would ask him to turn up the Auditor-General's report for 1927, and turn to page 7. That is where they are recorded. We know what they were for the year just ended. The policy of the Government has been a policy of "Take, take, take at every turn"; and they have, as I think I shall be able to show before I sit down, gone largely in the direction of ruining industry in this great State of Queensland. The Premier is entirely responsible for that increased taxation. Look at the figures. He got an increase in 1925-26 of £189,961, in 1926-27 an increase of £398,218, and in 1927-28 an increase of £475,742. Where did that money come from?

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is nothing to the increase in your business since the Labour Party came into power.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I wish I could say the hon. gentleman's statement is true. The inroads which have been made by the Government have made it almost impossible for people to run businesses to-day. Here is an hon. member who has never been in business in his life, and he comes along and makes a statement which is absolutely untrue.

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Absolutely true.

HON. W. H. BARNES: When has the hon. member had the opportunity of perusing our books? I tell the hon. member—and he is bound to accept my statement—that his statement is not correct. He is making a statement which is false in an endeavour to draw a red herring across the trail in that particular way. What has the Premier done—this Premier who would not increase taxation? He has increased license fees; he has imposed a super land tax.

MR. PEASE: Do you object to increasing license fees?

HON. W. H. BARNES: What a silly interjection! When a man comes into this House he does not represent any particular section of the community, but the community as a whole. I have views, but it is my first duty in the service of this great country to give of my very best, which is fair to every section of the community. Apparently the hon. member does not allow that to be the guiding element in connection with his public life; but he can go along his lines, and I will go along my own. What is the position? Talk about increases! Unemployment insurance has been raised, and increased fares have been imposed by the Government. Whichever way we go we find the Government have been delving into the pockets of the people. What is the position with regard to the unemployed? The hon. member for Sandgate drew attention to the way the unemployment insurance payments have been increased.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The Government get no revenue out of that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not suggesting that the Government do.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Yes, you were.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No. The Government have contributed to the fund, the workers have contributed, and the business people have contributed; but is it not an instance of the incapacity of the Government to govern? I heard an hon. member this morning talk of the new Jerusalem that was to come.

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member for Sandgate.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No—an hon. member opposite. The hon. member for Sandgate realises how human many things are in this life. An hon. member opposite said we have not gone all the way yet, but, if the position is so bad now, what will it be then? On a previous occasion the Leader of the Government said he was opposed to increasing the charges on the people, and that they had adopted the policy of making the wealthy income tax payers, most of whom were living in luxury in the city, bear the burden of the railway deficit. There is one comforting feature in that regard—that probably in the carrying out of this policy Mr. Theodore and some hon. members opposite are the ones who will contribute, because they are the wealthy members of the community. My friend the genial Home Secretary smiles. We were told by the Premier that we are not to listen to all the tittle-tattle going, but I hope, at any rate, that the hon. gentleman himself is one of those who have largely to contribute, and I believe he is well able to do it. Have not the State stations caused taxation? Will anyone say that where there has been a loss of over £2,000,000 that has not helped to increase taxation?

[2.30 p.m.]

When "everything in the garden was lovely" the following statement appeared in "Socialism at Work"—that little red book which I spent some time a day or two ago in going through:—

"So real was the public need for the State to enter the stock-producing industry that the advantages in the Government buying the stock for the new stations were too substantial to be ignored, and this condition doubtless will prevail for some years to come."

That was in 1917. Of course, we are told that the substantial advantages came in various ways—I do not know how. The book goes on—

"The working expenses of running either a cattle or sheep station are very small. Always the main outgoing of the pastoralist is represented by rent, interest on a mortgage, or what he reckons as fair interest on the capital invested in his land, together with interest on the capital value of his stock. On a sheep station not 20 per cent. of the total revenue is absorbed in wages and other working expenses; whilst on a cattle station the working expenses bill amounts to less than 5 per cent. of the total.

"Once the Government is fairly started in the business—"

I wonder whether they have got fairly started in the business yet. (Opposition laughter.)

The hon. gentleman who is in charge of that department was very busy not long ago trying to sell them.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I did not write that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, how hon. gentlemen opposite are always trying to climb down? Perish the thought that any of them had anything to do with the beginnings of this enterprise! Would it not be a good thing if all the books which said anything about it could be burned—this book among them? That was a practice in ages gone by in connection with obnoxious books. They were gathered together, and a bonfire was made to get rid of them. May I suggest that in some way "Socialism at Work" might be burned to get rid of it. This all reminds me that I have in my home a collection of pictures, and some of them were brought to me by a resident of Wellington Point, who took some photographs of the workers on the State stations. I have the greatest sympathy for any Government who employ our aboriginals. I think they are entitled to consideration, but the part that amused me was that nearly all the workers in those pictures represent our coloured Queenslanders. It amused me, because I knew the hostility of the party opposite to their employment. Not long ago the Government were taken to task for using them, but they managed to cover it up very nicely—"Never a dark man worked for us," they said. Of course, we may remember, for instance, that once there was a ship in port and there was some trouble on her, and her crew were told, "Come along to the Trades Hall. You are brothers, every one." But now they would never do a thing like that. Let me complete that quotation—

"Once the Government is fairly started in the business this very small charge for working expenses will represent all the real outgoing, from year to year, incurred in the enterprise."

Now I want the hon. member for Bowen to listen to this quotation from page 49—

"That Queensland possesses many iron deposits of high quality has already been demonstrated, and experiments carried out under the direction of the Mines Department have resulted in the production of specimens of pig iron, which has passed through a single process and which from its texture and general appearance conveys the impression of having reached a far more advanced stage of manufacture. The department has ascertained that pig iron can be produced locally at a cost of some £4 per ton, whilst the market price of the commodity at the time of writing (11th June, 1927) ranges from £11 to £12 per ton. Furnaces for the production of pig iron could be erected for as little as £5,000, though, of course, the erection and working of steel works would constitute a much more formidable undertaking. However, the latter, as a State enterprise, would be practically certain to follow the output by the State of raw iron. The prospects of the venture may be gauged to some extent by the fact, that, whereas in Scotland and Spain ore yielding only 15 per cent. of metal is successfully mined, the Queensland deposits return from 60 per cent. to 90 per cent. of iron."

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

Was there not a visit to Western Australia? Somehow or other it was necessary to go to Western Australia to complete this formidable thing and bring about for the hon. member for Bowen circumstances such as would make it certain that the Bowen iron and steel works was going to be a success. I should like to know if that property has been sold. That knowledge would be very interesting. To-morrow I shall probably give notice of a question as to what was the loss, and whether there was keen disappointment on the part of the hon. member for Bowen when he found that such an undertaking was only in the air, and had proceeded no further. I notice that the hon. member for Bowen is looking very sad, apparently because the whole project has disappeared; but, when he is Premier, it will be quite all right. (Laughter.)

I remarked a moment ago that the loss on State stations was £2,154,401. We have embarked upon something that the Government favoured so very much, but what have we lost? We have lost not only £2,154,401, but have you thought, Mr. Speaker, of the amount of taxation that we have lost? Have you thought, Mr. Speaker, of what it has meant to Queensland in attempting to run State enterprises that have proved a ghastly failure? Have you thought, Mr. Speaker—I want the Deputy Leader of the Government to pay attention to this—how it has helped towards increasing unemployment in the community? To have to announce that one of the State enterprises has lost over £2,000,000 surely is a travesty upon the Government that introduced it, and introduced it with such flying colours, as appears in connection with "Socialism at Work."

On the introduction of State fish shops we were practically told that the people were going to receive the commodity at a very reduced rate. Was that so? I scarcely need say that in one report presented to Parliament by the Auditor-General the statement was made that the turnover by the State butcher shops had not been so great practically because they could not compete with the private shops. I say to the community, if that is "Socialism at Work," then, if we have another eleven or twelve years of "Socialism at Work," where will Queensland be? When we think of the drift that has taken place in connection with socialistic enterprises, what is going to happen if we have another eleven or twelve years of Socialism imposed upon the unfortunate community?

The Leader of the Government refrained from informing us of the tremendous amount of money which had been borrowed, and did you notice, Mr. Speaker, how very careful he was to say that we were not going to spend so much this year? I am prepared to admit that we must face the question of expenditure of loan money; but the Premier neglected to tell us that during the year 1929 loans to the extent of £13,000,000 are falling due.

Mr. O'KEEFE: One of your legacies.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am glad of that interjection. Our legacies were legacies representing money invested in profitable undertakings, whereas the legacies bequeathed by the Labour Party have been most unprofitable—over £2,000,000 in one item.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that from 1917 to 1928 the Government have borrowed on Loan Account £40,660,340. No wonder that they are now talking about going slow! Many people are repentant of evildoing because they are found out. They would never repent at all if they were not found out. The Government have now found out, as the Premier said, that they have been going too fast, and have realised that they will have to go back to sane things.

The Premier, in the course of his remarks, made reference to the trade balance. I am not going to follow him, as the hon. member for Sandgate dealt with the question in a most effective manner. He covered the ground in a way so signally successful that it would be a pity to make any further reference to it.

I want now to deal with the question of unemployment.

Mr. COLLINS: How did you solve it when you were in office?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Premier threw out an insinuation that the Leader of the Opposition had been going out stirring up the unemployed. That statement was absolutely untrue. If we got right down to bedrock, it would be found that members of the Opposition had a more genuine desire to help the unemployed than hon. members on the Government benches.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: What are the causes of unemployment? One of the causes of unemployment to-day is the absence of confidence on the part of the community in the Government. If many people in the community found it at all possible to get away from their surroundings, they would get away, not because Queensland is no good, but because the people are badly governed? Unemployment is brought about very largely by the want of confidence which the people have in the ability of the Government to govern the country. It is brought about, too, as has been previously pointed out, by taxation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How would you explain unemployment in other States governed by Tory Governments?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman is desirous of side-tracking my question, and going somewhere else, instead of dealing with the difficulty in his own State. He merely deals with it by saying that the other fellow is worse. It is the duty of public men to tackle what exists in Queensland without going to other States. The Premier said that taxation was a factor. I agree with him. He also asked whether, if £3,000,000 were taken out of the pockets of the people and £500,000 returned, it would solve the problem. He answered that "Yes" and he answered it "No." My answer is that there would be £500,000 more to spend in enterprise, and that would at least go some of the way towards relieving unemployment. Every hon. member must realise that it does not matter whether the money comes from our own pockets or from the pockets of the community as a whole, because in whatever manner it is obtained it brings about a lessening of our spending powers. It would mean that £500,000 more would be available for industry.

Mr. BRUCE: Why don't you release some?

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is only men like the hon. member who has just interjected who may button up their pockets and keep what they have got. Other men have expended every penny they have in industry. The chief trouble in Queensland to-day is want of confidence.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why are you extending your business premises in Wickham street?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not aware that my firm is extending its business premises in Wickham street; but, if the hon. member chooses to visit that locality, he will find that, before he gets to the premises of my firm there is shop after shop to let. To-day taxation has gone on to such an extent that people are unable to carry the burden, and to that extent unemployment is created. The Premier asked if the unemployment problem would be solved if a reduction in taxation took place. My view is that the position in Queensland is not likely to improve until a reduction in taxation takes place. The grinding taxation that has been imposed has most seriously affected every industry, and until there is some lessening of the weight the State is not likely to prosper as it should.

The Leader of the Government quoted figures with regard to unions. I believe that every member of this party is extremely anxious that the good conditions belonging to the workers should be maintained, and that the principle of arbitration should be the deciding factor in fixing conditions. What, however, is the position to-day? There are certain unions which will not admit members to their ranks, although their awards provide for compulsory unionism. Only last week I had a case where a returned soldier with four children had a position offered to him, and, when he tried to get admission to the union, he was told there were no vacancies. That is a cruel shame. The first duty of every man is to try to provide by honest means bread and butter for his children. The right to work is his, under conditions prescribed by the Board of Trade and Arbitration.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I know what your people did.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Does the hon. gentleman refer to me as a private member?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I am referring to your party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If the hon. gentleman will visit my place of business, I shall have an opportunity of showing him men who have been employed there for many years; and let me remind the hon. gentleman that the party to which I belong is not only for making promises but is also desirous of carrying them out. My party is genuinely sympathetic towards the members of the community.

Mr. BRUCE: You are not the party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am one of them, and, whilst I am here, I shall assert myself as one of the party.

The PREMIER: What about you victimising a man because he is a unionist?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have never suggested victimising a man because he is a unionist.

Mr. KERR: That is the kind of statement one hears from the soap-box orator.

HON. W. H. BARNES: This party is out to help men who are unionists, and I believe that the unionists of this State are going to support this party. (Government laughter.)

What is one of the chief causes of unemployment to-day? I quite remember only a few years ago when the Premier marched down Queen street with certain flags flying.

The PREMIER: Be quite fair.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman marched down Queen street with certain flags flying, and one of the dangers in Queensland to-day—I think the Premier is waking up to it—is the Bolshevik movement. And whom do they support?

The PREMIER: You.

Mr. KERR: They support the Premier.

The PREMIER: Well, they wait on your party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have a very interesting quotation here from the Brisbane "Sun" of Sunday, 4th April, 1926:—

"A prominent Communist asked yesterday for his opinion in regard to the Communist Party's attitude in the approaching elections said: 'The Communist Party will solidly stand behind the Labour Party. Many of our members will actively support the Labour candidates in their campaign. Since we were evicted from the Trades Hall we have made great progress. We are a part of the great Labour movement, and despite the attempts by certain reactionary elements to evict us from the Labour movement, the effort to do so has miserably failed. We have members in pretty well every union. We have them in the Workers' Political Organisations. In order to retain our influence inside we allow many of our members to sign the anti-communistic pledge. We hold that in this great fight to emancipate the workers any methods are justifiable wherewith to defeat your opponents. Our influence in the Labour movement—political and industrial—is a solid one. Though we oppose many of the political reactionaries for their misleading and hypocritical tactics, at election time we must have the united front.

"The Communists throughout the State will support the Labour Party, and do their utmost to secure their return.'"

That is what is going to happen at the coming election. You will find them all behind the Premier. The quotation continues—

"Our press will specially deal with the campaign, and having a good influence throughout the State, its special plea for support for the Labour Party will be effective."

This is the part that will please the Premier—

"In the North, particularly Cairns district, the Communist group are well organised, and Mr. McCormack will find our support solidly behind him."

Mr. BRUCE: That was written by your party manager.

HON. W. H. BARNES: They do not like the physic. It is very distasteful. I have tried to sugar-coat it as much as possible, but I am afraid I have not been very successful. The Premier, in his speech, asked us for constructive criticism.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

HON. W. H. BARNES: Let me say that usually the doctor does not prescribe until he is called in. However, I am going to give him some points, and I hope he will not steal them for his platform. These are my points—I do not say they are the party's views.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You must be a doctor out of practice.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Oh, no! The hon. gentleman has always been out of practice. Did you notice how the Premier fished for the votes of the farming community? Did you notice how he baited throughout to try to secure their support? The State taxation should be reduced on those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. The hon. gentleman asked for something constructive, and that is one of the things that could be done. The flow to the cities is not good for the community, and it does seem to me that the men who are engaged in the primary industries of this great State should receive consideration at the hands of the Government.

THE PREMIER: That is why you do not want to let them know what you get for their produce.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am going to deal with that. The hon. gentleman made an absolute misstatement the other night. He said that the members of this party—

THE PREMIER: I said members of that party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I cannot read last Thursday's "Hansard," as Mr. Speaker will not allow me to do so, but the hon. gentleman deliberately said that the Opposition had done a certain thing. That is not correct. As a matter of fact, when Mr. Taylor signed that document, he was not a member of the House, and it never went from the parliamentary party. I know all about it—no one knows better. If the Premier is an honourable man, he will at once admit that he has made a statement which is not true.

THE PREMIER: It is true. Charles Taylor was a member of your party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce the document, and also to find a single man who was then in politics who signed it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE PREMIER: If you want to shed your sins as soon as you get into politics, I am not going to let you do it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not going to let the hon. gentleman say that the members of the Opposition were responsible for it.

THE PREMIER: I said members of the governing party.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman said members of the party in power.

THE PREMIER: I said you were in power, and you allowed him to do it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Have you ever seen such a lame statement?

THE PREMIER: The charge is against you—not against him.

HON. W. H. BARNES: How can it be a charge against me?

THE PREMIER: You were a member of the Government.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If I were a member of the Government which turned down the request, where does the charge come in? The hon. gentleman is "barking up the wrong tree." What is the position? A number of commercial men in the city made a request that the prices realised for produce sent in from the country should not be published. I was approached, and I refused to sign the paper. But, when the Premier comes here and has the audacity to say that the party was behind it, he is making an unfounded statement.

The hon. gentleman, when speaking previously, spoke about the Leader of the Opposition repeating in the House all the tittle-tattle he heard outside, but here is the Premier of a great country descending so low in his desire to try to get at the middleman. I am going to say something about middlemen. May I remind the hon. gentleman that he has figured in that capacity most conspicuously? Was he not a middleman when he was the secretary of a union? (Government laughter.) Surely he was a middleman. Let me deal with the actualities of life—what is the position to-day? We talk of State enterprises. Reference has been made to the State produce agency. No man has a right to say anything against a gentleman who is not here to answer for himself. The State produce agency is fortunate in having at its head a thoroughly capable man in Mr. Park. I ask this question: Has the State produce agency reduced the rates of commission since it came into existence? It has not.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Yes.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is incorrect. I may mention what it did, for I speak of something I know. When the price-fixing authority said, "You are only to charge a certain commission on certain goods," the State produce agency said it could not do anything with those lines, and dropped out of it. We hear talk about middlemen. My time as a public man may be getting shorter and shorter, but I want to say that I shall be able to go out of public life without any man on that side or this side

[3 p.m.] being able to say, "You did not play the game in commercial, business, or political life." (Hear, hear!) At any rate, there will nothing for those I leave behind me to carry in the nature of an incubus. When this question of middlemen comes up it is time that the facts were stated. Take my own case. It may be a personal matter, but my interests are very much more in the country than in the city; yet again and again we have that epithet thrown at us in connection with our business life. Let us get back to actualities. It may be egotistical for me to say it, nevertheless I say that the record of the Government with which I had the honour to be associated—the record in service actually rendered to the community—has never been equalled by that of any other Government. (Opposition members: Hear, hear!)

THE PREMIER: You got a terrible bump at the elections.

HON. W. H. BARNES: May I remind the hon. gentleman that he is going to get a terrible bump this election? I have had a bump, but in my electorate I had the experience of coming back again, and that is what this party is going to do at the next election.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Premier has made some reference to the potentialities of the State. Any man in this House would be a traitor to his country if he made other than favourable reference to the State. It is a great and a glorious State, with possibilities of which every man ought to be proud, and which it ought to be his aim to cultivate and assist.

The PREMIER: Your colleagues are decrying it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: My colleagues are decrying the Government; they are not decrying the State. Who could decry it, with its wool and its cattle, notwithstanding the advent of the State Government into the industry, putting their finger into the pie, trying to kill the business, and then asserting that they, and they alone, are trying to help the great industries of Queensland? Everyone knows that the problem we have to face is that of helping the industries of this State to a greater extent than they have ever been helped before. We have to do more to encourage the spirit of co-operation between the men who are employed and the men who are employers. We have to do our utmost to create a feeling which will be helpful to the community. What has been the attitude of the other party? True, the Secretary for Mines said that there would be no unemployment three months after a certain election at Paddington. He was not a good prophet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There was a qualification to that.

Mr. FRY: The qualification was, "if he is willing to work."

HON. W. H. BARNES: At any rate, the prophecy has not been realised. The duty of this party and of every other party is to see that the best is done for this great country of which all of us are representatives.

Before I sit down let me refer to a statement made by the Premier which was not correct. He said that the hon. member for Wynnum budgeted for an appropriation of loan money of £2,000,000 and spent £4,000,000.

The PREMIER: Oh, no.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Oh, yes. I took it down, and I took the trouble to read the hon. gentleman's speech line by line.

The PREMIER: I said you budgeted for £2,000,000, which was equal to £4,000,000 now.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman did not say that at all. How well it would sometimes be if we could wipe out "Hansard"!

The PREMIER: You spent £4,000,000.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If the hon. gentleman will go through the records, he will find that the Government with which I was associated were able year by year to conduct the affairs of this great State so as to be able to pay our way. What a crowing there has been over this small surplus—a poor thing hatched with great difficulty, and as a result of extreme taxation!

The PREMIER: Is it not better than having a deficit of £1,000,000?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not saying that it would be a good thing to have a deficit. We are in the position in which we

find ourselves to-day because of the debit balances which have been carried forward and on which we are paying interest.

The PREMIER: The debit balance of the Government with which you were associated was greater than our debit balance.

HON. W. H. BARNES: To what part do you refer?

The PREMIER: The whole period of your government.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman is making a mistake.

The PREMIER: It is true. I am speaking of the Continuous Government.

HON. W. H. BARNES: They were in power for a greater number of years than can be claimed by the Labour Party.

The Premier has again and again referred to statements made by hon. members of this House. I take it that, if I make a statement here to-day which is not a party statement, I cannot ask my leader, my deputy leader, or the whole party to swallow it. The Premier referred to statements made by the hon. member for Oxley. They were not party statements at all but merely expressed the private opinions of that hon. member. The hon. member for Oxley denied that they were party statements.

The PREMIER: They were more apropos the policy of your party than the associating of me with Communists.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman has been associated with them all the time. The mining activities on the part of the Government have resulted in a loss of £781,625, as disclosed by the Auditor-General's report. The Premier was not in the Chamber when I referred previously to loan money. I now ask him what he is going to do in connection with the loans maturing next year.

Mr. PEASE: What did you do when you were in power?

HON. W. H. BARNES: We provided for them. The hon. gentleman has not said anything about those £13,000,000.

The PREMIER: You left us £25,000,000.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No. We dealt with our loans in a masterly way, but the hon. gentleman is now penitent, the loans are maturing, and he is unable to speed so much.

The PREMIER: My credit is excellent in London.

HON. W. H. BARNES: His personal credit may be good anywhere, but the credit of his Government is bad. The aim of the party on this side of the House is to do the very best for this great country of Queensland, and, after all, that is greater and bigger than party politics. Every man has a right to give of his best.

I desire to say, in conclusion, that, when the elections are held, whether it be this year or next year, I hope the result will show that the Government have absolutely lost the confidence of the people. Then prosperity and progress will be the task which will be taken in hand by a new Government, who will be alive to all the conditions necessary for the State of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): I desire to join with the hon. member for Wynnum in expressing my regret at the demise of Mr. Corser, M.H.R. I know the Corser family in Maryborough, apart from their politics, and I know them to be good citizens, and respected by every man who knows them. I assure them of my regret at the death of the father of the family. (Hear, hear!)

My chief desire in rising is to thank the Premier for the help given by his Government in affording some relief so far as Maryborough is concerned by accepting the tender of Walkers Limited for the construction of locomotives. It means so much to Maryborough and the district that I feel I am bound to touch on this matter. The stagnation in the industry controlled by Walkers Limited, which I am now hopeful has been relieved for some time to come, followed what, to me, seemed a serious blunder by this Government in sending overseas for locomotives which could, and I submit, should, have been built here. To me this action was a decided break in the long chain of sympathy shown by Labour Governments towards industry in this State and in Australia since the advent of Labour in Queensland in 1915. I trust no other Government will ever send overseas for anything that can be manufactured in Queensland or in Australia. I note with pleasure in connection with the contract now under review that the price submitted by Walkers Limited was lower than any other Australian tender, and only 7.7 per cent. greater than the overseas tender. When one considers the high cost of wages ruling in this country as compared with the old country, and the other abnormal conditions governing competition between Australia and overseas manufacturers, it is something to be gratified at that there is only a difference of 7.7 per cent. between the two tenders. I submit that with continuity of work a firm like Walkers Limited will be able in the near future to eliminate any difference at all in costs, and be able to compete successfully with any overseas tenders, particularly in the manufacture of locomotives. The favourable position as disclosed between the tenders of the overseas and local firms has been brought about by the consideration given by the Labour Government since 1915 to local firms. During the years 1917 to 1928 the Governments of the day—all Labour Governments—have given Walkers Limited contracts to the value of over £1,000,000. (Hear, hear!) That is some consideration to that firm. I believe that, given a continuity of work, Walkers Limited will be able to produce at lower cost, because they will be able more effectively to control their overhead costs. The agitation for the order for the locomotives I am speaking of now, tenders for which closed last week, has been going on for two years. Following on the introduction of the last twenty-five British locomotives—I hope they will be the last—the firm of Walkers Limited, of their own volition, ordered material for the construction of ten class "C 17" locomotives to try to keep their highly-skilled craftsmen together, and to keep their shops going as normally as possible. Unfortunately for the industry, the overseas engines arrived about that time, and adverse conditions so affected this State that the Railway Department found it impossible until quite recently to call for tenders for more engines. It is quite patent to anyone that, unless engines are

[*Mr. Weir.*

necessary, or unless an article is necessary in any industry, it is quite useless asking for orders for them. The position in the Railway Department was brought about by other conditions. For example, the department found itself faced with a falling revenue consequent on a reduced mileage, so that there was no demand for locomotives. At the present time the traffic has improved, so that this week the Government have been able to grant a contract to Walkers Limited for the construction of ten locomotives.

Mr. CLAYTON: You lived on the doormat to get it.

Mr. WEIR: I did my best in the matter. I was in Maryborough yesterday when I received official news that the tender had been successful. The Secretary for Railways was good enough to wire me promptly of the result, and the effect of the granting of this contract reminded me of events in 1923, following on the granting to Walkers Limited of the Tully River mill contract. On that occasion the city of Maryborough was almost beflagged at the prospects of almost two years' work in front of Walkers Limited. I kept constantly in touch with the directors and management of Walkers Limited on that occasion, who had come to Brisbane for the finalising of the tenders, and it was my privilege, thanks to the late Premier, Mr. Theodore, to be able to convey to them at the Queensland Machinery Company's office the tidings that the firm had been successful in the tender for the Tully River mill. The directors, after hearing the good news, insisted on my returning to Maryborough with them that night in order to convey the glad tidings first-hand to the workers within the industry, which I did on the next day. This was the first occasion on which a public man had been permitted to address the workers of that industry inside the firm's premises and was a fitting climax to a concerted effort in which at every stage both the management and the unions involved extended to me the utmost confidence and loyalty. Just prior to calling tenders for that job I was successful in inducing the Government of the day—through the late Mr. Gillies—to withdraw tenders from overseas for a proposed bridge job, which was valued at £22,000 or £23,000, and offer the work to Walkers Limited, which enabled the firm, not only to retain most of the efficient staff, but also to reduce shop charges to a minimum, so that the Tully River mill job—and for that matter all jobs that follow—would have the benefit of the reduced overhead expenses. It will be apparent to all hon. members that, when a portion of a workshop is not working, certain overhead charges must of necessity continue. These charges must subsequently be recouped, so that continuity of operations has the effect of maintaining shop charges at a proper level. I was particularly anxious that Walkers Limited should get any work that was available in order to keep their works going, and so reduce the cost of the Tully River mill job, which was immediately in sight. I was pleased then when the bridge job to which I have referred—a job in connection with the Burnett bridge—came the way of Walkers Limited.

The latest tender will do much to provide employment for many men in Maryborough; but there will still be many unemployed. I would suggest that other avenues should be

sought in order to place in employment those who are seeking work. Everyone agrees with the Government in their desire to spend money only on reproductive work, and I will suggest certain avenues in which some of the unemployed in Maryborough could be used. For example, in the Railway Department the question of increased haulage capacity for locomotives is governed by the gradients on the road. Between Maryborough and Bundaberg a class "C 17" engine can haul 160 tons more than the same engine can haul from Gympie to Maryborough. That shows that on a trip from Gympie to Maryborough it is an everyday occurrence for an engine to lose 160 tons of, probably, a 400-ton maximum capacity owing to the fact that the gradients on one section are not so well cut down as the gradients on the other section.

I offer the suggestion to do something for the men in the Maryborough district who are looking for work. It might be a reasonable opportunity for the Railway Department to undertake some reproductive work in the direction of cutting down these grades, thereby allowing the engines to haul the full load of 400 tons. Hon. members will realise that 160 tons out of 400 tons is 40 per cent., and the cutting down of these gradients will certainly be a big factor in making the trains pay. I find in my district that the local railway officials who are well posted on this matter are favourable towards a reduction in the gradients, particularly in the vicinity of Tiaro, and I suggest this matter for the consideration of the Secretary for Railways in order that something may be done for the unemployed by attacking these gradients, thereby serving the double purpose of finding work and also of doing something for the State.

Touching on the timber industry, if anyone visits the yards of Messrs. Wilson and Hart, he will immediately find evidence there which will belie the cry of "blue ruin" which is so often heard from the opponents of the Government. Within the last twelve months these people have spent tens of thousands of pounds in further equipment, machinery, and such like in the mill in order to undertake more work and a better class of work than they have been doing in the past. Apart from the fact that they have spent money on machinery, the necessary increase in machinery has been responsible for an increase of 50 per cent. in the number of the staff, and that in itself has gone far towards finding work for some of the men who, in the ordinary course of events, would be walking the streets. Something may be done also in this direction, and I commend it to the Secretary for Public Lands. For some time there has been a slight hitch in regard to Fraser Island. Fraser Island is a source of a very large timber supply, mostly hardwood, which is brought to the Maryborough mills. This supply is uncertain owing to the hitch, and I venture the opinion that, if the Minister gave this matter consideration, he would be able to get over the difficulty, which would allow the timber industry of Fraser Island to get back on a proper footing and thereby considerably help the timber industry in the Maryborough district.

Let me now touch on what is known to us as "through running." That is the through running of trains between Gympie and Bundaberg as against the old system

of running from Maryborough to Bundaberg and Maryborough to Gympie. I have been handling this question for some considerable time because it is a very vexed question in the district. Everybody is concerned about it, because there is very serious risk—more than a risk probably—if this system is instituted and persisted in, of the transfer of some of the men who have spent a lifetime in building up their homes in Maryborough. Then, of course, the question becomes serious, and I take the view that it becomes political. In this matter, right through the piece, I have been fortunate in that I have been backed up by the members of the A.F.U.L.E., the Guards' Union, and other unions immediately in touch with the work. These people have been good enough right through the piece to furnish me with very useful information and, having had a training in the Railway Department, I venture the opinion that I am capable of handling the position—with the result that I have been constantly in touch with the Railway Department, and have endeavoured to show them that through running is not a success, and to my mind should not be persisted in. In the first instance, the department introduced the new running to economise in engine power. There was no great difficulty in exploding this theory for the reason that the system introduced by the department left valuable engines standing in the yards at Bundaberg for hours on end without turning a wheel, which, on the face of it, is false economy. This brought about a change of front by the department. Under the old system men who went to Bundaberg on trains had no return train on which to come back, and were sent back on "spare." The "spare" working brought about by the system in vogue, in addition to the heavy laying off and other incidental expenses paid to the men for unproductive duty, are a heavy tax on the running. To combat this officers have been sent to the Maryborough district from Brisbane, with the result that everything possible is being done in an endeavour to justify the system even to running Maryborough men on the through service from Bundaberg to Gympie and Gympie to Bundaberg. This only accentuates the trouble, as it has a tendency to bring the standard of living of the men engaged in the industry back to the condition which existed years ago, under which, to my knowledge, men were sent out on trains without having the slightest idea which day of the week they would be returning. I much regret any system of working on the road to-day which will have a tendency to put the men back into the position which obtained years ago. Taken by and large, I can unhesitatingly say the "through" running is badly conceived and cannot be supported on the score of economy, and should be abolished in favour of the original scheme which worked so well for many years.

While we all hail with delight the fact that the State finances have taken a better turn, to my mind the Government are standing on very thin ice in accumulating a surplus, on the one hand, while admitting the existence of an army of unemployed on the other hand. True it is that we are relatively better off than other States, but that is not a very good argument with which to meet the demand for work by unfortunate workers who, while willing and anxious to work, find themselves on the industrial scrapheap. A

*Mr. Weir.]*

happy and contented population would be a better asset to a Labour Government than a surplus. As a man who understands figures, I appreciate the surplus. I know the Government, and the Premier particularly, have had a worrying time in trying to put the finances on a proper footing; but to me a happy and contented people with a smaller number of men unemployed would be preferable. Unemployment is not peculiar to this Government alone, but is common to all countries in the world. We would be in a better position if all our people were at work, even if we had a deficit instead of a surplus.

During the course of the week an accident happened in the district of the hon. member for Burrum. I do not want anyone to think for a moment that I am deliberately attempting to prejudice the case, which may become a most serious matter in the Railway Department. I merely want to touch on the case in order to make a suggestion as to how to avoid similar happenings in the future. As we read in the press, an engine went over the side of a bridge, with the result that a close friend of mine was pinned under the engine for six or seven hours. It occurred, unfortunately, on a Saturday afternoon. We know that immediately the breakdown whistle blows in a district the breakdown gang, wherever they may be, whether at home or at a place of amusement, rush to their job as soon as possible and get out on the road. They do their duty nobly and well. In this particular case the men who heard the whistle did not even bother to go home to get into their working clothes. It was the call of duty, and, as there might be danger to life involved, they were on the job as quickly as possible. I would suggest to the Secretary for Railways the advisability in the near future of having a permanent properly equipped breakdown gang to be ready for these emergencies and save loss of life. We do not want to see such an accident happen again; and the appointment of a permanent breakdown gang will be able to render help more quickly. I am not blaming anyone. No fault lay with the members of the breakdown gang in the recent accident. They were called from all parts of the city, and went away immediately they were able to get together. The poor unfortunate man who lost his life was pinned under the engine, roughly, from 1.50 p.m. until about 8 o'clock at night before they could get him out. Hon.

members can imagine how the [3.30 p.m.] other man must have felt—I know him, and the hon. member for Bundaberg knows him well, too—working all that time trying to free his mate with only a small hack saw in a confined space, with the result that he practically winds up in hospital almost a mental case. I think the thing is serious enough to call for close attention, even if it should mean a little added expenditure in having a specially equipped gang continuously available, as is done in the case of mines rescue stations.

Dealing with the Governor's Speech, I want to comment on one item which appeals to me more than any other. I refer to His Excellency's remarks in regard to the intermediate system of education. For some considerable time past I have been closely connected with secondary education as chairman of trustees of the Maryborough Grammar School. This is a school which has been getting wonderfully good results. Anyone who watches the system carefully must recognise that good progress has been made; but we

[Mr. Weir.

have had to be exceedingly careful with the accommodation we have, otherwise we would not be able to show the results we have. We have a record enrolment. In the combined schools we have never had an enrolment up to what it was on the 1st of July of this year. I suppose that our schools are amongst the best in the State. I would not like to detract from the record of any other school, but I think I am justified in saying that. Our boys' school has also done wonderfully well, and the results generally are very good. The trouble with grammar schools generally all over the State, however, is one of funds. Every grammar school is carrying on under difficulties, with a limited grant from the Government, but with a big demand for accommodation and teaching staff, therefore the whole system remains stationary for want of ability to develop it. We have in Maryborough two very well-equipped schools, which are nicely situated, and it seems a great pity that the trustees have got to the point where they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that the buildings themselves are wholly inadequate. It seems to me that the sooner the State takes over the responsibility for the buildings the better it will be, because the State will have to pay in the long run. The State will have to spend, for instance, £600 or £700 on buildings alone, and I think it is want of economy not to do the work now. The trustees have got to their limit at the bank, and cannot go on any further. The State will not take them over at present, and we are at a standstill. The trustees recently have been through the schools to see if we could not find some means of extending the present accommodation. We went over every hole and corner in the building to see if we could not establish classrooms, and we found classes of as many as forty boys under the supervision of one teacher. From my experience, I venture the opinion that no one man can control forty boys in a secondary school. It is not possible in primary school work, and I am quite satisfied it is not possible in secondary school work. It does not give a man a chance to get to understand the temperament of his boys. Any man in this House with a family of, say, three, knows from his own experience how difficult it is in his own case, with a limited number of children; so we can understand how much more difficult it is where there are as many as forty children in a class in a building which is inadequate, and we can appreciate the necessity for extra expenditure on accommodation. We have been considering the advisableness of taking over the old gymnasium and reflooring it, but the trustees cannot do anything for want of funds. I would suggest to the Secretary for Public Instruction that something should be arranged between his department and that of the Secretary for Public Works, and that one of them should take the responsibility. They will have to take over sooner or later, not only our but other schools. They are good buildings, and I think the day has arrived when the Government should take them over or find the funds for the trustees to effect the necessary repairs. It is "penny wise and pound foolish" to let them "rip."

Regarding the proposed introduction of the intermediate education system, take the case of engineering as a case in point. To obtain an engineering certificate a boy must take one of two languages, French or Latin. I cannot understand why an engineer should know either French or

Latin. I can quite understand that, with a knowledge of, say, Latin, it will give a man a better grasp of the derivation of English; but the average man in this House or in the street can learn enough English in his time to serve him for all time and for all vocations without languages being included in the engineering examination. He has enough in his mind without loading it with foreign languages, and for that reason I consider the department should start with the university instead of starting at the bottom. I believe that the universities—I do not say this to be unfair—are so ingrained with old ideas and stodgy suggestions—rules within the walls of the building and customs of the game—that they will not move to eliminate unnecessary subjects unless something definite is done. I hope the thing will be got over without much trouble, and, if that can be done, there is a reasonably good chance of improving the scheme. I have never been able to understand why there should be such a disparity between the standard of examination for a high school and for a grammar school. Those who follow the question very closely know that there are three subjects for the examination for admission to the high school, and five subjects in the case of the grammar school, and, in addition, the subjects are more difficult. It is more difficult to pass the scholarship examination than it is to pass a high school examination; yet we find sometimes in the same city both a high school and a grammar school, which is not a good scheme, and not serving the purpose that the schools were intended to serve. I am not saying that, if you make the standard of the examination for the two uniform by bringing the standard for the high school up to the scholarship examination, there will not be disabilities in the country. I can imagine that there will be. The country school teacher, perhaps, has twenty to thirty children with no assistance, and no chance of forming a special scholarship class, whereas the big schools in the town can maintain one master to attend to the scholarship classes. That may have been in the main responsible for the difference in the two standards; but, after all, there is coming the day when the standard will have to be revised either by a levelling up or by a levelling down. I am not going to say whether it should be a levelling up or a levelling down, but my own personal opinion is—I give it for what it is worth—that the standard for a scholarship is low enough, and I believe that, if there could be in the country a system whereby children could be trained for scholarship purposes, then the matter would be all right. If we could get them all on the one level with that intermediate system—I take it the object of the intermediate system is a matter of secondary education coupled with technical education—and forge ahead from that through the next gap, co-ordinating the high school and the grammar school, and eliminating unnecessary subjects, the scheme will be all right. It seems absurd that in Bundaberg, Maryborough, Toowoomba, and Rockhampton there should be a grammar school with a teacher in commercial subjects, and over the road a technical college with a teacher in commercial subjects. We have a teacher of science in the grammar school, and a teacher of science in the technical college over the road—all, to my mind, overlapping. If we could take the secondary students into one class and draft them through the inter-

mediate course on to, perhaps, the university, then we would have something worth while.

Then there is next step, assuming that our goal is to prepare those boys leaving school and going on to the unskilled labour market, I think it is a tragedy that so many of our Australian boys are not being trained. We want to pick these youngsters up, and, if it is at all possible, make tradesmen of them. I presume that is what the scheme is for. That is what we desire to attain. We meet with difficulties, but we are proceeding in the right direction. If the boy passes the scholarship examination, he enters on his intermediate course and heads for the university. The intention is to give that boy two years to study for the junior university examination. It seems to me that it cannot be the same standard of examination as prevails now for which these youngsters have a course of study extending over two and a-half years. If it is, then they are now spending half a year doing nothing, which I know is not a fact. I know it takes an ordinary student quite two and a-half years to prepare to get through the junior university examination. There are quite a lot of authorities on education who are strongly opposed to the reduction of the period from three to two and a-half years. Personally, I am not opposed to that reduction. I believe that two and a-half years is quite sufficient to enable a youngster to study and get through the junior examination. I do not think, though, that a two years' course can give the same results. It is obvious to me that, if the intermediate course is reduced from two and a-half to two years, the number of subjects is also being cut down. If it means elimination from the study of a boy heading for a mechanical calling of such stupid subjects as Latin and French, then it is all to the good. I can quite understand Latin being a compulsory subject for a person studying for medicine. The doctor merely learns Latin in order to deceive the patient by prescribing "aqua pura" instead of "pure water." I certainly think that a system of intermediate education as propounded in the Governor's Speech, is worthy of consideration and if it is at all possible we should all strive to offer some suggestion to build up a scheme of which all should be proud.

Another matter I would like to refer to is the proposed amendment of the Fair Rents Court Act. It has appeared to me from time to time that there is a weakness in the Act. It is quite possible under the Act to-day to protest against the amount of rent being charged for a home. It is equally possible for the owner of the home to victimise the tenant by adopting means, with the aid of a chain of friends, making it difficult for that man to get into any other house. While that is possible we should overcome it either by allowing the union in which the person is interested to fight the case instead of the individual, or by instituting a system of policing under Government authority, just as is done in connection with awards of the Board of Trade and Arbitration. The particular point I want to make is that there is no protection to people starting out in business, in which they have invested every penny they possess in the world. The Fair Rents Court should be accessible to people in business as well as to people living in dwellings. I make the suggestion in the hope that the matter will be brought up at

Mr. Weir.]

some future date, as it is quite possible for these people to be right in the hands of people who have no consideration for what is a fair thing.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I have listened with a very considerable amount of interest to the speeches of the hon. members for Sandgate, Wynnum, and Maryborough, and I ask: Have they actually put their finger on the spot that is troubling Queensland to-day? It is all very well to say, "You are another," but there is no force in that argument. Has anything been suggested by the present Administration or those who have already spoken whereby we are going to solve the difficulty which exists to-day? It will be admitted on all sides that the great difficulty is unemployment. We know that unemployment exists practically everywhere in the world to-day. Whether or not it is the result of the Great War, which has caused such an upheaval in our industrial conditions, is not the question. Simply to say that unemployment exists in other countries, and to use that as an argument so far as the position is Queensland is concerned, is not the best way to solve the problem. Does the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor, which, after all, enunciates the policy of the present Administration, contain anything which offers a solution to the problem of unemployment? No; and not one speaker on the Government side has suggested a solution.

MR. O'KEEFE: What do you suggest?

HON. J. G. APPEL: We know what political economists have said on the effects of over-taxation. One has only to read the works of John Stuart Mill to become acquainted with the disastrous effects of over-taxation. There is no getting away from it that the over-taxation from which we are suffering has a reactionary effect upon the workers.

I was rather amused at the remark which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Herbert, who stated that under a previous Administration the amount of taxation per head or per minute was so much. But the hon. gentleman did not tell us that the loan indebtedness of the State has doubled since the present Government took office; nor did he tell us what the amount of taxation is to-day. He made a point that taxation has an effect upon our economic position. Unquestionably it has. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that at the time he speaks about the amount spent in relief was very small compared with the expenditure to-day. For example, during the last year that I was associated with the Home Department the relief expenditure amounted to approximately £5,000; and hon. members who desire to make a comparison need only look at the figures for the last financial year. That is the answer to the contention of the hon. member for Herbert that his party has done so much more for the workers of the State than the previous Administration.

MR. O'KEEFE: The present Administration look after the children.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Does the hon. gentleman for one moment contend that the previous Administration did not look after the children? It was a Government from this side of the House which instituted all these means of relief for the children and for the benefit of the mothers of the children.

MR. O'KEEFE: They gave the foster-mother more than the natural mother.

[*Mr. Weir.*]

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yes, and to-day, I am sorry to say, under the present Administration, a woman who is practically destitute and who has only one child can get no relief. It is just as well to realise these things; and also that only a certain number of children receive relief under the present Administration. Of course, we are promised in His Excellency's Speech—which is really the policy of the Government—an amendment in that direction. Prior to last election we were told that we were to have maternity allowances, but this reform has never eventuated, although it was promised nearly three years ago. One of the organisers of the party in power, travelling with me on one occasion, said, "That was an excellent stunt of ours. It won't be carried out, but before next election we will introduce that stunt again, and I have no doubt that it will be equally effective." Apparently that stunt is going to be introduced again. Whether it will be effective or not I do not know, but I have no doubt that it was effective at the last elections. I remember one organiser for the Labour candidate in my electorate went to one individual who has a number of children and pointed out that under the proposed scheme that individual would receive £3 a week, and, he said, "I got a vote from that party." The individual said, "Why, I need never work again, and I can keep a motor car." (Laughter.)

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: On £3 a week?

HON. J. G. APPEL: He lived in the country. This organiser said that that stunt was very effective.

Why have not the Government, in the first instance, suggested a reduction in the number of members of this House?

MR. HYNES: That would do away with the Opposition altogether.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is probably what the hon. member would like—wipe out the Opposition side and increase their own numbers, as they did at the last redistribution of seats. I want to arrive at a solution of this unemployment difficulty, and why not, in the first instance, reduce the number of members of this House from seventy-two to fifty? As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, there are electorates in which the number of electors is only one-third of the number in other electorates.

The next point is this—and I speak as a country member: What is causing the influx of young fellows from the country into the town? The hon. member for Maryborough spoke about giving facilities for improved education. Has the hon. member ever considered how those young fellows and girls are going to find employment? I know of one selector whose son gained a B.A. degree, and after he had the degree he could not get work. That will not solve the difficulty. The only thing that will solve the problem of unemployment is by inducing people to settle upon the land. The statistics show that millions of acres of land in Queensland are being vacated, and that settlement on the land is not increasing. We have had this unemployment problem before, and it was solved by putting people upon the land. What inducement is the present Administration giving to people to go on the land? You cannot get a freehold tenure in land. You cannot get a homestead area.

MR. O'KEEFE: What do you want a freehold for?

HON. J. G. APPEL: The inducement to people to go on the land was previously the freehold interest in the land—a homestead area of 160 acres at 2s. 6d. per acre, with five years' residence and improvements, twenty years to pay, and after five years the homesteader could pay off the whole of the amount. The result was that people went upon the land. They could not get what we term the basic wage, but they were quite willing to go upon the land under those conditions, because they realised they were building up capital. The question of unemployment was thus solved. People went on the land then, but to-day they are quitting the land.

We have various agricultural industries, and I wish to draw attention to the arrowroot industry. I suppose the electorate I represent produces the largest amount of arrowroot in Queensland. I am not blaming the Director of Agriculture in this matter; but the growers are being told to restrict their operations because there is not a sufficient market to be found for the manufactured article. What is the result of restricting the area to be cultivated? It simply means the restriction of the amount of labour which would otherwise be employed. These are matters which deserve the consideration of the House, and which materially affect the question of solving unemployment. A large number of young men are employed in our rural industries.

It is not a question of wages. [4 p.m.] but, owing to taxation, a large number of men engaged in our agricultural industries have been compelled to disperse with their employees, who have drifted to the cities. All these are matters which require consideration, and in other States than Queensland.

MR. HYNES: And under Tory Governments.

HON. J. G. APPEL: It is only recently that there has been a change of Government in New South Wales and a change in South Australia. There is a Labour Government in Victoria, and one in Western Australia. The interjection of the hon. member reminds me that, if he had been reading the statistics of Western Australia, he would realise that the policy of the Labour Government there is very different from that of the Labour Government in Queensland, that Western Australia has become our great competitor, and that a large flow of settlement is taking place to Western Australia which heretofore was directed to Queensland. And why? Taxation is not so great in Western Australia, and the facilities which are given to the settlers there are superior to those which are offered in Queensland.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: And they can get a freehold in Western Australia.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Certainly they can get a freehold there. I could never understand why, with our millions and millions of acres of land, we should refuse to give a freehold to those who desire it. We gave the option of freehold or a perpetual lease; but how many people took advantage of the latter system? The percentage was so small as to be negligible. Yet for some reason—or for no reason—the present Administration laid it down as a matter of policy that, with millions of acres of land which should be settled, they would refuse to give anybody a freehold.

MR. O'KEFFE: They leased it to Chinamen on the Atherton Tableland.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member may know more about Chinamen than I do. I have had no business dealings with them. I am speaking of Europeans and my own fellow natives, who want to get freehold. Only this morning a young fellow whose father is a dairyman in my electorate came to me for a recommendation in an endeavour to get a position in town. I said, "Why are you leaving your farm? You have been brought up in the dairying industry. You know all about it." He said, "Well, I am not going to take a perpetual leasehold. If I cannot get freehold, if I cannot get a homestead, I will see what I can do in the city." And that is only one of a number of instances. You, Mr. Speaker, know as well as I do that these are facts, and that is one of the problems we have to deal with.

MR. O'KEFFE: It is only one.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We can only judge by the records of the department, which show how many have gone out of rural occupations. How are we to solve this problem of unemployment?

MR. HYNES: How?

HON. J. G. APPEL: By settling people on the land and making conditions so attractive as to offer an inducement to those who desire to follow such occupations. I have stated on different occasions, and hon. members opposite are aware of the truth of my statement, that settlement upon the land means hard work.

MR. HYNES: The hon. member for Oxley said that he would solve the problem by bringing 500,000 men from overseas. Do you subscribe to that policy also?

MR. MAXWELL: That is wrong; and you know it.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I wish to see my fellow natives settled upon the land.

MR. HYNES: Do you repudiate the hon. member for Oxley also?

HON. J. G. APPEL: What have I to do with the hon. member for Oxley? Am I responsible for what is uttered by the hon. member for Townsville? I am simply endeavouring to offer some solution of the problem of unemployment, which is admitted to be the great problem that we have to face to-day. The mere panacea of the Government finding some work by reducing railway gradients here or doing work there is not going to solve the problem.

MR. BRUCE: The hon. member for Wynnum suggested that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I did not hear him suggest that.

MR. HYNES: Could the problem be solved by bringing 500,000 people from overseas, as suggested by the hon. member for Oxley?

HON. J. G. APPEL: If they were going on the land, it would. I do not believe in bringing unskilled workers to this country. We have to settle this country, but our policy should not be one of importing unskilled workers. We should endeavour to induce people to go upon the land; but before that can be achieved they must be granted freehold tenure and attractive conditions. Simply dumping 500,000 people into the

*Hon. J. G. Appel.]*

towns would tend only to make the position worse.

Mr. BRUCE: That is the suggestion from your side.

HON. J. G. APPEL: No doubt the hon. member has made suggestions, which suggestions did not meet with acceptance by his leader or by the Cabinet. I have my own views; the hon. member for Oxley has his; the hon. member for Townsville has his; and the hon. member for Kennedy has his. Does the hon. member for Kennedy contend that our population of 900,000 is a sufficient population? If he does, then all I can say is that I am sorry for him. When you hear the opinions of men who have travelled Queensland extolling its possibilities and lauding its potentialities, and you hear hon. members in this House contending that we have a sufficient population, then all I can say is: God help Queensland!

Mr. BRUCE: We have too many unemployed.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am trying to find a solution for that difficulty. The hon. member interjected that the influx into the cities was greater in the other States than it is in Queensland, but I do not accept that statement. I want to prevent that influx, and the only method by which that can be done is by the method which was adopted many years ago when similar conditions existed—that is, give the people a chance to acquire a homestead area at a minimum rate, and make the conditions to settle on the land attractive. To-day the conditions can be made very much more attractive than they were in the past, when these pioneers went into our scrubs and made the State what it is to-day. To-day the conditions for the greater success of such a scheme are far better. It is the duty of the Government to make provision for the settlement of the land, but I can see no provision made in the Governor's Speech—which is the policy of the Administration—for finding and creating markets for our products. I have already pointed out that the growers of arrowroot have been informed that they must not plant the same quantity as they have been accustomed to plant. That is actually a restriction of the cultivation of the land. Then legislation introduced by the present Administration restricts a selector to grow only such produce as is permitted by the department. That is a most extraordinary provision, because we all know that there are men who are experts in one kind of agriculture, some in other kinds, and again others in some other form of agriculture; and to tell these people that they must only take up that land on their agreeing to grow certain produce only is merely driving settlement to our great competitor—Western Australia.

Mr. HYNES: Isn't it far easier for a person to obtain land under our leasehold system than under the freehold system?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I thought my suggestion was not controversial. I was suggesting a solution, one being that opportunity be given to people to settle on the land.

Mr. HYNES: They can settle on the land under the leasehold system.

HON. J. G. APPEL: They will not go on the land under the present conditions.

Mr. HYNES: Why not?

HON. J. G. APPEL: They cannot get the land at 2s. 6d. an acre, as they could under

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

the old conditions. Is it not better to have the land settled, even if you permit it to be taken up free, than have it lying idle? Land settlement will withdraw a large number of people from the ranks of unemployed, and relieve the congestion existing in our cities. That is the point I am driving at; but my suggestion apparently does not meet with the approval of some hon. members opposite, although it proved a solution on a former occasion when a large amount of unemployment existed. I have no hesitation in saying that, if this policy were pursued under the present conditions, a large amount of settlement would take place to the benefit of the State and the relief of a large number of men who to-day are unemployed.

Mr. CONROY: Do you think that those men would make good settlers?

HON. J. G. APPEL: They did before, and I have no doubt they would do so again. There is a certain number of men who are unemployable, but the majority of men desire to be employed.

Mr. CONROY: Not as settlers.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is the hon. gentleman's view; but I do not know what his electorate would be were it not for the settlers on the land. The hon. gentleman has an object lesson in his own electorate. As I say, it seems a very hard thing when men can be seen going about, unable to obtain work.

Mr. CONROY: They would not all make good settlers.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We admit that; but the very fact of settlement would stimulate employment. It is very disheartening to see men walking about unable to get work, although willing to work. Who jeer at them?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The Opposition.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Why, then, did a deputation from the unemployed wait on the Leader of the Opposition to gain his sympathy? Is it not a fact that the present Administration have dismissed more men than any previous Government?

Mr. HANLON: That is untrue.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The Government say they are "deflating" men, but I do not suppose it matters very much to the poor unfortunate man whether he is told his position is brought about by sacking or by deflating. The fact remains that he is out; that he gets very little sympathy from the Government, and is prompted to wait upon the Opposition to ask for their assistance.

In common with other hon. members, I received a communication from a correspondent in connection with mineral leases on the Mount Cannindah mineral field. The writer pointed out that the warden recommended that the leases should be granted, but they were refused by the Minister. The leaseholders who did not carry out the labour conditions have had the leases restored to them, and are still not carrying out the labour conditions. My correspondent points out that they—I think there are two or three of them connected with it—were prepared to carry out the labour conditions and provide work for the required number of men in connection with those leases. Yet the present Administration, who profess to represent the workers of this State, have tied up those leases, and, in consequence, men who,

under the regulations of the Mines Department, would be employed, are, in effect, unemployed. These are things we have to discuss, because it is by careful attention to these matters that unemployment may be reduced.

To summarise, I suggest a reduction in the number of members of this House from seventy-two to fifty.

The Government should induce people to settle on the land by reintroducing homestead selection at 2s. 6d. an acre, making the conditions attractive to people, giving them every facility and providing every means by which labour can be employed.

Mr. O'KEEFE: What you advocate would mean more unemployment.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Mineral leases are tied up because they happen to be held by a wealthy class of men. Bona fide men were prepared to take up these leases, subject to the approval of the Minister, and were prepared to work these leases and employ the quota of men required by the Mines Department, and they were refused. And now the hon. members interject, "That would create unemployment." Of course, the action of the Minister is creating unemployment. I dare say the hon. member who interjects is not sympathetic towards the unemployed. I confess that I am, because it must be the bitterest thing in life for a man who desires work if he cannot obtain it. The hon. member for Wynnum gave instances whereby, owing to the action of militant unions, men were refused admission into the unions, and were thereby compelled to join the ranks of the unemployed. I am a unionist myself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What union?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am a member of the union of the legal profession. Of course, before admittance to that union you have to pass an educational qualification. I admit that, but with the unions to which the hon. member refers it is a question of the payment of a fee, and it is a question of whether it suits the members of that union to allow anyone to come in and get employment. If unionism is to be pure, then every man should have the right to join a union. We all know that in some cases the amount charged for an admission ticket ranges up to as much as £10.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Where?

HON. J. G. APPEL: In Queensland.

Mr. FERRICKS: In the lawyers' union.

HON. J. G. APPEL: It is more than that in my union. In connection with these other unions it is not a question as to how efficient a man may be. In the union to which I belong, if you show your efficiency, you are admitted. The trade unions to which I have referred practically take away a man's right to work. The right to work should be inherent in every man, yet it does not exist in Queensland to-day. That is another cause of unemployment in this State of ours.

In addressing myself to this subject I have not indulged in any personalities. It is a matter which should be above personalities. Every member of this House should be concerned in finding work for the unemployed—not some panacea by which you find a bit of work here and a bit of work there, and then find, when the money is expended, that the unemployment still exists. My desire is that

the House and the Administration should address themselves to the question of solving the whole problem of unemployment—not for the moment, but for all time—and the only way to do that is by settlement of the people on the land.

One hon. member opposite interjected, "Why not perpetual leasehold?" What country possesses the most patriotic people in Europe? We know that it is France. And why is it so? It is owing to the freehold in land possessed by the small peasant proprietors, who esteem that land as their most valuable possession.

Mr. BRUCE: Which they got after the French Revolution.

HON. J. G. APPEL: They did, and apparently we shall need to have a revolution here before people can get freehold land; and the quicker we have that revolution and the sooner those despots who have decided that no man in Queensland shall get a freehold are swept away, so much the better for the State of Queensland.

The question of Communism has been brought up. Is it not a fact that prior to the last election the hon. gentleman who leads the present Administration said there was no Communism in Queensland? What did he say the other day? He said that, if necessary, he would introduce legislation so that Communists who were doing so much injury to the community should be controlled. The Premier has got his party to heel—there is no doubt about that. I remember the time when members of the party opposite said they believed in Lenin—they were Bolsheviks—but now we never hear a word about it. The Premier has got them absolutely at heel. They are the most servile party that ever sat behind a Government. They will swallow anything. I would like to know why this is so. The party opposite at election time and other times say, "Give us your policy!" I say to them, "Give us your policy!" Can any one say that this rag-tag and bob-tailed list of nothing but amending measures—I see there is that little innocent again—the amendment of the Stamp Duties Act—is a policy?

The hon. member for Herbert spoke about middlemen. Probably the hon. member for Herbert is more successful financially as a middleman than the hon. member for Wynnum. That is the funny [4.30 p.m.] part of it. He also spoke about infantile mortality. Of course, it is ridiculous for any Government to claim that they alone are responsible for humanitarian measures. All these enactments providing for the care of our children were initiated by the previous Administration. In the same way they initiated our education system. But there is no particular merit to be ascribed to the Administration of which I was a member for having established the University of Queensland, and such fine technical and other schools; and to say that any party is responsible for these things is a fallacy. The same remark applies to our benevolent institutions, although I can say that they are not now carried on in the same way as they were under the Administration of which I was a member.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They do not feed them on green peas.

HON. J. G. APPEL: They do not get any peas at all, green or otherwise. The Secretary for Public Instruction—who is my

*Hon. J. G. Appel.]*

personal friend—is sympathetic in the administration of his department, but he is only carrying out the policy which must be carried out by any party.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And you call this Speech a rag-tag and bob-tail policy.

HON. J. G. APPEL: This list of amendments? That is the very thing we are all complaining of. We are not allowed the opportunity of amending measures in this Chamber, so every session the Administrations come along with a list of amending Bills. Here we have them this year—a Land Act Amendment Bill, a Hospitals Act Amendment Bill, a Nurses' Registration and Massours Act Amendment Bill, and so on. Is that a policy? It is not. We hear people outside asking Opposition speakers, "Give us your policy!" I stand here and say, "Here is your policy in black and white." I have heard the Premier speak. I have heard other members on the other side speak. Why, the whole thing is a glorification of themselves and what their party have done. They have actually got a surplus of £10,000 odd! Fancy that! Ten thousand pounds! Wonderful! Then the Premier goes back to the beginning of government in this State, and says that our deficits—and he includes the deficits of every party, whether the Squatter Party or Liberal Party—and without allowing anything for the fact that Queensland was not then in the financial position it is in to-day—he says that our deficits were greater than the deficits of his Government.

The present Government have doubled taxation; they have increased the loan indebtedness of the State by 100 per cent.; the railways, whether rightly or wrongly, have become a burden instead of an asset, and will become a greater burden unless their administration is left entirely to the Commissioner. I am not saying that the Commissioner should have control of the policy in connection with the railways, but, unless the railways are left entirely to his control, they will become a still greater and greater burden. The railways have to compete with motor transport competition, which must involve the railways in a tremendous loss of revenue. Still, there must be correlation between the Main Roads Commission and the Railway Department. We witness motor cars running along the main highways adjacent to railway lines in open competition with the railways. The railways are the property of the people; the people have to pay for them; and some mention of this problem might well have been included in the policy speech of the Administration. What do the Administration propose to do in connection with the serious competition to which they are subject in motor transport?

MR. O'KEEFE: What are the farmers doing in Victoria?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I know that the Labour Premier in Victoria proposes to control motor traffic. The farmers live away from the railways, and have to use motor trucks to bring their produce to the lines. I am referring to the traffic, for instance, from Brisbane to Grafton and the New England district. I cannot understand why our own people are refused a license for motor bus passenger service to Tambourine Mountain when the Lismore-New England Bus Company—practically a foreign company in open competition with us—can secure a

license. These are all matters that we must discuss and reserve for consideration of hon. members, because, more or less, they have some effect on the question of unemployment.

There are a lot of other matters I should like to discuss, but where are they? It is very hard to discuss the policy of an Administration when the whole policy is entirely one of amending legislation. There should be placed before this Chamber a programme of value and of progress—one tending to relieve unemployment and settle our land; but all that is contained in this policy speech is a programme of amendments of small Acts of Parliament. Now I say to hon. members opposite, "Give us your policy!" They cannot go outside this Speech. That is their policy; and I wish the electors of the State to know what exactly is the policy of this Administration. More or less they are grinding all that they can out of the electors. They are grinding taxation from the man on the land, putting all the burden they can upon the man on the land, and at the same time doing nothing to assist or encourage him. They are thus by their actions creating an army of unemployed in Queensland.

MR. HANLON (*Ithuca*): I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Albert advocating a reduction of members of Parliament in Queensland. This Labour Party reduced the number of parliamentarians in Queensland some few years back, and had to do so in the face of bitter hostility from the hon. member and those hon. members associated with him. The Labour Party also had the pleasing distinction of reducing the strength of the hon. member's party in this House from forty-eight members to twenty-nine, and one would think, after that very drastic reduction, that he would be satisfied with regard to a reduction of representatives. However, I am pleased to see that, after years of bitter hostility to the action of the Government in so reducing the number of legislators in Queensland, the hon. member is at last converted.

The hon. member for Albert also made the statement that the Government were "sacking" enormous numbers of men.

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

MR. HANLON: The hon. member could not have been paying attention when the Premier was speaking on Thursday evening last. The Premier then gave the number of employees employed by the Government during the past financial year as compared with the previous financial year; and those figures disclose that something over 100 more men are now employed than were employed in the previous financial year. Had the hon. member been paying attention to what the Premier was saying, he would not have made the rather absurd statement I have just referred to.

It came somewhat as a surprise to me to hear the Leader of the Opposition base his amendment, which has for its purpose the censuring of the Government, upon the unemployment existing in Queensland to-day. During the previous two sessions of this Parliament the Leader of the Opposition made a fierce attack on the administration of the Government because it had shown a deficit on the previous year's transactions. Much to the disgust of the Leader of the Opposition and his associates, the Treasurer was able at the end of the last financial

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

year to show a surplus. We can consequently understand the rather peevish mood with which hon. members opposite approach this motion. I would refer the Leader of the Opposition and hon. members opposite to the leading article appearing in the "Courier" on 3rd July last. This article, which dealt with the financial position as disclosed at the end of the financial year, stated—

"The end of the financial year finds most of the Governments of Australia in the financial rapids, endeavouring to live upon losses. The detailed figures are not yet available, but, in round numbers, the Commonwealth has a deficit of £3,000,000; New South Wales has a deficit of more than £1,000,000; Victoria is unable to balance its books by a considerable amount; and South Australia is in such a bad way that its Treasurer is proposing to ask the Commonwealth for a special grant to enable that State to pay its way. The position is thoroughly disquieting, and shows that the different Governments, despite all the warnings they have had from financial authorities, have been blind to the signs of the times and deaf to the logic of events."

It is a lengthy article, but concludes in these words—

"Although the expenditure is still too high and the taxation crushingly excessive, Mr. McCormack has done what every good Treasurer is expected to do—he has balanced his books."

When the leading morning journal of Queensland pays a compliment to the Labour Treasurer for having done what it considers every good Treasurer should do, one is rather surprised to find that the presence of a surplus in the last financial year has caused such disgust and disquietude on the part of members of the Opposition.

Listening carefully to the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition, so far as I could gather, the only reason which he could definitely put forward as to why there were so many men unemployed in Queensland at the present time is his statement that it is the result of the taxation policy of this Government. If that is the case, it is rather difficult to understand how the people of other States are bearing their burden of taxation, when we find in recently issued statistics from the Commonwealth Statistician that Queensland has by far the lowest number of unemployed on a population basis of any State in the Commonwealth. The official report gives the number of unemployed in Queensland at 7.1 per cent., the next lowest to Queensland being Western Australia with 9.5 per cent., and the average for Australia as a whole being 11.2 per cent. In looking into these figures we should be able to see quite easily that they are more favourable to Queensland than would appear on the surface, because the figures are based upon the number of unionists unemployed. With the extensive preference to unionists which is granted in Queensland, it is probable that a greater proportion of the workers of Queensland are unionists than is the case in any other State; consequently it is easier to trace the number of the unemployed. Furthermore, the introduction of unemployment insurance relief in Queensland enables a more accurate return to be obtained of the unemployed in this State than in other State of the Commonwealth;

and, as I say, the Queensland position is even more favourable than the figures disclose.

I do not believe that taxation is the sole cause of unemployment in Queensland; I doubt if even the Leader of the Opposition believes that it is any great factor. Still, I am satisfied we have to look a little further for the cause of unemployment than in the taxation policy of this Government. Reading the daily press one becomes aware that unemployment is a problem in almost every country in the world—in America, Great Britain, France, New Zealand, and in other States of Australia. Only yesterday a New Zealand visitor in an interview admitted that New Zealand had a serious unemployment problem. Unemployment, unfortunately, exists in all these countries. According to the Leader of the Opposition, in none of these countries does taxation exist to such an extent as it does in Queensland. That, of course, is merely his opinion; but, on his own argument, it is clear that taxation can have nothing to do with unemployment, because in Queensland, which he claims to be the most heavily taxed State in existence, unemployment is not so severe as in other countries. If there is an unemployment problem here, it means that people engaged in some one or other of the industries of Queensland are out of work, and, if people engaged in those industries are out of work, then it follows that for the time being those industries are not prosperous. Now, a great portion of the industries of Queensland consists of agricultural and pastoral undertakings; and we know perfectly well that during the last two years the agricultural and pastoral industries of Queensland have had a very lean time indeed through drought. The result has been that large numbers of people ordinarily engaged in pastoral pursuits have been thrown upon the unemployed market, and, of course, have come into the city seeking work.

Large numbers of men also are unemployed who should be employed in the manufacture of goods. Despite any argument put forward by hon. members opposite, the State Government can have very little influence upon manufactures in Queensland. The condition of the manufacturing industries, not only in Queensland but throughout Australia, is such as to cause a good deal of concern to anyone who wishes to see Australia a self-contained nation.

The troubles in the manufacturing industries are not confined to Queensland, but exist throughout the Commonwealth. The main cause of stagnation in manufacture in Australia is the policy of the Federal Government. The lack of adequate protection by the Federal Government is the main factor in the stagnation of manufactures in the Commonwealth. The actions of this Government have very little effect on manufactures in Queensland. The only way they can have any effect is by the very generous meed of preference which they give to Queensland industries. In many cases the Queensland Government pay vastly higher amounts than are necessary in order to give preference to local industry. That is the only way in which the actions of this Government can have any effect on the manufactures of the Commonwealth. I think an hon. member interjected some time ago that we need a more highly protective tariff in Australia. High tariffs do not make for protection. It is quite possible to have an excessively

*Mr. Hanlon.]*

burdensome tariff without giving any protection to industry, and that has been one of the causes of industrial stagnation in Australia. A high tariff is one method of nursing an industry. That has been the policy of the Federal Government as long as the present Administration have been in power. Upon a case being made for increased protection to an industry an increased duty is recommended by the Tariff Board, and subsequently comes into operation; but that increased duty affords no protection to the industry, because immediately the Federal Government increase the duty upon any article manufactured here the manufacturers and dealers immediately raise the price correspondingly, and the protection automatically disappears.

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL: Competition brings the price down again.

Mr. HANLON: Competition does not bring the price down once the manufacturers put it up. The press, not only in Queensland but in the other States, has been continually commenting on this aspect of the case. An application is made for an increased duty, and immediately that increase is granted the price of the article is increased, and the protection thereby disappears; and then a complaint arises because the workers engaged in that industry seek to procure a small proportion of the increased profits going to the industry. That has been the endless cycle, and the Brisbane "Telegraph" on 9th July, referring to the tariff, said this—

"Tariffs to shut out oversea competition are of little value to him because every fresh protection is taken advantage of to squeeze out of industry further concessions in the way of pay and better conditions. The arbitration courts have listened to their pleas all too sympathetically for the workers' own ultimate good, and their last state is worse than their first."

The reason the employees approach the court for an increase in wages or an improvement in conditions is because they know that, immediately the tariff is increased upon an article manufactured here, the price of that article automatically increases, and they know that the industry is in a position to pay them more. The consumers—the people of Australia—are not such uneducated dunces nowadays as to allow an industry to be subsidised and the employer to get away with the whole of it. They are not dense. They see through these tricks, and immediately put in their claim for a share in the profits in the industry. There was a time when the workers were so unawakened to their own condition that this sort of thing could be put across them, but nowadays every man and woman in the Commonwealth knows that, if £1 is paid in customs duties, it is £1 taken out of the pockets of the people, and there must be a reason for paying that £1. If it is going to assist an industry which will give employment to Australian citizens, they do not begrudge the £1, but if the £1 is being given to increase the profits of certain manufacturers, the people object to it and put in a claim for a share of the amount. If the manufacturers of the Commonwealth are going to get any protection from the tariff, it must be so regulated as to encourage the industry—not to encourage the pockets of the proprietors. That is the

[Mr. Hanlon.

difference in the point of view of hon. members opposite, who say we have a protective tariff, and hon. members on this side, who say that the Commonwealth tariff is not protecting industry.

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL: That is not what Mr. Scullin said, anyhow.

Mr. HANLON: We find that ability to tell the Government how to run their businesses is not confined entirely to members of the Opposition. Outside this House there is a great number of people who can tell the Government how to run their business—what the Government should do and should not do. People who have made a failure in the running of their own businesses generally give advice to the Government as to how to run their business. One of those persons who freely gives advice to the Government of Queensland is the Mayor of Brisbane. With all due respect to the mayor, I do not believe there has been any officer administering any public service in Australia who has made such an awful mess of his own job as the present mayor has.

Mr. FRY: What job do you mean?

Mr. HANLON: Administering the affairs of the City of Brisbane. He has made such a thundering mess of his own job that he is anxious to get out at any price and leave the cleaning up to somebody else.

Mr. FRY: The Labour councils left him a difficult position, which they themselves could not handle.

Mr. HANLON: The mayor bought himself into a difficult position. He went before the people of Brisbane, and told them that he was going to give them all sorts of good things in his administrative capacity, and he was not going to tax them to pay for it. The position to-day is that the money has to be paid. He has to break his word to the people of Brisbane and put their rates up to ls., after saying that he would not increase them, or else admit that he is a "holy frost." He is retiring at the earliest possible moment, leaving the job to some other unfortunate person who did not make the promises to come in and clean up the mess.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is not true.

[5 p.m.]

Mr. HANLON: The position of the mayor reminds me of a story of a North of Ireland chap who used to tell me about a confectionery business which he had. He wanted somebody to boil the sugar for the confectionery, and he put a notice in his window asking for a sugar-boiler. A fat, unkempt man came in and applied for the position. The owner asked him his name, and the man replied, "I am Smith, the sugar-boiler." He said, "Can you boil sugar?" The man replied, "What! Have you never read the newspapers? Don't you know who Smith, the sugar-boiler is?" And he so impressed this chap that he engaged him to boil the sugar and make the confectionery. He put him on the job, and the man filled up the pot with sugar and the other ingredients, whatever they are, that go to the making of lollies. While the pot was boiling he took a few little nips out of the bottle and got "shot," and the pot boiled over. When his employer returned and saw the result, he said, "Good heavens, old man, what sort of a mess is this?" and the fellow looked at it and said, "My God, it's a pudden"—

(laughter)—and walked out. That is the position the Mayor of Brisbane is in to-day, he is the sugar-boiler who made a "pudden," and now wants to leave it to someone else to clean up.

But the ability to give advice to the Government is not confined even to the Opposition and the Mayor of Brisbane. We find the manufacturers and other commercial people everlastingly giving advice to them as to what they should do. I looked very anxiously in the paper this morning to see what wonderful plan for the relief of unemployment and the improvement of business and manufactures had been devised at the conference of the Chambers of Commerce in Maryborough. I thought, "Surely this band of brilliant, trained business men—men with capital locked up in their industries, about which we hear so much from the Opposition—surely they, when the McCormack Government have failed to devise some scheme for the improvement of industry, will be able to lift us out of the trouble we are in!" So I looked up the report in the paper, and I found that practically the whole of their business was to ask the Government to do things for them. Certainly, one of their criticisms was that we were wrongly paying sustenance to unemployed workers, and that we should make them go out and work. It was a sin, in the estimation of these people, that they should get that money without having to work. Fundamentally there is something in their argument. The men should be entitled to their sustenance—not a partial sustenance but full sustenance—but they should also be entitled, as a means of getting it, to work. That is logic, but to suggest that men who are drawing a bare existence from the fund—to which they have paid something themselves—should be asked to go out and work for it is ridiculous, and specially ridiculous coming from people who spend the whole of their own lives in asking for something from the Government. Their first request yesterday was to ask the Government to investigate the redwater disease in cattle. "Will the Government take the responsibility?" they ask. There is no suggestion that private enterprise or these commercial magnates or geniuses should put their brains together to investigate anything. Yet it is an investigation for their benefit, although it is to come from the public purse.

The next resolution was in favour of giving preference to Queensland goods. That is quite all right, and I shall have something to say on that at the end of my speech, because it is a subject on which I like to speak. The third request is for increased exemption from gift duty—getting out of some responsibility. Number four was that the Government should introduce legislation to bring into operation the Federal housing scheme. The housing of the people of Queensland is one of the functions of government which has been looked after pretty well by the present State Government. The fifth request was to build another railway—to look after the profits of some little group of individuals. The sixth had to deal with the improvement of the education system, which has been continuous since this Government took office. The seventh was in favour of the amalgamation of the Federal and State rolls on the score of economy. What that had to do with the work of chambers of commerce I am a little bit fogged about. The eighth was a request to assist the timber industry; and the ninth and tenth were to set

the seal of their approval on fixed Easter and Anzac Day holidays.

That was the sum total of the work done by the associated Chambers of Commerce conference at Maryborough. Full of advice to the Government, the president in his presidential address gave all sorts of advice about controlling the railways and carrying out various functions; but no suggestions to improve the condition of business or manufactures or commerce of Queensland. That was never put forward.

I wish to deal with the second motion carried—the desire to give preference to Queensland manufactured goods. Since the establishment of the Queensland Preference League I have given every assistance in my power, as I regarded the league as a rather fine idea, if we could by propaganda awaken the people of Queensland sufficiently to their own interests and encourage them as much as possible to purchase Queensland manufactured goods. I was asked by the Queensland Preference League to speak at several meetings, which I did. I was also sent along as their delegate to the dinner given by the Chamber of Manufactures. I notice the Deputy Leader of the Government smiling. He was present at that dinner also. Sitting there listening to what took place that evening, one could almost realise what was wrong with the manufacturers of Queensland. They spent the whole evening abusing the Government and delivering political speeches. Almost every speech could be classed as a speech delivered by a political aspirant. They required unlimited concessions from the Government, and were full of advice as to what the Government should do. There was not one sound suggestion as to what the business people and the manufacturer could do to improve the condition of their manufactures—not one suggestion as to improving their own particular business. They were simply bursting with advice to the Government as to how they should manage their business, and begging for all sorts of concessions from the Government. Incidentally I might state that the guests at the dinner were regaled with South Australian wine, and imported matches were strewn all over the table, whilst a loud boast was made that the menu was made entirely in Queensland. The idea of the league is a sound one. It is to encourage as much as possible the purchasing of Queensland goods; but it is not going to get anywhere so long as the people are interested in the Queensland Preference League only from their own little industry viewpoint. The manufacturer who joins the league and subscribes to it must look a little wider than his own little shop or factory. His particular little shop or factory is not Queensland industry; and it is no use a Queensland soap manufacturer wearing a pair of boots manufactured in the South getting up and abusing a boot manufacturer for using Southern soap; and that is really what the league is coming to. One man requires all the preference in the world to be given to his manufactures; but he is not prepared to extend any preference in a reciprocating spirit, and, while the league is based on that idea, we cannot get anywhere. I have listened to many speeches delivered at meetings on behalf of the Queensland Preference League, exhorting the people to buy Queensland manufactured goods, and pointing out that it is their duty to do so. We admit that. The duty that we owe to the manufacturers is to buy their goods; but

*Mr. Hanlon.]*

we also say that there is a duty on the part of the manufacturers to the citizens of Queensland; and that is to give the best possible article at the cheapest possible price to the people of Queensland. If we are going to go out of our way to subsidise their industries, we are not doing it with any idea of making individual manufacturers rich. The people of Queensland are prepared to pay, provided they get service from the manufacturers; but, when we see such inefficient service rendered by many Queensland manufacturers, we realise what is wrong with our Queensland Preference League, and we realise why the league is necessary.

We find that the manufacturers of Queensland do not take advantage of the fact that they are a lot nearer the people they are serving here, and that they should be able to produce an article a shade cheaper. One of our modern manufacturers complained of competition from New South Wales. They have a modern factory, and should be able easily to undersell the article produced in New South Wales. Yet we find that the class of goods they manufacture were last year manufactured in Rockhampton, sent to Brisbane, and sold  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cheaper than the Brisbane manufactured article. There is something wrong there. The people of Brisbane are quite prepared to tax themselves to support Queensland industries, but they realise that there is something wrong when they see that fact for themselves. They expect the manufacturers to carry out their duty to the citizens of Queensland, and I do not think they will find the public of Queensland lacking in appreciation if they render the service necessary.

Before I conclude I wish to say a word about the real undercurrent that is running through the propaganda both in this House by the Opposition and outside through the newspapers and public meetings in favour of a general wage-cut in Queensland. The hon. member for Sandgate visited my electorate last week. I was very pleased to see him there, and I give him a cordial invitation to come along again and amuse the inhabitants at any time he thinks fit. There was a very large crowd—I understand six or seven people—at the meeting. I am very thankful to the hon. member for coming along and entertaining them. During the evening he made a great cry over the proposed co-operative board, which he said would consist of an employer, a representative of the employees, and also a representative of the general public, and that the functions of this board were to give relief in taxation to industry and to give such other relief as may be necessary. Possibly the hon. member for Sandgate had just heard of this co-operative board business. We on this side heard of it a good while ago. It is pretty old propaganda; but it is absolutely apparent to anyone that a real campaign is being organised for a wage-cut, and that this wage-cut is supposed to take place immediately following the next Federal elections. The Federal Prime Minister and members of the Opposition outside are careful to be very guarded in the matter, and do not commit themselves, because, with their usual courage, they first want to see what the possibilities are. There is no doubt that the plot is there. We have a delegation—one of the numerous delegations which are coming to Australia from the old country—visiting Australia at the special invitation

[Mr. Hanlon.

of the Prime Minister. That delegation is coming from England where it is already announced there has been "a triumph in common sense." That is a cut of nearly £2,000,000 in the wages of the railway men, and a gentleman intimately associated with the wage reduction campaign there is coming along with the delegation. Without awaiting for that delegation to arrive in Australia I can tell exactly what its members are going to say. They will say that, in order to give industry in Australia a chance, there must be a reduction in wages. Stanley Bruce knows what they are going to say, and I know, too; but it is much safer for him to bring someone from overseas, over whom the electors have no control, to say these things for him.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where is your Arbitration Court?

Mr. HANLON: That wage-cut will come about, provided the Federal Government get through the next election. The hon. member for Toowoong interjected "Where is your Arbitration Court?" That court will have no power to prevent a cut in wages, if the Federal Government decide that such a cut shall take place.

\*We have already seen where the employers in the shipping industry have forcibly brought the waterside workers of Queensland under a Federal award, although that body has worked amicably under an award of the State court, and has no fault to find with the Board of Trade and Arbitration here. As a matter of fact, the waterside workers are doing their best to stay within the jurisdiction of the State court, but, against their wishes they have been dragged under an award of the Federal Arbitration Court. That is only the first case, and it remains to be seen how far it is going to extend. I wish to warn the people of Queensland particularly that the wage-cut is in the air, and they should be prepared to meet it.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is your slogan, but it is not true.

Mr. HANLON: No member of the Opposition has shown any other way in which he is going to relieve industry or cheaper production than by cutting wages. On every occasion hon. members opposite hold forth about the impossibility of Australian manufacturers competing with production from other countries on account of our high wage cost. Their constant cry is: "High wages are the cause of every trouble in this country." On every occasion they deal with Australian industries they moan about the high cost of wages. I would remind hon. members that in these days of machinery and scientific handling wages have not such a big effect on the cost of production as hon. members opposite would have us believe. Nevertheless, the constant cry is, "High wages! High wages!" The Opposition say that we shall have to get cheaper production in order to compete with goods from overseas. It does not need much reasoning ability to be able to connect this so-called high wage cost with the cheapening of production which is being advocated.

Mr. MOORE: Did you not cheapen production at the Bowen State coalmine by the introduction of piecework?

Mr. HANLON: I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remark. The people of Queensland are going to resist, and I, too, will

resist as far as possible, any attempt to reduce the conditions of the people of this State to the conditions obtaining in coolie and black labour countries. It may be quite possible for the manufacturers and importers to show substantially increased bank balances if they are granted a reduction of wages in industry; but, as a Queenslander, I object to any attempt to reduce the conditions of life of the people of this State; and to the best of my ability I will endeavour to prevent any reduction in the standard of living enjoyed by the people of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

Resumption of the debate made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

---