

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 29 AUGUST 1928

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

that the conditions be modified in accordance with recognised health procedure.

"2. The responsibility of testing constitutionally the action of the Victorian Government is upon the meat companies or the cattle owners who have a direct interest in the restrictions. Some years ago a similar situation arose between New South Wales and Queensland, and the people vitally concerned in that case did not ask the Government to take action, but immediately had the question decided before the High Court with satisfactory results to themselves."

I wish further to add that since framing the answer to the question, I have heard from Victoria that the question has arisen in that State as to whether the Government have the necessary power to enforce the regulations. That may or may not be true. All I can say is that the Government of Queensland do not desire to have a controversy with another Government, because there are other issues involved. Victoria buys large quantities of goods from Queensland besides meat, and we do not want to have a dispute between the two Governments.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: We buy large quantities of goods from them also.

The PREMIER: We do, and we do not want retaliatory measures. I was advised this morning from Melbourne that the position is a little more hopeful.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

COMMODITY BOARDS AND DIRECTOR OF MARKETING.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"1. On what Commodity Boards constituted under the Primary Producers' Organisation Act is the Director of Marketing appointed a member?

"2. What was the total amount of his fees and expenses paid by each such board during last financial year?

"3. What amount has the Government received to date from this source?

"4. Has a board any power to dispense with his services?"

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

"1. Arrowroot, Atherton Tableland Maize, Northern Pig, Butter, Broom Millet, Canary Seed, Cheese, Cotton, Egg, and Peanut Boards."

"2. £132 7s.

"3. £132 7s.

"4. No. The Act provides that the Minister shall appoint a representative to each board exercising marketing functions. This officer's services are much appreciated by the boards. Opposition, however, is sometimes raised for political and other reasons by people who are really opposed to this system of co-operative marketing."

GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO FARMERS OWNING PURE BRED BULLS.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

"In view of his statement in the press of 13th June last that the Queensland

WEDNESDAY, 29 AUGUST, 1928.

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

QUESTIONS.

VICTORIAN GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS RELATING TO QUEENSLAND CHILLED BEEF SOLD IN VICTORIA.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*) asked the Premier—

"1. Will he inform the House what steps he has taken to prevail upon the Victorian Government to amend their regulations relating to Queensland chilled beef being sold in Victoria?

"2. Failing satisfactory negotiations, will he take steps to have the validity of the regulations tested in the High Court of Australia?"

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

"1. The Queensland Government has pointed out to the Victorian Government that it considered the action in imposing harassing conditions, in the form of health regulations, upon the sale of meat as unfair and un-Federal and subversive of the best interests of the people of both States, and requested

Government had a scheme providing for grants (limited to £50) to cover half cost of purebred bulls, how many farmers received such grants during last financial year, and what was the total amount of such grants?"

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

"Twenty-one farmers; £497. It is hoped that increased numbers of dairy farmers will take advantage of the subsidy available under this scheme, now that there are prospects of a return to normal seasonal conditions."

APPEALS AGAINST STAFF ARRANGEMENTS IN TAXATION DEPARTMENT.

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

"1. How many appeals, showing also the number of persons concerned, have been lodged in regard to certain recent staff arrangements in the Taxation Department of the State public service?"

"2. Has he any cognisance of the extraordinary state of affairs which has arisen in regard thereto?"

"3. Is it intended to apply the same principle which has caused such appeals to be lodged throughout the whole public service, whether it is allegedly a technical or scientific occupation or not?"

"4. Will he lay on the table of the House a copy of the agreement between the Commissioner and the union?"

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

"1. Forty-eight officers have lodged 425 appeals against the promotions of thirty-eight other officers.

"2. No.

"3. Qualifying examinations are held in connection with many positions in the public service. The principle will be extended to other positions if deemed desirable.

"4. The minutes of the conference between representatives of the Public Service Commissioner, the Commissioner of Taxes, and the State Service Union may be perused by the hon. member at the Public Service Commissioner's Department."

WATERSIDE STRIKES AT NORTHERN PORTS AND LOSSES CAUSED THEREBY.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to the fact that he was mistaken when answering my question on the 22nd—he denied there had been a strike at Northern ports—as the industrial magistrate at Bowen decided there had been an illegal strike in connection with the loading of the 'Port Pirie'?"

"2. Is he aware that—(a) after waiting for three days that vessel had to sail, leaving behind a quantity of sugar and meat, and that, although the shipowners were compelled to pay wages for two hours during which no work was done; (b) no penalty was enforced on those whose illegal action had caused considerable loss through preventing the shipping of a large quantity of primary products?"

"3. Is he aware that at Cairns, owing to a dispute between different gangs of waterside workers, no cargo was loaded on various ships for two days, and that for a week subsequently the work on the wharves was only partially done?"

"4. Has it escaped his notice that the stoppages of work in field, factory, and amongst transport workers which are constantly recurring during the busiest seasons cause an enormous addition to the costs of production. In the case of cane-growers, estimated to amount to 1s. per ton, or upwards of £200,000 annually?"

"5. Has he power under existing legislation to prevent this constant harassing of industry?"

"6. If so, will he take such steps as may be necessary to protect the public in cases where a monopoly of some essential service is granted to a limited number of individuals, and, through refusal on their part to carry on the work they have been given the sole right to perform, heavy loss is caused to the whole community?"

"7. If not, will he introduce legislation for the purpose?"

"8. Is he aware he was in error when informing me that the seamen were under Commonwealth jurisdiction at present, as having incurred the cancellation of their award, they are supposed to be working under an agreement with the ship-owners?"

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

"1. The hon. member is not correct in his assertion. In my answer to his question on the 22nd, I stated that the Registrar had not been notified under section 65 of the Industrial Arbitration Acts, and in doing so dealt specifically with Cairns. At the time, when replying to the hon. member's question, the Industrial Registrar had not received a report from the Bowen magistrate.

"2. The report of the industrial magistrate at Bowen, which only reached the Industrial Registrar on 24th instant, states that the magistrate found that the waterside workers' refusal to work amounted to a strike, but he also found that the shipping companies had wrongly dismissed certain employees two hours before they were entitled to, and he ordered that the men so dismissed be given two hours' pay. The prior illegal action of the shipping company was the cause of the men ceasing work. The hon. member should know that it is not open to any magistrate to impose a penalty for a breach of the Act unless a complaint is made in accordance with the rules of court. It was always open, and is still open, to the shipping company, who were the aggrieved party, to make such a complaint if they wish to prosecute the waterside workers.

"3 and 8. As I previously stated to the hon. member, the union executive at Cairns and the majority of the members at all times offered for work, and did work, whenever the seamen, who are not subject to any award of the Board of Trade and Arbitration, supplied steam. I am still not aware that I was in error in informing the hon. member that the

seamen were under Commonwealth jurisdiction. Surely the fact that the Commonwealth Court cancelled their award shows that they are under Commonwealth jurisdiction. I would be very loth to state that the Commonwealth Court had exceeded its jurisdiction in dealing with the seamen. Does the hon. member ask that the State attempt to override the Commonwealth and restore an award that the Commonwealth Court saw fit to cancel?

"4, 5, 6, and 7. There is ample provision under the existing legislation for employers to prosecute employees who take part in unauthorised strikes if they so desire. The Arbitration Court or industrial magistrates endeavour at all times to use conciliatory methods to settle any dispute or impending dispute. It is hard to understand what the hon. member desires to convey. Is he annoyed because the court has been able to arrange resumption of work without any prolonged stoppages?"

NURSES AND MASSEURS REGISTRATION BILL.

INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make provision for the training, qualification, and registration of nurses and masseurs; and for other purposes."

Question put and passed.

TRAFFIC ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Traffic Acts, 1905 to 1916, in certain particulars."

The Bill is very short. It deals with breaches of the Traffic Acts in relation to the penalties to be imposed for the offence of being found drunk in charge of motor cars. (Hear, hear!) At present magistrates fine such offenders, and we have cases where there has been more than one offence committed by the same person. The magistrate has always had power to suspend the license, but I do not think these powers are sufficient. The Commission of Police has taken power by regulation to the same effect—a cumbersome method—but it is now proposed by this Bill to increase the penalties for that particular breach, and in respect of other breaches to provide penalties which are not already laid down specifically in the Acts.

It is further proposed to provide that, when a person is twice found guilty of being in charge of a car while under the influence of liquor to such an extent that he is not able to control the car, his license shall be automatically cancelled for twelve months, and the magistrate shall be able to sentence him to a term of imprisonment not exceeding three months

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I am rather disappointed to find that this Bill is only designed to serve one purpose. Such a lot of contention has been raised lately about the Traffic Acts that I thought it was going to be more comprehensive than it is.

The HOME SECRETARY: Most of these things can be done by regulation.

Mr. MOORE: I do not know that they can. For instance, there seems to be a doubt whether fruit barrows can be controlled by regulation. We do not know what Act they come under. The Committee of Direction seems to have them under its control to a certain extent, and I thought this Bill was going to make it possible for the Brisbane City Council or the Government to control them. It seems rather extraordinary that we should have dual or even treble control in the Greater Brisbane area in such matters. We have the Committee of Direction licensing fruit barrows in certain streets against the wishes of the Brisbane City Council, and without any control at all by the police. Then we have the parking regulations, and, although the police are expected to enforce the Traffic Act, they have no voice in connection with the regulations under which they are to work in connection with the parking of cars. I naturally thought that the object of the motion would be more comprehensive. I admit that it is a very serious offence to permit drunken motorists to be in charge of vehicles. They are a menace to the public and to the motor industry.

There are many difficulties in connection with traffic matters in the Brisbane area to-day, and, although the Minister says they might be altered by regulation, there appears to be considerable difficulty in securing suitable regulations. There does not appear to be the requisite power granted in proper directions; the trouble apparently being due to divided control.

The HOME SECRETARY: The question of safety zones is a contentious matter, but that can be dealt with by means of regulation.

Mr. MOORE: The control of barrows and matters relating to parking are two very burning questions.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have control of parking.

Mr. MOORE: The Minister may say that the Government have control; but the Brisbane City Council seem to be rather at sea as to whether they have direct control or not. There is nothing definite to indicate whether the parking regulations are to be enforced by the police, or whether the Council should employ their own inspectors. In a place like Brisbane, where traffic control presents some difficulties, principally on account of congestion, it should be made absolutely definite what is legal and what is not; whether certain matters are to be accomplished by regulation or by Act of Parliament; and whether they are to be enforced by the police or by some other authority. We should have some definite understanding rather than continue the present loose method of control.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I strongly support the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. To-day there is considerable misconception respecting Acts of Parliament

Mr. Kerr.]

dealing with traffic matters, and unquestionably the present law requires a good deal of clarification.

The Traffic Acts provide for the imposition of fees and for charges in connection with licenses, registration, and permits. There is also provision for the imposition of licensing and other fees in connection with heavy vehicles, and, in addition, the Main Roads Board provides a schedule of fees.

It is my intention to move an amendment to the motion with a view to securing a more comprehensive Traffic Act than we have to-day. The first Act was introduced in 1905, since when very few amendments have been made. Necessary amendments of traffic laws have been accomplished through a number of other Acts of Parliament, and the Committee to-day should give this matter serious consideration with a view to securing a more comprehensive Act dealing with traffic matters, particularly in the city of Brisbane. I beg to move the following amendment:—

“Omit the words—
‘in certain particulars.’”

The motion will then read—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Traffic Acts, 1905 to 1916.”

To-day the Commissioner of Police is authorised to perform certain duties and to administer the Act; but there is a controversy between the Brisbane City Council and the Home Department as to certain phases of traffic control in Brisbane. The time is fast approaching when the Brisbane City Council will require greater control over traffic matters than they possess to-day.

The HOME SECRETARY: We could give them complete control.

Mr. KERR: No doubt the hon. gentleman would be willing to grant them complete control provided they contributed towards the cost of the services rendered by the police. It has always been the policy of the Government to shift their responsibility in connection with expenditure to some other body. In passing, we have a typical example in the hospital tax of what the Government have done in this connection. By their legislation affecting hospitals they have diverted the taxation for those institutions from the revenue of the State to the land.

The HOME SECRETARY: They have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. KERR: A tax for the upkeep of hospitals has been placed upon the local authorities.

The HOME SECRETARY: No. The Government are responsible. We provide a subsidy for the hospitals.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows that the subsidy for hospitals has been reduced considerably since a number of hospitals were districtised. At one time the Government provided subsidy to the extent of £100,000 per annum for the upkeep of hospitals; but to-day that amount has dwindled down to about £75,000. Who is paying the difference? Proceeds from the “Golden Casket” and the local authorities. That is some relief to the Treasurer. To-day the Government are ready to concede to the Brisbane City Council the control of traffic in the city area provided it pays for

the services of the police. There might be something in that argument if the whole question were examined. The owners of motor vehicles in Brisbane to-day are paying exorbitant fees; and, if those fees were allotted to the centres where they are collected, the Brisbane City Council would be in a position to pay for the services of the police to control traffic.

The HOME SECRETARY: The collection of motor fees and licenses does not come under the Traffic Act. They are provided for under the Main Roads Act.

Mr. KERR: I said at the commencement of my speech that the various Acts dealing with traffic should be thoroughly analysed with a view to evolving a more comprehensive Traffic Act. At the present time it is difficult to obtain a complete knowledge of the traffic laws, as to do so four or five Acts have to be examined. That is the only method by which one can glean who is the authority responsible for this or that, and who is empowered to do certain work. It is a position which can be easily remedied by legislation.

Certain provisions in the Traffic Act can easily be deleted without affecting the Act itself because, as a matter of cold fact, they are not being carried out. Provision is made under the Traffic Acts for the closing of roads by the police and the erection of signs. These provisions might very easily be deleted and these powers placed under the control of the Brisbane City Council or the local authority interested. The police have nothing whatever to do with those duties; still those provisions remain in the Act.

There are other matters which might very well be deleted in order to perfect the legislation. For instance, the Traffic Act provides for the kind of brakes that must be used on tramcars; and there is another provision requiring motormen and conductors on tramcars to obtain licenses. These provisions, which are contained in other Acts, are not being carried out, and are, therefore, quite useless.

The frequent controversies which take place in connection with our traffic problems disclose the fact that the Government have not given the attention they should have done to make the legislation understood. There is altogether too much controversy in regard to these matters. One controversy was in regard to brakes on tramcars. The Brisbane City Council did not intend to put certain brakes on their trams. The Government had power to insist upon certain things being done because specific provision is contained in the Traffic Act. There should not be these over-riding powers in various Acts. The Brisbane City Council run the tramways, and, as they are the responsible body, such provisions should be contained in their charter.

Another controversy which has taken place between the Government and the Brisbane City Council has been in connection with motor taxation. The Government somehow or other are always getting into a controversy with somebody or other. The Mayor of Brisbane, Mr. Jolly, had an interview with the Premier in regard to the matter, and asked for a share of the revenue received from motor taxation, which is now paid to the Main Roads Commission. Mr. Jolly in this connection used

[*Mr. Kerr.*

a very strong argument. He stated that the Brisbane City Council has many hundreds of miles of roads to maintain in their area of 385 square miles. I believe that there is collected in motor fees in the Greater Brisbane area alone a sum in the vicinity of £250,000, and the ratepayers who are responsible for the upkeep of the roads receive no part of that sum.

I have no desire to be parochial this morning; but there are one or two phases of this matter that might very well be considered. Under the Main Roads Act the State is divided into three parts, which share equally in certain moneys collected under that Act. In my opinion the Traffic Act might very well be altered so that the Brisbane City Council would receive a larger amount for the maintenance and construction of roads within its boundaries than it receives at present. It must be realised that the numerous heavy vehicles in use to-day require many factors in road maintenance that would not otherwise be necessary. For example, a wider and better road is required for heavy vehicles, and, in addition to that, sharp turns in the road must be reduced to a minimum. Under the Heavy Vehicles Act the fees collected are paid into a fund in the Treasury, and that money is divided among the various local authorities as the Minister decides. The Traffic Act might be amended to permit of a number of authorities sharing in this money. In New South Wales the local authorities have absolute control of a certain proportion of the motor fees collected in that State, which in round figures amount to £1,250,000. The municipal authorities also are compensated in this respect; and I think the Government here might very well do something to rectify the glaring anomalies which exist at the present time in this State.

The matter of the safety zones has been mentioned, and in that connection I think the Traffic Acts might be more definite. The provision of safety zones has passed the experimental stage; they are an established fact in Sydney and Melbourne. I understand that the previous Commissioner of Police would not agree to the establishment of such zones, and that the present Commissioner is also suspicious as to their efficacy. That is a matter in which the Brisbane City Council might be given greater power than it has to-day. Brass tags have been nailed down in certain streets in Brisbane; but such a proceeding cannot be regarded as establishing a safety zone; neither can the white chalking of the streets to mark safety zones be deemed effective, because it only requires a shower of rain or the passage of a few cars to obliterate these marks. What is required is marking the zones with steel studs firmly embedded in the streets. Such a provision is made in almost every other country, and there is no reason why the Government should hesitate in the matter.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The Government have already agreed upon that.

MR. KERR: Well, let us have some legislation to know just where we stand, because at the present time there are too many regulations governing these matters.

Another matter calling for attention is in regard to the light motor lorries which are particularly noticeable during week-ends. These lorries, which travel at a speed of anything from 18 to 25 miles per hour, are invariably packed with people on holiday

excursions, and are fitted with temporary seats nailed for the purpose. Whilst I have no desire to interfere with the pleasure of people who travel in that way, I do think that some provision is absolutely essential so that the danger line is not crossed by these lorries being overloaded with passengers. The Government should go thoroughly into this matter, because some action in the interests of the safety of the public is necessary.

The noise nuisance is another matter that might be dealt with when considering the traffic laws. Several questions have been asked in this House in regard to noises caused

by traffic, and I believe the Commissioner of Police has received many requests in regard to noises caused by motor cycles owing to the fact that proper exhausts are not provided, but no definite action has been taken in this regard. I turned up the Traffic Act Amendment Act of 1916, in which there is a section which provides that regulations may be made—

“Regulating or restricting and, if necessary, prohibiting the use of noisy brakes on any vehicle.”

The Traffic Act deals with noises caused by brakes, but it does not go any further; and now that we have an opportunity of doing something to regulate those noises which are disturbing the community, nothing is done. I read in the press the other day that in Paris a by-law has been framed prohibiting motor cars from making a noise between certain hours of the night, when people are allegedly asleep—though I understand that many people in Paris get out of their beds at 12 o'clock at night and go to bed at 7 in the morning. During the prohibited hours they are not permitted to go beyond a snail's pace, so that the residents are not disturbed. In Brisbane there are more noises during the night than there are in London or Paris. The noises in the streets to-day are tremendous, and no definite action is being taken to cause a cessation of these noises.

I have moved my amendment with the intention of asking the Home Secretary to see if he cannot co-ordinate the legislation contained in the various Acts so that we can make the Traffic Act what it should be. It badly wants revision, as many of the provisions are out of date, and there are many matters in regard to nuisances that require controlling by legislative action. The opportunity should always be taken by the Opposition of putting forward something constructive; and, if the Minister introduced a comprehensive Traffic Bill, the Opposition would submit amendments that would be of benefit to the whole of the people of Queensland in the matter of traffic control. The Home Secretary should bring down a Bill to cover all these matters. I have tried to show some directions in which the traffic laws can be amended, and, if the opportunity is provided, I shall be prepared to move sufficient amendments to make it a decent measure.

MR. MORGAN (Murilla): While I fully agree with the amendment foreshadowed by the Home Secretary, I think he should have gone further, as further amendments to the Traffic Act are necessary. Only the other day I noticed in the press where an individual had been fined four times for driving while being drunk. He was not brought up on a charge of driving without a license, but he

Mr. Morgan.]

was charged with driving a motor car while under the influence of liquor, and it was stated by the police prosecutor that his license had been cancelled. I want to know why that man was not also charged with driving a motor car without a license. What is the use of merely cancelling a man's license if he is afterwards discovered to have been driving a car? The Minister should withdraw his motion with a view to bringing down an amendment providing that any person who is guilty of negligent driving so as to cause injury to a person on the road and who does not stop to inquire into the matter should be imprisoned without the option of a fine. We should not allow a man of that sort an option in any shape or form. When anyone is so cruel as to knock down an individual on a lonely road in the suburbs or in the country, and does not stop to see whether the person is injured, there should be no optional fine at all when the police secure a conviction. The offender should not be allowed to say whether he will pay a fine of £10 or £20, as the case may be, but should be given six months' imprisonment with the cancellation of his license for all time. Why has the Home Secretary not brought in an amendment of the Act in that direction? It is just as important to amend the Act in the way I have suggested as it is to give a magistrate the discretion to inflict imprisonment without the option of a fine.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): With the Leader of the Opposition, I regret very much that the Minister is confining his attention to one single phase in regard to the amendment of the Traffic Act. Another phase which should be dealt with is the registration of barrowmen, and also the practice which has grown within the last couple of years of shopkeepers utilising a certain portion of the pavement for displaying their goods. This matter has been thrashed out at great length in the public press during the last twelve months. We have been told—and by interjection from the Minister—that this matter is in the hands of the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing, and the order of leave should be extended to deal with this matter. It would be quite simple to amend the Fruit Marketing Organisation Act as well as the Traffic Act, so that the whole question could be placed under the control of the police or of the City Council. The Minister says he is quite willing to allow this matter to be handed over to the City Council if the Council will pay the police. Surely the time has arrived when in the city of Brisbane, with such a large volume of traffic as we have now, something definite should be done to regulate these barrowmen. It is a great hardship to men who have to pay rent and rates and taxes that these barrowmen should stick their barrows in front of their shops and offer fruit and other goods for sale on merely paying a license fee. On the face of it, that is inequitable; and I think the Minister would do well to extend the order of leave so that the police rather than the Committee of Direction would be able to control the barrows.

The HOME SECRETARY: You cannot amend other Acts under this Bill.

Mr. KELSO: Surely another Bill could be brought in concurrently to alter the power of the Committee of Direction to deal with these things. Any Southerner coming here now—and we have a large number of

visitors—is absolutely amazed at the position. Let me illustrate by referring to the barrow at the Australian Mutual Provident corner.

Mr. HANLON: If you have been in Sydney, you must have seen that it is alive with fruit barrows.

Mr. KELSO: The barrow at the Australian Mutual Provident corner is an absolute disgrace. It seems to be a permanent affair. It disfigures the corner of Edward and Queen streets. Go down to Brunswick street, and you will find the place alive with barrows immediately opposite fruit shops. The men who own those shops pay rates and taxes and rent, and have a just grievance, but nothing is done. The City Council want to move these barrowmen, but they have not the authority. The police have been asked to move them, but they say they have not the authority. The Committee of Direction, apparently, does nothing. The fruit barrow may serve a very useful purpose in the suburbs, where it would be constantly on the move; but to allow it to stand in the principal streets of the city in competition with shops is unfair to the people who have to pay rent and taxes and make a profit. The matter has been discussed in the public press for over twelve months, and I would commend to the Home Secretary the extending of the order of leave to deal with the question during the progress of this Bill.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I hope the Home Secretary will make this measure comprehensive. I have been using motor cars ever since they were first available, and it seems to me that the question is being raised as to who is to have control of this traffic. I read in the "Courier" yesterday, or the day before, a paragraph in which the writer asked why motors should be controlled when there were straight roads on which they could do 80 miles an hour.

The HOME SECRETARY: Have you done that?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I have not. I conform to the regulations. As we are having this amendment of the Acts, I hope that the measure will be comprehensive. We have to consider the rights of others than motorists. We have to consider the wayfarers. It seems to me that the people who walk along our roads now are not considered. The motorist appears to have the idea—and I am a motorist—that he possesses the right to the whole road. Take Queen street, for instance. There is a certain amount of regulation to-day; but, instead of cars having to take corners as near as practicable to the left-hand side, they make a wide detour. Only the other day I noticed again the very great danger from such a practice. I have discussed these matters with the Home Secretary, and I can only hope that the Bill will be a comprehensive one. We do not want to interfere with the motorists, but there are other people—people who have no cars—who have to be considered also. If there is to be traffic regulation, then let the regulations be observed. I suggest to the Home Secretary in connection with main roads—they would amply justify the cost of regulations—that there should be proper regulations dealing with those particular roads. Anything that will regulate this traffic will meet with my assent, and I will do all I can to assist the Home Secretary in that connection.

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL (*Toombul*): I think the Minister might accept the amendment moved by the Opposition. There is no doubt that the traffic problem is of such an urgent nature that it would be wise for this Chamber to discuss the whole question in all its aspects, without being tied down to addressing our attention to the inclusion of power to deal chiefly with motorists who are under the influence of liquor. While I am sure that the Committee is quite agreeable to give the traffic authorities every facility for the preservation of the security of the citizens, I think also that we should endeavour to ascertain whether the present Traffic Acts are ample to cover present requirements. We know that it has been the custom for the Government on many occasions to limit discussion to a few amendments of existing legislation; and times out of number the Opposition have objected to what I might term tinkering with the present legislation by attempting to limit discussion to unimportant amendments of legislation introduced from time to time. There is no doubt that many of the Acts on the statute-book require very serious amendment; and the Government should bear in mind that they do not possess the whole of the wisdom of this Chamber, nor do they represent the majority of the electors. On that account, I think it would be wise wherever possible to initiate discussion on cardinal principles rather than confine our attention to a few minor amendments of existing legislation. I commend to the Home Secretary the amendment moved by the Opposition, which will not interfere in any way with his proposal, and probably, if we are enabled to discuss the traffic problem in its entirety, we might be able to suggest amendments that will certainly improve existing legislation.

To-day there is a clash of authorities, particularly between the Brisbane City Council and the Government. The Brisbane City Council constructs and maintains many of the main roads in its own area, but it has no control over the traffic on those roads. The control of traffic is entirely in the hands of the police. The Brisbane City Council intends to submit certain proposals for the consideration of the Government. Those proposals will not altogether come within the category of the Traffic Acts, but are problems involved and very closely interwoven with those Acts. It would be wise for the Minister not only to deal with the Traffic Acts but with those other Acts. The time is opportune for a more thorough investigation of the conditions appertaining to all those Acts. I might cite the Act governing the Committee of Direction and the Main Roads Act. Each of those measures contains anomalies which should be rectified. For instance, the Brisbane City Council quite recently instituted certain parking regulations. Those regulations have been opposed very strenuously by a large section of the community. The whole matter of parking should be controlled by one authority; but whether that authority should be the Brisbane City Council or the police is a moot point. At any rate, we should not have two authorities dealing with the one problem; and, if the opportunity offered, some satisfactory settlement of the present clash of authority could be arrived at. The council is called upon to pay the whole cost of construction and maintenance of the roads in its area; yet the fees derived from motor registration go to another authority. It should be decided whether the Brisbane City

Council shall not receive a proportion of those fees. That is a matter which might be considered when amending the Traffic Acts. Some discussion has also taken place on the question of fruit barrows. The Brisbane City Council has no control over them because their licenses are issued by another authority. The whole question of the control of the streets and the control of the traffic upon them should be placed under one authority, and not be under two or three authorities as at present.

I sincerely suggest that the Minister should allow discussion on all those subjects, and that can only be accomplished by widening the order of leave. If that action is not taken, then only such matters as are specifically dealt with in the Bill can be discussed on its second reading, and any other matters will be ruled out of order. This is an opportunity for the Opposition to impress on the Minister the necessity for widening the scope of this Bill, enabling hon. members to deal with the whole question of the traffic problem. In every large centre of population the traffic problem is a very pressing one, and it is coming to that stage in Brisbane when something very definite will have to be done in the near future to deal with the anomalies which exist here, chief of which is the conflicting interests of different authorities. It is a well-known fact that in the larger centres of Australia the traffic problem is a very pressing one, and it is growing in intensity year by year, and it is difficult to know how to solve it. The Home Secretary is usually very reasonable, and I hope that on this occasion he will listen to our suggestion and give this Chamber the fullest opportunity of bringing forward amendments which will have for their purpose the improving of the present Traffic Acts. The Minister must admit that the proposition he is bringing forward will not improve the Traffic Acts except to deal with a grievance that he considers is not covered by the present regulations. We know that a great number of grievances that exist to-day can be dealt with under regulations, though I am inclined to think that we have too much government by regulation. It is a pernicious practice which should be limited as much as possible, and one of which the present Government have been guilty throughout their career.

The Committee should be afforded the fullest opportunity of discussing not only the main principles that may be covered by a measure but also the regulations to be framed under the measure. Very often the Government frame regulations which, to my mind, are contrary to the wishes of hon. members. The Home Secretary interjected while one hon. member was speaking that many matters referred to at the time could be covered by regulation. If that is so, how is it that the very matter which the Home Secretary is bringing up to-day cannot also be dealt with by regulation? I contend that the hon. gentleman has ample power under the regulations to deal with the matter now under discussion.

THE HOME SECRETARY: That is not so.

Mr. H. M. RUSSELL: Under the present regulations the department has assumed very extensive powers in dealing with matters of a similar nature, and I can see no necessity for introducing a special Bill to deal with the present subject. At any rate, if the hon. gentleman's contention is correct, why

Mr. H. M. Russell.]

waste time in dealing with that matter only? I suggest that the Minister should accept the amendment, so that there will be an opportunity afforded of discussing the whole matter with the object of improving the existing legislation, removing many of the present anomalies, and making the legislation such that the respective authorities will know just where they stand.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): So far the debate has succeeded in doing nothing more than disclosing the ignorance of hon. members opposite who have spoken. The hon. member for Enoggera, for example, said that the Government asked for constructive suggestions. What constructive suggestions have we received? I tried to tell the hon. gentleman on three occasions while he was speaking that the question of safety zones has already been dealt with, and that the police department, in conjunction with the tramways department, has made provision for safety zones at Roma street, the Customs House, and Gray street. It is absurd to suggest that Traffic Acts for all Queensland should contain the provision of safety zones and regulations dealing with fruit barrows in the city of Brisbane. Not one suggestion has been made this morning that is not already covered by the Acts or the regulations framed under the Acts. To suggest that every detail affecting the traffic of Brisbane should be dealt with under the Bill is an absurdity. One hon. member—I think it was the hon. member for Murilla—spoke about motorists who, having knocked down pedestrians, cleared for their lives; and the hon. member wanted to know why these people are not criminally prosecuted. As a matter of fact, they are criminally prosecuted. I might also inform hon. members at this stage that, without passing special legislation on the matter, the Government have made provision under regulations whereby the tail-light on a motor car must be operated by a separate switch, thereby altering the old system under which a driver might switch off his tail light from the driver's seat if he encountered any trouble such as that suggested by the hon. member for Murilla.

At 11.30 a.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17 and Sessional Orders agreed to by the House on 26th July, I shall now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.*

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SEVENTH 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 affec-

[*Mr. H. M. Russell.*

tion 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. FRY (*Kurilpa*), continuing, said: The Government in the past attributed the unemployment to the drought; after that to motor cars; and now to the tariff. I am a high protectionist, and always have been. I believe that we must protect our young industries against competition from the outside world; but I cannot agree that protection is the cause of so much unemployment, and I challenge anyone to prove that to be so. They may assert it, but there is no proof adduced to show that that is so. The tariff applies equally to each State of the Commonwealth, and a comparison will show a great depreciation of Queensland industries, not because of the tariff, but because of the competition of southern manufacturers who are able to produce cheaper than the Queensland manufacturers. Was it the tariff that caused the failure of the State enterprises which were launched under Government supervision under the most favourable conditions, as they paid no taxation and were relieved of large interest payments? What caused their failure? Was it the tariff? No!

Mr. COLLINS: Five out of seven State enterprises are a success.

Mr. FRY: The hon. member should know that his statement is not correct; at a later stage I shall go into details. Within a period of ten years the State enterprises have lost nearly 50 per cent. of the capital invested in them. If that is success, then that is a solution of the unemployed problem. The policy enunciated by the Labour Party is calculated to destroy private industry and cause unemployment; and apparently the State enterprises have done their work in helping to destroy industry and create unemployment.

The State enterprises have been a financial failure, and that has not been caused by the operation of the tariff, but by conditions brought about by the administration of the Government.

Let me compare the movements in industry in the States on the eastern border of Australia—Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria. They all work under the same tariff:—

MOVEMENTS IN INDUSTRIES FROM 1914 TO 1926.

<i>Sawmilling and Joinery Establishments.</i>			
New South Wales (increase)	...	254	
Victoria (increase)	...	255	
Queensland (increase)	...	4	

In Queensland, where we have got all the timber, sawmills and joinery works have only increased by four.

Ironworks and Foundries.

New South Wales (increase) ...	214
Victoria (increase) ...	176
Queensland (decrease) ...	39

Confectionery.

New South Wales (increase) ...	44
Victoria (increase) ...	82
Queensland—No increase.	

Wool, Cotton, and Tweed Mills.

New South Wales (increase) ...	8
Victoria (increase) ...	17
Queensland ...	1

Boot and Shoe Factories.

New South Wales (increase) ...	534
Victoria (increase) ...	259
Queensland (increase) ...	5

Clothing Factories.

New South Wales (increase) ...	67
Victoria (increase) ...	47
Queensland (decrease) ...	4

Furniture and Cabinet-making Factories.

New South Wales (increase) ...	94
Victoria (increase) ...	141
Queensland (increase) ...	16

That decrease in the number of factories in Queensland means a consequent decrease in the number of employees.

In the three years from 1924 to 1927 the value of the output of factories in all the States was—

	£
New South Wales (increase)	19,653,171
Victoria (increase) ...	9,220,553
South Australia (increase)	4,734,476
Western Australia (increase)	1,742,373
Tasmania (increase) ...	262,041
Queensland (decrease)	7,814,863

Then take the factory production increases per head of the population from 1914 to 1927—that is, the period covering the Labour reign in Queensland:—

New South Wales, £40 0s. 3d., showing an increase of 110 per cent.
Victoria, £39 15s. 10d., showing an increase of 115 per cent.
South Australia, £35 8s. 10d., showing an increase of 119.2 per cent.
Western Australia, £21 11s. 8d., showing an increase of 108.9 per cent.
Tasmania, £19 0s. 5d., showing an increase of 101.6 per cent.
Queensland, £7 6s. 10d., showing an increase of 19.5 per cent.

That is under the same tariff, but under different Governments. That is where our trouble comes in; and that is one of the arguments in favour of the adoption of the no-confidence motion of the Leader of the Opposition. The operation of the tariff has nothing to do with the great differences between the States on the eastern border of Australia. If we were comparing Western Australia with Queensland, it might have some bearing because of location and Western Australia's isolation.

Let me mention an impartial body of men, whose sincerity cannot be questioned. A deputation from religious bodies waited on the Premier on 16th March last and presented

to him a carefully drawn-up manifesto. It was the first occasion on which the heads of Christian bodies in this State had combined on any social question. These bodies preach tolerance and love, and inculcate the brotherhood of man, and they are all deeply impressed by the regrettable unemployment existing in our midst. Nobody knows more about the unemployed question than the heads of religious bodies, who are continually in the homes of the people, and to whom the people always go for relief. The deputation consisted of the official representatives of all churches—Protestant and Roman Catholic.

The Catholic "Age" of Saturday, 24th March, 1928, under the caption "Industrial Unrest," printed the following article:—

"Because the authors of the manifesto declared that industrial strife was the cause of much unemployment and suffering at the present time, an evening paper that professes to champion the rights of the worker questioned the fitness of Churchmen to deal with such matters at all and regarded their treatment of the whole subject as superficial. It would be useless to remind a prejudiced press that it is not the first time that Churchmen have not only dealt ably with such matters but intervened successfully and generally on the side of the worker.

"Industry is all right and the workers are all right; but those who hobble both with unreasonable laws and restrictions are all wrong. That is the very thing that has been done in Queensland. Will the writer in the Labour press tell us why it is that industry in Queensland has been waning while our population has been increasing? Where are the factories and workshops we should have? Where has been the establishment of new industries or the expansion of old ones? Where do we see development of our own native industries? For instance, to-day in Queensland mining is practically dead. Who killed it? Who or what has been responsible for killing the tanning industry? We understand that some tanneries have gone out of existence altogether and others are dying. There was a time when boot factories flourished in Queensland. They do not flourish to-day. America comes in and at a swoop purchases all available hides, with a consequent rise to the working man's family of about 5s. a pair in boots. Will the enlightened leader, writer of the Labour press tell us that the tanners are responsible for this? And, as we believe he must admit the fact of the depression if not the death of the industry, will he analyse the matter and put his finger on the cause for us?

"We make bold to say that between the laws that have hobbled industry and the agitator who has stirred up industrial strife the working man of Australia has been a helpless victim."

Those are strong words, but I say they are true words.

We are told about the increase in savings bank deposits by hon. members on the Government side, but they do not give us a comparison with the other States. The savings bank statistics show that Queensland is in an unfavourable position, having dropped from fourth to fifth place in the

Mr. Fry.]

amount of savings per inhabitant, and to the last place in respect of the increase in savings during the period from 1st January, 1915, to 31st December, 1927, the date of the last official figures issued. Those figures reflect the state of the workers' savings; and the Government have been able to bring nothing forward to remove the effect of their actions, or prove that they have not been the cause of the unfortunate position in which many of their supporters find themselves to-day. As the leaders of these people, they professed to be able to lead them into a paradise, but they led them into a prickly-pear paddock. The people they have thus led are realising the difference. They asked for bread, and the Government gave them a stone. The Government have handed them a snake instead of an eel. They have treated them most scandalously, and they have proved themselves unworthy of trust. They said to them, "Let us have the socialisation of industry. Industrial strikes and taxation all hit the men who deserve hitting." But they have found that strikes hit the wage earner, and also that taxation hits the wage earner, for, whilst it is levied on industry, it is passed on till the wage earner has to pay it. They cannot get away from the fact that, when we compare one thing with another, the tariff is a minor matter in comparison with excessive taxes on industry and strikes. I have compared the conditions of factory life in Queensland with those existing elsewhere, and hon. members opposite must admit that the difference is largely due to their administration. Unemployment to-day is worse because of the policy of the Labour Party.

Unfortunately, the party opposite have drifted, having abandoned the policy upon which they came into power, and having grasped and adopted the foreign policy of Communism, the observance of which will surely end in failure. With such a policy they do not know the direction in which they are heading. They are like a blind man feeling his way along a road, then veering to one side, only to meet with disaster. So long as the Government of this State are guided by an evil influence and unwillingly led in certain directions, they must meet with utter failure. There can be no gainsaying the fact that they are being retained in power by the extreme element of the community. On speaking to one of the extreme individuals in the shipping world, he informed me in reply to my remark that the Labour Party would kick out the Communists, "Ah, they cannot do that. The Labour Party have embraced Communism, and we are now going to control the party." I told him that his followers would be all booted out. He replied, "They cannot do that, because we have a grip on the strategical positions in the movement, and at our will we can crush the Labour movement." That influence is having a serious effect on the party to-day.

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

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Merthyr*): I desire to associate myself with other hon. members who have spoken in reference to the deaths of members who occupied their places in this Chamber during the last session of Parliament. I refer to Mr. F. L. Nott, the hon. member for Stanley, and Mr. John Payne, the hon. member for Mitchell.

[*Mr. Fry.*

I was not very well acquainted with the late Mr. Nott; but the little acquaintance I had with him led me to regard him as a very sincere gentleman, and a man of a kindly nature—a nature which endeared him to all members of the House.

It was my privilege to be acquainted with the late Mr. John Payne for a very long time. He was a member of this House when I entered it in 1908; and during the whole time that he occupied a seat in this House it was remarkable how steadfastly true he was to the principles that he espoused. The Labour movement had a strong supporter in him, his political views amounting almost to a religion. I am of the opinion that the House is very much poorer by his demise; but I congratulate the electors of Mitchell upon having sent to take his place a man following faithfully in the footsteps of the late Mr. Payne.

With other hon. members on this side I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should move an amendment of want of confidence in the Government. To me it appears to be purely fireworks on his part, because the hon. gentleman and those associated with him know that they have no possible chance of carrying the amendment. When one considers the record of the Labour Government since their advent to power, bearing in mind that we have been returned to power at every succeeding general election since 1915, when we were first returned to the Treasury benches, one must be convinced that the people of Queensland have entire confidence in the Labour Government; and those facts prove, at all events, that, whatever may be the opinions of hon. members opposite, the people of Queensland are perfectly satisfied with the legislation and administration of this party.

In the results of the by-elections for Mitchell and Balonne there is evidence again of the confidence the people have in the Labour Government and their administration, inasmuch as, when the opportunity came, they returned two Labour men for those constituencies. The Labour party have at all times gone to the people on the platform they stood for, and on a platform that is not in any way hidden. They have not attempted at any time or during any election to cloud the issues as they affected them. On all occasions they have gone to the people on a definite platform, and they were at all times prepared to expound its planks. The people have accepted them as being truthful and honest in their convictions, and they have, as opportunity offered, endeavoured to give effect to their platform. Since the Labour Party came into power in 1915 hundred of measures have been placed on the statute-book, and, if each and every one of them were analysed, it would be found that they all have for their object the advancement of the State of Queensland as a whole, an attempt to improve the conditions of the people, and an endeavour to make this State what in my opinion it is destined to be, the foremost State in the Commonwealth.

The Governor's Speech was very interesting reading to me. It shows to the people who read it what a great State we have. I was particularly pleased to read in the Speech that the Governor has set himself the task of gaining a thorough acquaintance at first hand of the State of which he is Governor. That has been the practice of other Governors, particularly his predecessor, Sir Matthew

Nathan. Not only did Sir Matthew Nathan prove a very excellent Governor and make himself thoroughly acquainted with Queensland and her people, but, since he left here, he has proved himself to be a very fine agent for Queensland. I have read speeches delivered in other parts of the world by him, and he has never missed an opportunity of extolling Queensland as a wonderful State. Our present Governor is following on the same lines, and desires to acquaint himself with the State so that, when he leaves here and goes to some other place, he will be able to speak with first-hand knowledge of what a great State Queensland is.

The following paragraph appears in the Speech in reference to the peregrinations of His Excellency:—

"In my various tours I have traversed more than 12,000 miles by road and rail, and the study of the many and varied conditions and industries of the country has been of intense interest, while the meeting with the people in both town and country districts has afforded me the greatest possible pleasure.

"Although even now I am acquainted with but a comparatively small portion of the State, yet my earlier impressions as to its amazing natural resources and future possibilities are more than fully realised. The cordial greetings which have been accorded to me everywhere have made a very lasting impression on me, and the expressions of loyalty to the throne and person of His Majesty have been universal. I invariably transmit such expressions of loyalty direct to His Majesty."

This is the spirit which should animate all Queenslanders; but, instead, we hear the doleful expressions which we have to listen to sometimes from the members of the Opposition, who cannot say one good word for Queensland.

Mr. MAXWELL: They don't traduce Queensland at all.

Mr. SWAYNE: They have nothing against Queensland; it is the administration we criticise.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Possibly the Opposition are not so well acquainted with Queensland as they should be. This paragraph in the Governor's Speech which I have read clearly shows that the Opposition have no grounds for the statements they make, and I will prove that assertion as I go along.

Mr. MAXWELL: We deal only with the administration of the Government.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I will deal with the hon. member directly. I have listened attentively to the speeches that have been delivered, but have not heard one hon. member opposite who had a good word to say for the State of Queensland. Hon. members opposite may say what they like, but it has been the practice not only of the present occupants of the Opposition benches but of their predecessors never to cease traducing Queensland.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is wrong.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Hon. members may say they are attacking the Government and not the State; but their speeches prove that is not so. When a man who is in a responsible position will not stand up manfully for the State he represents and in which he gets

his living, he seems to me to be a very poor type of individual indeed.

As another instance of what visitors to Queensland think of the State as compared with the murmurings of hon. members opposite, I was interested in reading the remarks of Sir Benjamin Morgan, who recently toured the State. In addressing a meeting of members of the Constitutional Club in Brisbane, that gentleman had this to say with reference to his visit to the Atherton Tableland, as reported in the Brisbane "Courier" of 10th August—

"He was amazed at the possibilities, not only of that area, but of the whole of the districts in the northern part of the State. The one-farm exhibits at the show demonstrated that in these northern areas ten or fifteen different industries could be effectively built up, which would be able to supply Britain with goods that she required."

That is the statement of a man who just casually visited those parts of the State, the productivity of which cannot be questioned. Is it any wonder that persons who take an interest in the State, and who are permanently resident within its boundaries, are constantly espousing the claims of Queensland rather than traducing it? Here is another extract from the speech—

"As the result of my visit to North Queensland, I shall be able to assure those in authority in Britain that you can, without difficulty, increase your supplies of sugar to the Mother Country by 200,000 or 300,000 tons per annum.

"An enormous and profitable industry can also be built up in the export to Britain of orange and lemon juice and grape pulp, which we are at present obtaining to the value of millions of pounds per annum from the Mediterranean countries."

That is a spirit that should animate us all—to be patriotic, and at every opportunity advertise our State. As I said previously in this Chamber, we do not sufficiently boost our State. On the other hand, the speeches of Americans show that they never cease to find opportunities for extolling the country to which they belong. It is a pity that our public men do not more often stand up and shout from the housetops, as it were, the great potentialities and possibilities of Queensland.

I was pleased also to notice a reference in the Governor's Speech to the traffic problem, about which a Bill was sought to be introduced this morning. I hope the measure will provide stringent penalties for motorists who endanger the lives of people by driving motor cars when they are not in a fit condition to do so. Not only are they a source of danger to themselves [12 noon] and the passengers whom they may be driving, but they are a source of danger to people in their vicinity. I trust the Bill will provide the desired reform in this direction.

Anyone who views the traffic in the city of Brisbane at the peak hours of the day must be convinced of the great difficulty of handling that traffic at the present time. For some considerable time the Brisbane City Council has been agitating for the construction of Adelaide street right through to North Quay. The stumbling block is the railway offices, and I do hope that the

Mr. McLachlan.]

Government will see the necessity of meeting the City Council in this connection. The building occupied by the railway offices in George street is not a very pretentious one, and there is not nearly sufficient room in the building to enable the railway officers to carry out the business of that department properly. Taking that into consideration, and the great need there is for continuing Adelaide street through to the North Quay to provide an outlet for traffic, the matter is deserving of the consideration of the Government. Traffic is getting so congested that it will not be very long before one-way traffic will have to be introduced in the City of Brisbane. To a certain extent it is being done now, because between 4.30 and 6 o'clock p.m. traffic going up Elizabeth street is sent round William street instead of turning into Queen street along George street. The difficulty of introducing a proper system of one-way traffic will be very great indeed unless Adelaide street is opened through to North Quay, and I hope that will be done before very long.

I listened very attentively to the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Cooroora. In his opening remarks the hon. member gave credit to the Opposition for the introduction of almost all the humane legislation at present on the statute-book. I know, and the hon. member knows, perfectly well that that is not true. Hon. members who are sitting in opposition to-day are of the same political colour as members who sat behind the old Nationalist Government, and I do not think any hon. member on that side can produce a programme of legislation submitted to the people which contains any of the measures they now claim credit for until they had practically been forced into passing those measures by the advocacy of hon. members who are now on this side of the House.

Mr. MORGAN: A minority cannot force a majority.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The minority in that case did force the majority. We were then sitting in opposition in a minority. The great constituency outside believed in the platform we were then standing for, contained in which were measures such as the amendment of the Elections Act. Workers' compensation was included in our platform before any thought was given to it by those who were controlling the affairs of government in those days, and old-age pensions were advocated. The hon. member for Cooroora takes credit for the members of the Opposition who passed that legislation when they were sitting on this side of the House. Conciliation and compulsory arbitration and the abolition of the Legislative Council were also in the Labour Party's platform. It was only by reason of the abolition of the Legislative Council that we on this side were able to give to the people that measure of reform for which they were looking.

Other items in the Labour platform in those days were State loans to settlers, taxation of land values of absentees, and a State Department of Labour. All these items, which find a place on the statute-book to-day, were advocated by the Labour Party when a small party in opposition. When we were in opposition the people were gradually educated to that stage of democracy for which the Labour Party stood, with the result that hon. members opposite, when in power, introduced some of the measures required which

they would never have thought of introducing had it not been for the efforts of Labour members at that time.

I have looked up some old records I have at home—I have not got the complete records which the Secretary for Public Works has collated and indexed—of the doings in Parliament away back as far as 1899 and 1900. On 28th November, 1901, Henry Turley was a Labour member in this Chamber, and moved a motion in favour of a minimum wage and an eight-hour day. I suppose there is hardly a member of the Opposition who would now say that he is not in favour of a minimum wage; but, when Mr. Turley introduced that resolution, a division was taken, which showed that there were sixteen Labour members in favour and thirty Tories against it. Included in the "Noes" was the name of the hon. member for Wynnum, the Hon. W. H. Barnes, who is the only member on the other side who was then a member of this House. He was standing then for the same principles that the Nationalist Party stand for to-day. They had never any intention of being a party to the introduction of this reform, which has improved the conditions of the working men. During the same session, Mr. George Jackson, who was then a Labour member, introduced a motion in favour of establishing a Government Department of Labour. One would think that, if members of the Government of that day—now the Opposition—were in favour of any of the reforms which have been achieved, they would have offered no objection to the establishment of a Department of Labour. A debate took place, and eventually a division was taken, the motion being defeated by twenty-six votes to sixteen. The minority of sixteen were all Labour men; the others all Tories, and again the name of the hon. member for Wynnum appears amongst the latter.

I remember well the agitation which took place in favour of old-age pensions. I think that Mr. George Jackson was the first to introduce a motion in favour of the system. The amount of the indigent allowance at that time was 5s. per week—a very small amount indeed. That hon. member endeavoured to have old-age pensions introduced and moved in that direction many times in this Chamber from the Opposition benches, but nothing came of it. At that particular time I remember from reading the debates that Mr. Foxton, the Home Secretary of those days, was prepared to increase the allowance to 7s. a week, but he said that the State expenditure then would be very great indeed. The spade work in connection with old-age pensions was all performed by the Labour Party when sitting in opposition in this House.

The hon. member for Toowong the other day took credit to the members of his party—not to himself, because he was not in Parliament then—for having introduced and passed the first Workers' Compensation Act. I do not propose to question the fact that it was a so-called Liberal Government which introduced that measure, but it was again the Labour Party who forced the issue. Mr. Andrew Fisher, who was then the Labour Party Leader in this Chamber, repeatedly and persistently advocated the introduction of such a Bill, and, when he left State politics to go into the Federal House of Representatives, the fight was still carried on by Mr. George Ryland, who was then member of this Chamber for Gympie.

[Mr. McLachlan.]

These were the men who in the early days—about 1900 and before it—advocated this reform, which later on a so-called Liberal Government introduced. The fact remains that, no matter what the pretensions of hon. members of the Opposition may be, the spade work in connection with all this reform legislation was done by the Labour Party, and they had it in their platform even before any member of the party was in this Parliament.

Mr. MAXWELL: The foundation was laid by the Liberals.

Mr. McLACHLAN: It was not. The foundation was laid by the Labour Party. The first Act may have been passed by a so-called Liberal Government, but it has been improved beyond all measure since 1915. The foundation of all this legislation was the agitation of the Labour Party before they even got into this Chamber at all. It is true that Sir Arthur Rutledge in 1901 introduced the first Workmen's Compensation Bill, which did not get past its second reading. It is very interesting to anybody who wishes to indulge in retrospect to read the debates on these measures. That measure did not become law, and it was not until 1905 that the first Act of its kind was placed on the statute-book. Although Sir Arthur Rutledge introduced that first Bill, to show how the Government of those days, now the Opposition party, strenuously opposed reform measures, let me quote from the columns of an old issue of "The Worker" which I came across recently. In an article on 15th February, 1902, it printed "Fifty Reasons why the Electors should not vote for Government Candidates." Mr. Robert Philp was Premier at the time.

Amongst various reasons that were given in that article appeared the following with regard to workers' compensation. I am quoting this to show that, no matter what hon. members opposite may say about their predecessors who were then on the Government benches, acclaiming them as being in favour of workers' compensation, their actions and speeches prove that the contrary was their opinion at that particular time. Amongst the reasons stated were—

"Because they (the then Government) are relentless enemies of workmen's compensation, and have bitterly resisted all efforts to protect workmen engaged in dangerous callings and to compensate the unfortunate relatives and dependents of those injured in the course of their employment.

"Because the Government, through the Attorney-General, induced Labour member George Ryland to withdraw his Workmen's Compensation Bill under false pretences, pledging themselves to carry a similar measure, but dropping it soon after its introduction.

"Because, through the foregoing dishonourable action, the law as to compensation for accidents has been left in a condition which practically penalises anyone who attempts to recover damages for injury."

That was the position at that time when workers' compensation was being advocated by Labour members sitting in opposition. I think it was in 1905 that the then Attorney-General, Mr. Blair, introduced and passed a Workers' Compensation Bill; but that measure did not contain anything like

the requirements of the Labour Party. Even when that legislation was being discussed the Labour Party sought to have embodied a provision contained in a New Zealand measure that a man should be paid a certain specified amount for certain injuries to obviate the necessity for an injured worker being involved in litigation, and in order that he should know exactly what he was to receive.

Mr. ROBERTS: The litigation continues to-day.

Mr. McLACHLAN: We did not succeed in securing the adoption of the amendments that we had hoped to carry; but at the first opportunity—when we were returned to power—we amended the legislation so as to give effect to the views held at that time. The action of this Government has been responsible for a substantial reduction in the rates charged by insurance companies in respect of workers' compensation, and the benefits have been more than doubled. The weekly amount paid to an injured worker has been increased from £1 to £2, and a special provision permits of a payment of £4 5s. per week.

Mr. MAXWELL: They cannot get any work now.

Mr. McLACHLAN: When a man meets with an accident when carrying on his avocation, whatever it may be, he knows that his wife and family are assured of some compensation, and that did not obtain when other Governments were in power. If a worker is killed, his widow receives considerably more than she would have received in days gone by.

Mr. MOORE: If a son is killed, his parents receive nothing.

Mr. McLACHLAN: In the case of death the widow receives £600, and in the case of total incapacity the injured worker receives £750. When the Labour Party introduced the necessary legislation providing for workers' compensation, the friends of hon. members opposite, through the agency of the Legislative Council, prevented sufferers from miners' phthisis from receiving the compensation that hon. members on this side were desirous of giving them.

It is no use hon. members opposite endeavouring to convince the people of Queensland that they stood for a policy of workers' compensation. They would lead the people to believe that they are the men who are prepared to go out of their way to assist working men and women, notwithstanding that the whole history of the Nationalist Governments in this State and in other States is just to the contrary. Never have they been found espousing the cause of the working man until they were forced into a position similar to that which they were forced into by the agitation of the Labour Party in this State on the occasion of the passage of the humanitarian legislation they have referred to.

In addition to the matters I have mentioned, in spite of the opposition that took place at the time in the Legislative Council, and in spite of the attitude of hon. members opposite, the Government brought about an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act providing for compensation being paid to sufferers from miners' phthisis and other industrial diseases. Since 1916, the year after the Government took over the reins of office, about 140,000 claims under the Workers' Compensation Act, involving the

Mr. McLachlan.]

payment of about £3,000,000, have been paid. The measure has given general satisfaction to everybody. In my opinion the end has not yet been reached, in so far as the benefits under the Act are concerned.

The Government are also doing good work in both the fire and life insurance departments of the State Insurance Office. I obtained the facts I have quoted from the office only yesterday, and anyone can verify my statement. Notwithstanding that we have definitely proved that these reform measures were advocated by the Labour Party when in opposition, and before they obtained power, the Opposition have the effrontery to stand up in their places and claim to be the introducers of legislation of this character. In my opinion, it is unthinkable, and I cannot understand how in their electioneering speeches they can lay claim to the credit for having introduced these measures. The people evidently take such statements at their face value, for since 1915, when Labour was returned to power, they have not been able to convince the people of the sincerity of their advocacy, as they have never been able to command a majority in this House.

Mr. MAXWELL: We represent 2,000 more electors than you do.

Mr. McLACHLAN: That is proof that the people take the Opposition at their real worth. I intend to quote a statement which other hon. members have quoted, but I believe with the late Hon. T. J. Ryan that, when driving home a point, even if it has been used on a previous occasion, you must say it over and over and over again. I remember reading in the "Daily Mail" in 1918 the following paragraph, and it is just as well that we should resuscitate it at this particular time, seeing that the Opposition claim the credit for some of the present reform measures:—

"The Nationalists are out to banish for all time the mischievous interference of the Government in such matters as State insurance, State butcher shops, etc. Even whether these misguided enterprises be profitable or not in State hands has no bearing on the subject. They are commercially immoral and anti-Liberal."

The Nationalists of that day are the same class of men who occupy the Opposition benches to-day. This is a statement made by their press mouthpiece—a paper that stood for their policy in that particular year, saying distinctly what the policy of the Opposition was. The Opposition may say that they would not interfere with legislation of this character, but the fact remains that their mouthpiece, the newspaper that espouses their cause, stated that they were out for the purpose of doing that very thing. The speeches of hon. members opposite on the question of workers' compensation recall to my mind a meeting held in 1917 by the representatives of all the insurance companies. Twenty-eight insurance companies were represented at that meeting, which was addressed by Mr. G. S. Murphy, who said that he had been promised strong support from financial bodies—Brisbane merchants, pastoral associations, and mercantile houses—and was now approaching the insurance companies, who had suffered to such a large extent by recent Labour legislation, with the object of securing their financial co-operation. What did he want with financial co-operation? Was it not for the purpose of defeating the Labour Party and introducing

measures which would have the effect of undoing the great work that had been done by the Labour Party while in power? Mr. Murphy further stated that he had received a definite promise from the National Political Council that one of the planks of their platform was the amendment of the existing Insurance Acts to eliminate therefrom Government interference and unfair competition and control. That would mean that the intention of the then Opposition—and it is the policy of the present Opposition, too, although they try to dodge the issue—was to remove insurance from Government control and hand it back again to private persons. The result of such action would, of course, have been that the workers would have found themselves in the same position, so far as insurance was concerned, as obtained prior to the advent of a Labour Government. The report shows that a general discussion followed, and that a motion to the following effect was moved and carried:—

"This meeting of Queensland representatives very strongly urges that, in view of the serious and acute political situation in the State, all insurance companies should combine to subscribe a substantial sum to the funds of the Queensland branch of the National Union, with the object of such funds being utilised in propaganda work towards the securing a change of Government which must considerably benefit insurance companies generally."

We know that prior to the advent of State insurance, the private insurance companies charged almost any premiums they liked, but that since the Labour Party legislated in the matter insurance premiums have been reduced by at least 33½ per cent. If the resolution which was carried at the meeting referred to means anything, it shows that the desire of members of the National Union or National Council both then and now is to get rid of a Labour Government so that they may put a Government into power that will repeal the legislation that has been found so beneficial to the great bulk of the people in this State, and reintroduce measures that will have the backward tendency that has always characterised the policy of hon. members opposite when in power.

I desire to make one or two references to the prosperity of Queensland. The hon. member for Kurilpa had something to say this morning about savings bank deposits, and, if I understand him correctly, he said that Queensland had the lowest savings bank deposits per capita in the Commonwealth. That statement is altogether contrary to the facts, and should not be allowed to be published without the truth being disclosed.

Mr. KELSO: That is what the Government Statistician has shown.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I remember when the old Liberal Government was in power, the hon. member for Wynnum, who then occupied the position of Treasurer, said that no truer index of our general prosperity could be found than was disclosed by the savings bank returns.

Mr. KELSO: That is what the Secretary for Railways said the other day.

Mr. McLACHLAN: That was a statement made by the hon. member for Wynnum when occupying the office of Treasurer under a Liberal Government. I desire now to give certain figures which have been culled from

[Mr. McLachlan.]

the "ABC of Queensland and Australian Statistics," relating to the savings bank business in Queensland for the year ended 30th June, 1926—

	£	s.	d.
Deposits made during year	24,423,729	0	0
Withdrawals during year	23,641,166	0	0
Number of accounts open at end of year	420,903	0	0
Amount to credit at end of year	22,836,910	0	0
Average of each account	54	5	1

[12.30 p.m.]

That compares more than favourably with the other States of the Commonwealth, as the following table from the Commonwealth "Year Book" for 1927 will show:—

Average per Savings Bank, all States of Commonwealth for 1926.

	£	s.	d.
Queensland	54	5	1
New South Wales	51	0	6
Victoria	45	5	11
South Australia	44	10	6
Western Australia	30	13	8
Tasmania	34	19	7

Instead of Queensland having the lowest deposits per capita in the Savings Bank, as the hon. member for Kurilpa would lead us to believe, she has the highest.

MR. MOORE: You have taken the depositors. Give us the figures per head of population.

MR. McLACHLAN: The hon. member can look up the "Year Book" for himself.

MR. KELSO: Give us the figures for 1927.

MR. McLACHLAN: I have quoted the latest figures available. I want to show how the continued progress throughout Labour's term compares with the last year of Tory rule. The average deposit per head of population in 1914-15—that was the year before Labour came into power—was £17 5s. 4d., and in 1926 was £25 19s. 5d. The number of depositors in 1914-15 was 229,000, and in 1926 it was 420,903. Those figures clearly show the present position, and prove that during the time the Labour Government have been in power Queensland has progressed at every point. Anybody who reads the history of the State during the time the Labour Government have been in power will find that the savings bank deposits have increased; that there has been a record in dairying; that production has increased; and that there has been a continued increase in the general wealth of the State. The people are better off now than ever they were when the friends of hon. members opposite were in control of the affairs of the State. Confidence throughout Queensland in the Labour Government will again be evidenced when the next appeal is made to the people, and I have no doubt that, when Parliament meets after the next election, hon. members opposite will still be gracing the Opposition benches, and that the Labour Government, standing on their record of the last twelve years, will be returned to power with an increased majority.

MR. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): It is rather amusing to note the way in which the Government, in order to make an alleged attack on the Opposition in connection with this vote of want of confidence, go away back to the dark ages. The Secretary for Public Works yesterday went away back to 1895, and

the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has told us of incidents that happened in 1902, and then he took the unctious to his soul that the Labour Government were answerable for all the humane legislation and for everything that had been done to build up Queensland.

I wish to devote some attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for Merthyr. The hon. member says, "We, the Government; we, the Labour Party; we, the Socialists of Queensland, are responsible for the granting of old-age pensions." As one of who was in this House when the first Bill was introduced by Mr. Kidston, I know that the Labour Party of that day were responsible for the delay of twelve months in passing the measure. That is just how they helped the passage in Queensland of the first Old-age Pensions Act. That statement is supported by the records of this House.

MR. WINSTANLEY: We got a better Bill.

MR. ROBERTS: It is all right for the hon. member to say that they got a better Bill. They got the Bill which the Government of the day were prepared to introduce and pass. There is an election looming at the present time, and we have seen hon. members opposite, in defence of their position, trying to collect information which they claim is truthful, but the records show quite the contrary.

What about the Workers' Dwellings Act? That Act is one of the finest measures in the Australian States, and was passed by the Kidston Government, and later on amended in the interests of the workers by that Government. Hon. members opposite might just as well say that, because an hon. member on this side suggests an amendment which is afterwards adopted by them, they themselves are responsible for the amendment. They may accept an amendment, but, in their cleverness, they will give no credit to the Opposition for it. Hon. members opposite cannot say that, when sitting in opposition, they controlled the legislation. If they made a suggestion and it was a good one, the Government of the day accepted it; but the legislation was due to the foresight of men like Mr. Kidston and those who supported him at the time.

It is quite enough for the Government to give attention to the problems of Queensland which are affecting us so disastrously to-day, instead of claiming that they passed the Old-age Pensions Act. Old-age pensions are now under Commonwealth control.

I heard the hon. member for Bowen booming up the Government and getting ready for the next election, and saying, "We ought to carry the country; there ought not to be one of the Opposition returned at the next election. Look what we have done!" He said, "We have increased the State children allowances." It is deplorable that in a glorious country like Queensland, where there ought to be enough and to spare for everyone, we have to depend on an Act of Parliament to provide conditions such as these. I recognise they are necessary, but it is regrettable that we have to make provision for such a thing.

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Do you want State children to have to earn their own living?

Mr. Roberts.]

Mr. ROBERTS: If there is an hon. member in this House who ought to try to do the decent thing, seeing what he says on a certain day of the week other than week days, it is the Secretary for Labour and Industry; but there is no one more given than the hon. gentleman to trying to put into another man's mouth that which he knows that man does not say and has no intention of saying. Anyone who knows me—and the Minister himself will admit it if he is honest and honourable—realises that there is no one in this House, no matter where he sits, who is trying to do more for the down-and-outs in this State and to get a fair deal for them than myself.

I can stand on any platform and say that my record is such that I can claim that I would be the last to hound down any man, woman, or child. Nobody can say that I have ever done anything to take the bread out of their mouths. Men like hon. members opposite are taking it out of their mouths every day of the week.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: Who produced the position which gave rise to the demonstration in the gallery yesterday? What a state of affairs have hon. members opposite brought about in Queensland—this great big Government for the people! Have they not brought about such a state in industry that to-day I know a man in Toowoomba with a wife and five children who has been nine months out of employment, regularly going to the labour bureau looking for a job, able and willing to do anything? Twice his turn came, and twice he was turned down because he had not got the money for a union ticket. I saw the labour agent at Toowoomba, and addressed a letter to Mr. Walsh, the Director of Labour, saying, "Surely we are not living in a country where a man cannot get a job when his turn comes?" He quoted the conditions, and said that so far as the Australian Workers' Union were concerned, they allowed a member of the union three months to renew his ticket, and, if he could not do so in that time, that was the end of it. Here was a man who was thrown out of work at an inopportune time. Notwithstanding the big wages which hon. members opposite talk of, the workers have no more money available than they had prior to 1915, and a man with a wife and five children does not find himself able to put by any more than did a man in those days. I remember listening to Mr. Lesina, speaking from behind the very seat where I am now, quoting exactly what the wages were and what it cost to live, and showing that, after everything was paid, the worker had about 2s. per week more than was sufficient to provide him with the ordinary necessities of life. Is it any better to-day? As I have said, this man in Toowoomba was thrown out of work, and he was not able to renew his union ticket because he had not got a job, and when the three months expired he was still out of employment and living on rations. How could he get a ticket? He could not sell the rations and get a ticket.

Mr. DASH: What month was this?

Mr. ROBERTS: Last month.

Mr. DASH: You are wrong, because that ticket does not expire for six months.

Mr. ROBERTS: When the hon. member asked me that question I thought he was referring to the incident. I have already

told him that the man has been out of work nine months. How could the ticket have been in existence two months ago? I know hon. members opposite do not like this question.

Mr. HYNES: Why did you not buy him a ticket?

Mr. ROBERTS: This man was unable to get a ticket, and, as a result, he could not get a job. Twice his name has been called in rotation; by right of having been out of employment so long his turn came, and twice he has been turned down. Think of the wife and children! Imagine that man going out every day and his wife asking him, "What is the position? Have you got a job, Jack?" He says, "No, but I am about fourth on the list. I think I will get one in a day or two." Then in a day or two his name is called and he goes up. "Where is your union ticket?" he is asked. "Haven't got one. Can't buy it. Haven't got a bob," he replies. Then he goes home again and tells his wife. Do not tell me that that is in the interests of the State of Queensland or that it is in the interests of any country that that state of affairs should be permitted. Mr. Theodore made an alteration in his day. When I put a question to him in regard to an incident at Rockhampton he said he would see that men out of employment, when their turn came, would receive enough for a ticket and then they could pay for their tickets out of their wages.

Mr. HYNES: They are given that right now.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is no good telling me that they are given that right. I know what rights they have. The Government have made an arrangement with the Australian Workers' Union that they shall have the right to pick the men for the jobs. When they claim that all men are equal, then I ask: What is the object of picking the men? I have seen in Toowoomba the race through which these men have to pass in order to get a job.

Mr. DASH: A race?

Mr. ROBERTS: Yes, a race, similar to that through which sheep are passed. It is a most inhumane picture. On the one side stands a man—big and burly—a man on a good salary—and watches the other men go through. Unfortunately, the physique of all men is not the same; but this man picks his men. Talk about the capitalist! This man selects the men who he thinks are the most likely to swing the pick best and move the muck the quickest. That is the position created by men who claim that they are looking after the interests of the workers. If the Government still claim that all men are equal, then why are these men, some with wives and families, not given a chance of employment? If they cannot do the job, that is unfortunate; but they should be given a chance. But no: the Government themselves are looking for the big, hefty chap, the chap who looks as though he will be able to move the greatest quantity of earth or lift the heaviest rail. That is how they act.

Mr. SIZER: The Department of Public Works does that.

Mr. HYNES: Do you suggest that, if a navvy is required, a tailor should be engaged?

Mr. ROBERTS: I am not going to suggest anything to assist the hon. gentleman; but, if I can help the man who is out of work, then I am going to do it. I am not going to

[Mr. Roberts.]

permit hon. members opposite continually to hoodwink the people of Queensland from the public platform by saying, "We are looking after the people of Queensland; we are looking after your interests; we will see that you get a job." If the man out of work is a tailor, and is prepared to do labouring work, then he should be entitled to the job. It is all a matter of business. I do not ask that a man should do a job unless he can do it satisfactorily. I am not asking that an unfortunate worker suffering from asthma should be expected to do pick and shovel work; but I would like to know why he cannot get a chance to get a job. I have seen some small men knock the big men "sky high" at pick and shovel work. I have seen them do much more in a day than a 6-foot man. You cannot always judge men by their stature.

The Government are always meaninglessly proclaiming that all men should have an equal opportunity. This morning the hon. member for Merthyr commenced his speech by making reference to hon. members who had passed away. I have a very high opinion of the hon. members who have passed from this Chamber. I first met the late hon. member for Mitchell at Townsville twenty-three years ago, and I had a very high opinion of that gentleman. In those days they claimed that men should have an equal opportunity. To-day, after thirteen years of Labour rule, the Government have reached the position when they say that all men are not equal, and all men should not have a chance to get a job.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. I do not say the hon. member for Merthyr was trying to mislead the House and the country by his quotations; but I give him credit for trying to get the best end of the stick in presenting his argument before the unthinking masses. The unfortunate feature of this debate is the preponderance of propaganda.

As I said the other day, whenever a quotation is made by hon. members opposite it is quoted in such a way as to give a meaning the opposite to that intended. These are the figures showing the number of depositors in the savings bank per 10,000 of population in the Commonwealth—

South Australia	...	...	...	897
Victoria	...	...	...	843
Western Australia	...	...	...	804
New South Wales	...	...	...	676
Tasmania	...	...	...	665
Queensland	...	...	...	490

Look at the top and bottom figures, and you will see a wonderful comparison! The average amount deposited per head of population up to 30th June last—and that is late enough surely—was: Queensland, £25 2s. 1d.; average for the rest of the Commonwealth, £34 9s. 3d.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Give us the figures for some of the other States.

Mr. ROBERTS: I have given figures for the purpose of making a comparison with those quoted by the hon. member, who told us that his figures were for 1926. I am quite satisfied that my figures are correct.

I wish to touch again on the question of what we produce in Queensland. We know that, unfortunately, in this State at the present moment there are thousands out of work.

Mr. FERRICKS: Yet you want to bring more immigrants into Australia.

Mr. ROBERTS: There are hundreds of young Queenslanders who cannot obtain work, unfortunately, notwithstanding the expenditure of considerable sums of money in education in this State by this Government and by other Governments in the past. In that respect we are in an unfortunate position. The thing is to get them something to do. I was very much interested in a question which the hon. member for Sandgate asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry on 31st July last dealing with apprentices. The Minister stated that the number of applications for apprenticeship for the previous twelve months was 1,311, and the number who obtained employment was 526. This is a tragedy. Go anywhere in Brisbane or in any other city in Queensland, and see large numbers of our youths from the age of fourteen up to nineteen years who are unable to find employment. Hon. members opposite talk about a register of the number of unionists unemployed in Queensland. If we had a register of the youths of Queensland who have not been able to make a start in earning a livelihood and thus be of some advantage to this State, it would astound the people. I was proceeding home with a working man the other day; he was talking of the "glorious times" we hear hon. members opposite talking about, and he said, "I wish we could get back to where we were prior to 1914." Then he said, "You know, I have two boys at home who have been out of employment for twelve and eighteen months respectively; and, worse than that, they have got into that state of mind that they think Dad, being the only wage-earner, should keep the house going." It is all very well to talk about wages, but we should consider them much on the same lines as we do a savings bank account; in other words, what is the net result after a certain period of time? A man may be entitled to a weekly wage of £4 10s.; but what is his actual position if he can get work for only three months in the year and if, in order to get that work, he is compelled to become a member of two or three unions? The whole position is unsatisfactory, just as it is with our boys. I know that what I am about to say will immediately call from hon. members opposite a statement about reduced wages, but I am prepared to meet the position if that is so.

I say quite definitely that the apprenticeship system has reached a stage when it is not profitable for an employer to take an apprentice, by reason of the irksome regulations and conditions to which he is subjected. The Secretary for Labour and Industry knows just what the responsibility of an employer is under the apprenticeship system. Only the other day a Toowoomba employer telephoned me regarding a difficulty in which he found himself with respect to his apprentices. These apprentices were attending classes at the Technical College, but for some reason or other—probably to suit the convenience of the teacher at the college—the class hours were altered so that the apprentices had to attend every Saturday morning. Hon. members will realise that industry cannot be carried on efficiently when employees in an industry cease work at irregular intervals at the dictate of some outside party. Some more convenient method should be adopted of providing the extra technical

Mr. Roberts.]

tuition required under the apprenticeship scheme.

Another matter which is pertinent to this matter, although it is one for which the Government are not responsible, is the defence training which apprentices are called upon to undertake throughout the year. The Defence Department insists on apprentices undergoing training on a number of Saturdays, which has the effect of disturbing the continuity of business operations. This has got to such a stage that it might truthfully be said that there are only five working days in the week so far as apprentices are concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Over a five-year period of apprenticeship the intelligent boy, having regard to the wages he receives, is the most profitable form of investment to any employer.

Mr. ROBERTS: I do not know what experience the hon. gentleman has had in apprenticeship matters.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: My employer made a lot of money out of me.

Mr. ROBERTS: I fully appreciate all that was done for me during my apprenticeship days, and I can recall that there were many occasions on which I was anything but profitable to my employer, although I always endeavoured to do my best, just as I do now.

[2 p.m.]

Just before adjourning the Secretary for Agriculture alluded to what he called the great profit that was made by the employer from apprentices. I very much regret that a gentleman occupying such a position should make such a wild statement. I know something of industry, and I have yet to learn of any possibility of making profits out of young fellows in their apprenticeship. State ments such as that do a tremendous amount of harm, and that is why I refer to the matter. There is always a tendency to encourage the worker to believe he is not getting what they call "a fair result for his labour." The world is wide and opportunities exist for men to travel; and, if a man is not satisfied and has the manliness he ought to have with a trade in his hands, let him do the best he can under the circumstances, and look elsewhere for employment. I have here the "Daily Standard" of Friday last, in which are reported some of the resolutions which were carried at the Trades and Labour Council in Melbourne a few weeks ago; and this is only in keeping with the hon. gentleman and the men who support him. This is how some of them talk about industry. Instead of trying to say a word of encouragement, they are always accusing this side of the House of speaking falsely, of betraying Queensland, and of doing things to injure it. It is men like the Secretary for Agriculture and these men in the Trades Hall who are killing industry in Queensland. If there is one thing that will cause men to "go slow" and make them dissatisfied, it is the utterances of these men.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you say I do that?

Mr. ROBERTS: Yes, I do.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then I say you are a deliberate, cold, calculating, frigid liar.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I would point out to the hon. member that the

[Mr. Roberts.

expression is unparliamentary, and I must ask him to withdraw.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I understand the term is unparliamentary, and I withdraw it.

Mr. ROBERTS: Instead of trying to give a lead to the people of Australia in the building up of this great State and the Commonwealth, this is what they say, as reported in the "Standard" of Friday last—

"That the question of preference to Australian-made goods be opposed because as far as the question of the working class is concerned it will only mean a longer working day and a reduction of wages in industry in Australia. The slogan of Australian-made goods means that the time must come when the Australian worker must fight the workers of other competing countries in the interests of the newly born Australian capitalists."

Here is another—

"Mr. S. J. Bryan (Electrical Trades) said he could not understand why a trade union congress should be held if its decisions were afterwards to be opposed and ignored by councils and unions. By the procedure now being adopted they were bringing about disunity, and if that was to be the outcome congresses should be cut out."

Then—

"Mr. J. W. Roche (Storemen and Packers) said that the discussion on congress resolutions could be taken as an expression of opinion by the council. He was opposed to the resolution. If the workers were going to support the Australian-made goods preference, Australian employers would make big profits and would then increase the hours and attack the standard of life of Australian workers. After all, it was the capitalists, and not the workers, who would decide the matter of preference."

If any argument is wanted to combat statements such as these, it is contained in that last sentence. The speaker said that, when capitalists were making big profits, they would be able to lengthen the hours. The thing is ridiculous in the extreme. Employers of labour in industry, by and large, have always been prepared to do the fair thing, although I admit that they are out for profit. When I employ labour I want men who will earn something for me. I am not like the Government, who have got the country at their backs. I cannot continue to employ men if they are unprofitable, and that is the general position in industry.

Mr. Justice Higgins went a long way towards creating unemployment when he made the memorable statement that, if an industry could not pay 8s. a day, it was not worth carrying on. We have to recognise that in former days that amount was looked upon as a reasonable wage. There are industries which it is necessary to carry on, but which cannot pay the rate of wage fixed by the Arbitration Court. If we followed the dictum of Mr. Justice Higgins, those industries would go by the board, and the men engaged therein would find themselves out of employment. There are, unfortunately, some men who are not worth the award rate of wages, but they cannot help it, and under our present system they never

get a job. I know of men who do not work two months in the year because they are not up to the standard required under the ruling rate of wages. If such men were employed, we would not have the regrettable position we saw yesterday, and which was dealt with in the Brisbane "Telegraph" of this morning. The position is startling. Hon. members opposite talk about degrading Queensland. I am not making use of this quotation for that purpose, but to show the deplorable position Queensland is in after thirteen years of Labour government, which furnishes ample reason for the no-confidence motion of the Leader of the Opposition. The "Telegraph" states—

"SUSTENANCE PAYMENTS.

"Figures for Last July.

"During the month of July last sustenance payments from the Unemployment Insurance Fund amounted to £30,794, as compared with £24,540 in July, 1927. An abstract of the balance-sheet for the month is as under:—

<i>Income.</i>		£ s. d.	
Contributions by workers and employers	...	24,581	9 6
Government endowment accrued due	...	12,290	14 6
Sundries	...	19	13 9
Total	...	£36,881	17 3
<i>Expenditure.</i>		£ s. d.	
Sustenance payments	...	29,215	12 3
General expenditure	...	1,588	17 1
Total	...	£30,794	9 4
Credit balance for month	...	6,079	7 11

"Payments in Seven Months.

"Sustenance payments during the first seven months of the present calendar year total £276,132 (not including administrative expenses)."

I do not know whether hon. members realise it or not, but that comes to approximately £500,000 in a year. It is a lamentable position of affairs. Assume that that £24,581, which has been taken from industry as contributions by the employers and employees—quite apart from what the Government have contributed out of taxation—assume that that money had been put into something profitable. What would have been the result? We are languishing for capital, yet here we waste it. We are keeping people in idleness. I am thankful to the "Telegraph" for its leader to-day. It reminds me that in 1925 the Government passed a special Act for the purpose of investigating this matter and reporting, and, if possible, discovering some means by which we might get away from these ghosts which seem to have been shadowing the Government ever since they took office—this ever-increasing unemployment. They have had three years since 1925. What has been done? Nothing! Nothing beneficial! They ask the Opposition for suggestions. In reply I say that, when we get them off the Treasury benches, we shall be able to do something practical that will give the workers of Queensland an opportunity to work.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: We want the opportunity to do more than make suggestions. The

Government have had three years to look into this question since they passed that Act, and they have produced nothing but the greatest amount of unemployment known in the history of Queensland, costing on the average £500,000 a year.

Mr. BEDFORD: Which 500,000 are you talking about? Elphinstone's?

Mr. ROBERTS: If the hon. member had been in the House instead of going round the country raising capital for companies, he might understand which it was. (Laughter.) I want to say quite distinctly that he is one of the men who take life easy. "I am just as good as the other fellow—take it from me." (Laughter.) These men take life easy. They go up and down the country. I remember the day when I was sitting on that side of the House, and from morning till night it was dinned into us that we were capitalists, that we were wild-cat schemers, that we were floating bogus mining companies all over Australia, and living on the fat of the land. I want to know where these men are to-day. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. COSTELLO: They are over there.

Mr. ROBERTS: They are certainly not on this side of the House, and they were not on that side when I sat there. I repeat definitely that the Government are doing nothing to improve the unemployment position. A little while ago they had a convention in Townsville of the leaders of the men who comprise the Labour movement. What did they do about this question? If there is anything that men who say they represent the workers—call them Socialists, Communists, or what you like—ought to do at such a convention, surely it is to get the workers work! When they got into their first-class railway carriages and sleepers, when they were at their leading hotels, one would assume that they would give some attention to unemployment. They know the workers are willing to work. We tell them that every day, and they know it themselves only too well. What did they do at Townsville? A delegate named Gordon Brown—I have heard the name before—pleaded in the interests of the worker, and made an attack upon the Government. He even moved the suspension of the standing orders at this Queensland convention of Labour—it is a dreadful thing, of course, to suspend standing orders—in order that the convention might discuss unemployment, but he could not get a seconder. Fancy at a meeting of men claiming to represent the worker it not being possible to secure a seconder to such a motion! It reminds me of an incident I saw in Sydney a few weeks ago. Of course, there you have all brands of Labour. You have what is called, I suppose, this go-between business such as we have in the Government of Queensland, then you have the Socialist, and then the Communist. I saw the two latter bodies in Bathurst street, and, being interested, I thought the game was worth watching. The question is often asked, "What is the difference between a Communist and a Socialist?" and, being anxious to ascertain, I thought that I could secure an explanation from the very men engaged in the business. I got it all right, and I propose to illustrate it here. The Communist said they were too long waiting for these jokers; it did not matter whether Lang or Bavin was in power they got nothing, but they must get on the Treasury benches. The speaker pointed out that they must

Mr. Roberts.]

secure that end by force, that the place must run red. Then when I approached the Socialist gathering, the speaker said that it was no good massing all the forces; that they would bring out rifles and machine guns, and, if the members were in one force, they could be mown down easily, and the objective would have to be achieved in another way. Then he made an amazing statement conveying his opinion of the Labour movement in Australia. This man, a Socialist, gave his name and his place of employment, which I found to be with the Government of New South Wales. I have nothing against him for that. He was quite frank, and gave his name. I do not wish it said that I do not know whom I am talking about. I have found that my statement is correct. This speaker was asking what was the prospect in Australia for the sons and daughters of the workers. He said, "On the one hand you have thieving and robbery, and on the other hand prostitution." Imagine a man speaking in the interests of the working people of Australia trying to force this doctrine down their throats. Such a man should not be permitted to give voice to such statements. Talk about freedom of speech with such tripe and rubbish! It is no wonder that some people go a little over the fence in the matter of violence. These men stand up in public places trying to lead the people of Australia in certain directions, and it is just about time that they were put in their places.

That brings me to this point. Whatever stand the Government of this State take at the next Federal elections, it stands to the credit of the Bruce Government that they have tried to settle a lot of these things that are carried on in Australia, and we see the result of their actions already. One man has just had to answer for his actions. He has been before the court, and has been sentenced. I think time will show that the people are behind the Bruce Government in this matter. It is time that these disrupters got a move on; it is time they declared either that they are for Australia or against it; and the sooner we tell them that the world is wide, that there are other places than Australia, and that, if they are not satisfied with their conditions, they should try somewhere else where they can get what they are looking for, the better it will be for Australia as a whole.

We hear quite a lot about the solidarity of this party. Of course, we know there is solidarity on the other side. There is so much solidarity that it does not matter how much they differ. They can talk as they like, but there is only one thing that counts, and that is something at election times—votes. That accounts for some of the speeches which have been made by hon. members opposite in this Chamber during this debate. They can criticise the Government, and then, of course, they may get castigated a little in their caucus, but it is the vote that counts. Since Labour has been in power I have watched the occupants of the Treasury benches. (Government interjections.) The hon. member for Oxley is not in it with hon. members opposite. He has the freedom of his conscience, just as every hon. member of this party has, but hon. members opposite have not. If I wanted an exhibition of the freedom of hon. members on the other side, I could not do better than quote the speech of the hon. member for Balonne at the Townsville Labour Convention. It was there that the hon. member for

Gregory said, "Boys, what about singing 'For He's a Jolly Good Fellow'?" (Opposition laughter.) Votes counted at that convention just as they do in this House. The hon. member for Balonne is reported in the "Worker"—and I looked up his speech to make sure of my ground—as saying that he knew that the action of the Government in connection with the railway strike was wrong, but, he added, "What does it mean if you vote against them?" That is the position in this House. We know that for weeks and weeks before the Townsville Labour Convention was held the Government were watching the appointment of delegates to see if they stood in the majority.

That is something like what they do at election time. They arrange the date of elections for a time most suitable for their securing a majority. When the hon. member for Kennedy made his attack on the Government in this House last session, when the hon. member for Bowen made his memorable speech, and when everyone was wondering what the hon. member for Maryborough was going to do, we knew that the only thing that showed the independence of those men would be the votes they would record on the floor of this House. Those hon. members were castigated in caucus, but we knew that they would not do their job in accordance with their conscience and vote against the Government on the floor of this Chamber. The vote of every member of the Opposition counts.

I now desire to touch on one or two matters connected with the actions of the Government. I have in my hand a statement made many years ago in this House, but at a time when I was a member. It is not as far back as 1895. It was made in 1914 by the late Mr. James Crawford, then member for Mount Morgan. There are a lot of statements in "Hansard" which have not come true, but this is one that has done so. The Opposition, which then comprised the Labour Party, told us of all the glorious things that were going to operate when they got to the Treasury benches. Unfortunately for Queensland, we had a demonstration of them yesterday in this very Chamber. Mr. Crawford said this—

"Taxation is threatened in every State that is under the domination of a Labour Government, and were we in Queensland under the dominance of a Labour Government, nothing would be more certain than that the taxation which we already feel to be quite severe enough would be increased in intensity."

That statement has come true. That is simply what the Premier said—that taxation had reached the breaking point.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Mr. Crawford was speaking in opposition to Labour then, as you are doing now.

Mr. ROBERTS: That is so; but he forecast what would happen.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He "ratted" from the Labour Party.

Mr. ROBERTS: If he or any other man "ratted," they took the risk of their constituencies; but there was no hon. member on the Government benches who was game to do so last year, notwithstanding the fact that in the country, and in addressing the men at the Ipswich workshops and the delegates at the Townsville Convention, they said that the action of the Government was wrong. They

[Mr. Roberts.]

were not game to back their assertions with their votes. If a man "ratted," he simply did what his conscience told him to do. Hon. members opposite can look as white in the face as they like, but that is the position.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROBERTS: I want to add another word about employment, because it is the one thing on which the motion of "no confidence" has been launched. We were told by the hon. member for Merthyr that we could not carry it. I wish we shall, because I think it would be the dawn of a better day for Queensland. Like the Government, we can speak to the people of Queensland through our speeches in this House; and I hope that in this way we shall be able to direct their attention to the hollowness and insincerity of the Government. I am satisfied the Government know what to do; the point is that they will not do it.

Speaking on the question of industry and employment generally, the Premier at the Townsville Convention said that, if he could only depend on the men who are doing the job—if they would only give of their best—he could produce in Australia £120,000,000 worth of goods that are now imported into Australia. The hon. gentleman also emphasised the point of which we often hear—day work versus piecework. Hon. members opposite would lead people to believe that we on this side would sweat the employees for every shilling they got. The trouble is they must earn it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The trouble is you would not give them every shilling they earned.

Mr. ROBERTS: Whatever the Secretary for Agriculture may try to hurl across at me—I did not hear him—I question if there is one hon. member sitting on that side who has ever devoted himself to profitable work on his own account. They may have worked for someone else; but the only men who can talk about industry are those who have put up the capital with which to carry on industry. This is what the Premier said at Townsville—

"In spite of all the talk against pieceworking in industries like canecutting and shearing, if they could establish a proper organisation which would prevent the employer exploiting the worker as he did in other countries, and prevent the employee from exploiting himself, thus injuring himself physically, such a system would solve many of their problems. The feeling that no unemployment would be created if they went slow on the job was a bad and rotten one. If they could get service from the people the party could go to the country and tell the people that they could make £120,000,000 worth of goods which were now imported into Australia, and thus build up a great nation. There was no need to abandon their policy of nationalisation of industry if they could only get good social service."

I am glad to see the hon. gentleman recognises that payment by results is sound, seeing that it aims at providing more employment of a constant nature.

[2.30 p.m.]

I want now to touch on one or two remarks made by the hon. member for Toowoomba. I understand he is very unwell, which I

very much regret. The hon. member spoke about the large amount of Government money which is being spent in the city of Toowoomba. If the money has been spent in a satisfactory manner on work that is required, then I agree with it; nevertheless, not only in Toowoomba but in the whole of Queensland there are far too many men out of work. The jobs to which reference has been made are very expensive, if that is to be the method by which we are to retain the Labour Government in Queensland. It would be better for Queensland and for the city of Toowoomba if these jobs had never been started, if they are the price we have to pay for the industrial difficulties which this State is facing.

During the last thirteen years the population of Queensland has increased by over 200,000; but what is the position of industry? Speaking with regard to Toowoomba, I say the progress of Toowoomba, unfortunately, has been anything but satisfactory. Take the Toowoomba Foundry. I remember the time when they were employing between 400 and 500 workers. I suppose to-day they employ less than 70. Then take the boot industry. I know the time when over 200 men were employed in the boot trade; to-day I do not suppose you could count 50 in that trade. The position is the same in all the manufacturing industries, and until we recognise that there is something wrong and make a move to put things right, the unsatisfactory state of things will remain. We know that an effort has been made by the Prime Minister of Australia to get both sides in industry together in order to arrive at a fair position. The Prime Minister said, "I will call a conference. You appoint your representatives, and, when the conference is over, I will get to business and try to do something for this Commonwealth of Australia." What was the answer of these men who are always supposed to be looking after the interests of the employees—the "down and outs." They said, "Don't go near him." It was the same old cry, "He wants to help the capitalists." As a result nothing was done. We do see now, however, that some men have more sense than their leaders. That is perhaps the one bright ray of sunshine we see in the Labour movement. We know that in New South Wales that, notwithstanding what the leaders have said, there is a definite decision by the workers in one industry at least to get nearer the job. Under present conditions the worker sees no chance of getting inside these works and doing something, and he is making up his mind to work if at all possible. He is beginning to see that it is no use putting all the blame on the capitalist. These men are getting tired of keeping their coats on, and there is a possibility, through the good influence of the Nationalist Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Bavin, of the employer on the one side and the employee on the other, coming together. They are going to discuss the situation, and see if more work cannot be found for men who to-day cannot get a job. If the Government want a solution of the present difficulties, I can give them one straight away. Let them follow the lead of the Nationalist Premier of New South Wales. A little while ago I illustrated the case of legislation passed three years ago. We are still waiting for a report. People outside have been put to all sorts of inconveniences making returns and employing men to analyse them, and some day,

Mr. Roberts.]

when a number of these men who are now looking for a job have passed out, we may have that report—that is, if the people of Queensland unfortunately keep the Government in power for that time.

I suggest that in the meantime the Government should take a leaf out of the book of the Nationalist Leader in the Commonwealth Parliament and admit they have done the wrong thing. Let them bring the employers and employees in industry together. I would like to know of anything which the Queensland Labour Government have put into effect in connection with their policy which has not been a rank failure; but they have not been manly enough to take the proper course to get out of the trouble. What did they do? They appointed Commissions—three in particular—and each of those Commissions brought in reports and finished their jobs—not like the Secretary for Labour and Industry, who, three years after an Act of Parliament was passed, started to obtain a report as to the position with regard to unemployment. The reports of those Commissions practically condemned the legislation put on the statute-book by the Premier and previous Leaders of the Labour Party. The Government are using the Commissions as scapegoats for their insane policy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): The hon. member for East Toowoomba, who has been discussing the question of the Government appointing Commissions, might have contrasted our attitude with that of the Federal Government in this regard. Every member of the Federal Parliament is on some Commission or other racing round the country from one week-end to another, and doing something which the Commonwealth Parliament as a body is paid to do. The hon. member has ventured to tell us we have appointed Commissions to do things, whereas only two or three Commissions have been appointed during the lifetime of this Government. As an example of unmitigated gall that takes the cake.

Mr. MORGAN: He did not complain. He said that the Commissions you appointed condemned your work.

Mr. POLLOCK: They were appointed with the honest intention of finding out just where certain things were faulty, and they were successful in doing so. I freely admit that in regard to one phase of the Land Act they found the legislation was not workable. This Government never posed as one which never made a mistake. I am not afraid to admit that one of the provisions in the Land Act was a mistake, and the Commission was definitely appointed by the Premier to find out how far to go. When it was discovered that it was a mistake it was immediately amended. What is wrong with that?

Mr. SIZER interjected.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member and other hon. members opposite do not know anything about the conditions of men on the land in the western parts of Queensland. If they did, we would not have this continual gabble about unemployment from the members of the Opposition. It seems rather strange that, while we are discussing a no-confidence motion, not one member of the Opposition, except the last speaker, has

addressed himself to it, and that hon. members opposite refuse to take seriously the vote of want of confidence in the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not true.

Mr. POLLOCK: On this occasion we have the unprecedented experience of seeing the Government, while a no-confidence motion is hanging over their heads, doing business at the old address and in the same way. The Opposition have not raised a word of protest about it, which shows, firstly, that they are not taking their motion seriously, and, secondly, that, if they are, they do not know their jobs.

Mr. MORGAN: We cannot control the Government business.

Mr. POLLOCK: And the Opposition will not be able to control their business if by good fortune they ever become the Government.

Mr. PETERSON interjected.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Opposition will not be able to control the hon. member if he shows the same desire to leave that party as he did this. No member of the Opposition has drawn attention to the fact that one of the principal reasons for unemployment—and one of the causes which can only be removed by an act of God—is the drought. It is the greatest cause of unemployment in the State, as I shall proceed to show. (Opposition interruption.) As a member of this Chamber I have the right to put my case, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will give me sufficient protection while I am doing it. The whole of the Gregory electorate, which includes over 106,000 square miles of country, is still—every inch of it—in the grip of a most extreme drought, and has been for the last four years. A portion of the Burke, the whole of the Mitchell, a portion of the Barcoo, a portion of Queenton, a portion of Cook, and a big portion of Flinders—and those are seven of the largest electorates in the State—are feeling the devastating effects of the drought. Even a portion of Leichhardt and a very large portion of Queenton are affected. If I wanted to show how the drought does affect the question of unemployment, I would need to mention only one station in the Winton district, Llanrheidol—and I am not speaking of the largest—I am taking one at random. It is about 120 miles from Winton, and during normal seasons produced 1,200 bales of wool. The cost of handling and marketing that wool alone was usually about £4 5s. per bale, or, in round figures, about £5,000. There is not a sheep on that place at the present time; not an ounce of wool is going away, and there will be none until at least six or eight months after rain has fallen. The expenditure of that £5,000 in normal seasons usually gives employment to a certain number of men; and there can be only one remedy or means of returning to normal conditions, and that is by having a sufficient downpour of rain. In addition to that, twenty men or more were employed on this station, which is one of scores. They got £3 10s. a week. They all had to leave the station and the district and look for work elsewhere; and, if you multiply that number by 400 or 500, you get one of the reasons why there is unemployment in Queensland. I want to know whether the Opposition expect the Government to place in employment men who are thus thrown out of work elsewhere? When the principal industry in the State—the one that produces

[Mr. Roberts.

our greatest wealth—is in dire difficulties owing to lack of rain, how is it possible to place the men ordinarily employed in it elsewhere? I say that there can be only one way of doing it, and, even if we have a fall of rain, many difficulties remain to be overcome before it can be done.

A scrutiny of the Governor's Speech would incline one to believe that the position in the western part of the State is not as bad as it really is. His Excellency says that out of 21,000,000 sheep which this State was depasturing in pre-drought days we still have 16,500,000, which would show a decline of 4,500,000. That does not look so bad after four years of drought. Personally, I question whether those figures are correct.

I maintain that no man can yet tell what the losses have been in the sheep industry, because many sheep have been shifted away. Even the owners do not know how many have been lost and how many they will be able to bring back when the drought is over. The stock returns, to say the least, are very inaccurate. A man who sends 10,000 sheep to a place in the Gulf is dependent on meagre reports as to how they are doing. To-day he might have 5,000 sheep; to-morrow he might have only 3,000; and so it goes on. Any information in that regard must be very inaccurate indeed. I wish to show that that is not the greatest loss that this State has suffered. If we merely say that we still have 16,500,000 sheep left out of 21,000,000, one would say that, on the face of it, the position does not look so bad; but one thing the statistician fails to take into account is the loss of natural increase over those four years. That is the big loss that Queensland has suffered. That is one of the principal reasons for the unemployment that exists to-day. I should say that a fair estimate of the number of sheep lost to Queensland would be 16,500,000. If the figures of the statistician are correct, then we have lost 4,500,000; but the number of sheep that would have been gained by this State, had there been normal seasons, would have been at least 12,000,000 sheep, which means that an additional 12,000,000 sheep have been lost to Queensland; and those 12,000,000 sheep represent the surplus spending money of this community and its equivalent in employment to the people of this State. That is the major cause of unemployment in this State.

In addition, we have to face the fact that, even when the drought is over, it will take some years to recover completely. We cannot expect to get general rain before December of this year, and we might not get it then. For four years we have been hoping to get it in December or January, but so far we have not been sufficiently lucky to get it. The end of the drought may come before then; but the western part of Queensland is not likely to experience a wet season before December, and then it will be at least another six or eight months before the people of the West are able to reorganise their financial position sufficiently to be able to restock. After they have restocked, it will be some time before they will be moving along in a normal way. Men who have had considerable experience—I think I can speak as one with some experience in the matter—are of the opinion that it may take at least two or three years before the grass in the West resumes its normal quality and density. After a drought such as the one now being experienced, some time must elapse before the country can

properly recover. If everything goes on as the most sanguine of us anticipate, it will be at least another two years before the western parts of Queensland are in a condition to employ as many men as were ordinarily employed. Mr. Speaker, that brings you to the realisation that the time ahead of Queensland is a very lean one.

There are other factors that enter into this matter. Speaking to some prominent sheep men the other day, I was reminded that where rain had fallen in certain places during last year, some of the ewes that were getting very old and were very worn after a drought of three years were not breeding as prolifically as younger and fresher ewes would do. The result will be that we shall find ourselves with flocks of sheep too old to breed as well as they might do, and so further hinder the prosperity of this State. I mentioned this matter when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking; but all the satisfaction that I got from him was that the Opposition were not concerned with, what he termed, the "unborn lambs." I am concerned with that position.

Mr. MOORE: I never said anything about unborn lambs.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member did do so.

Mr. MOORE: When?

Mr. POLLOCK: I assure the hon. member that he did so. He may be unconscious of what he says at times, but I have a distinct recollection of it. If this House is going to face this problem of unemployment, we must have regard to the factors that are causing it, and merely to skip over such a gigantic thing as a four years' drought is not going to get us anywhere. We have to recognise that and recognise any methods that have to be adopted to make for stabilisation of the industry when the drought has departed from us. I have never been one of those hon. members who have shirked that question when it has arisen. It is the failure of the Opposition to recognise these things that have made them so unpopular in the western parts of Queensland. The people in the western parts of Queensland will not stand the Opposition. The reason is, to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition, because he has no time for the grazier. He made that statement in this House last session.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You know that cannot be correct.

Mr. KERR: Read the report of his whole speech.

Mr. POLLOCK: If those words mean anything, I take it they mean what I have stated.

Mr. KERR: You are deliberately misinterpreting what he said.

Mr. POLLOCK: I would not do that for the world, and the hon. member knows it, too.

Mr. KERR: I hope you would not do it, but you are doing it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: It was this condition of stagnation in the West that enabled the Opposition to throw up their hats and say that they had got to within 300 or 400 votes of the Labour candidate in the recent Mitchell by-election. Everyone acquainted with the

Mr. Pollock.]

pastoral industry knows that pastoral properties usually employing twenty or thirty men to look after their flocks could not afford to employ a man on account of their losses through drought. Selections in the vicinity of Longreach which ordinarily employed five, six, or seven men had no men engaged.

Mr. MORGAN: But they were on the roll all the same.

Mr. BRAND: The same number is on the roll.

Mr. POLLOCK: As a matter of fact, when there is no work on the stations the men shift to other parts of the State.

Mr. BRAND: But their names are on the roll.

Mr. POLLOCK: Their names are on the roll because their homes are mostly in Longreach; but the men were largely in other parts of the State seeking employment, and, because there was no provision in the by-election for recording absent votes, from 800 to 1,000 Labour supporters were disfranchised. That is a conservative estimate of the number of men who were absent from the Mitchell electorate on polling-day. The supporters of the Opposition, though, were still there. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: But you said the graziers did not vote for us.

Mr. POLLOCK: They did not vote for the Opposition; they voted for a man who dissociated himself from that party, and whom the Leader of the Opposition did not go out to help.

Mr. MORGAN: That is not so.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Leader of the Opposition did not go out to help Labour's opponent, so I base my assumption on that fact.

Mr. MOORE: You can assume whatever you like.

Mr. POLLOCK: What I assume is a correct assumption.

Mr. MOORE: If it satisfies you, it is all right.

Mr. POLLOCK: I spoke to quite a number of men in the Mitchell, Gregory, Barcoo, and Burke districts during the period that the by-election was on, and all that I spoke to, political opponents of mine, were satisfied that the Government's land legislation had done more than anything else to help them to re-establish themselves after this dreadful drought had broken.

Mr. MOORE: And your legislation did more than anything else to ruin them before you altered the land legislation.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is not correct.

Mr. MOORE: It is. It is the worst Act ever put on the statute-book.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the hon. member were an authority on the question I might be prepared to debate it with him; but, as he did not have the courtesy even to go out and help the opponent of Labour in that election, I take it he is not an authority, and it is not worth while discussing the question with him.

Mr. MOORE: You did not answer the question, all the same.

Mr. POLLOCK: The application of the Land Act Amendment Act passed by the Government during the last session of Par-

[Mr. Pollock.

liament has been a great factor in re-establishing confidence not only in the pastoral industry but in the Government of this State. Men who were previously opposed to the Labour Party now admit that the Government's action has given them a chance that nobody else could possibly have given.

Mr. MOORE: A chance that the Government took away from them before.

Mr. POLLOCK: One of the members of the hon. gentleman's party has even gone so far as to tell me that he thinks the Opposition could not have done as much for the graziers as we have done. Whatever hostility there is against the Government in the West has come largely from dealers and agents, who, after all, are people for whom the Government cannot show very much consideration. Agents have been the principal cause of trouble in the West. These were the men who, under the old system of non-selection of applicants for land, made up to £2,000 in fees of £1 ls. each from every applicant for a block of land. They are the people who were hostile to the Government; who built up bogies; and who were behind the candidature of the gentleman who was unsuccessful at the Mitchell by-election. They made more row than all the graziers and workers put together. In fact, two of them tried to break up a meeting that I was addressing in Longreach. I knew them personally, and I knew why they were doing it. The genuine selector in the West knows he can thank this Government for the efforts made to place the pastoral industry on a good footing.

After the drought has broken we shall require the care of the Government in the matter of finance to help these people who have to restock their properties with sheep. Many of them have already approached me asking that financial assistance be given them to bring sheep from New South Wales and the southern parts of Queensland where they have been depasturing during the drought period in order that they may restock their properties. Whilst I congratulate the Treasurer on his surplus, I do so for one reason beyond all others—that is, I realise that we must be careful with the finances of this State to enable the people of whom I am speaking to get back upon their feet again. Every pound we can save to help to put this industry on a proper footing is going to mean prosperity, not only for the grazier but for every person in the community.

Mr. MORGAN: Your Government do not propose to finance them.

Mr. POLLOCK: I take it that the Government's proposals will be made known in due course. I believe that the Government will give assistance to men to bring sheep to the West for restocking purposes and that assistance given in that direction will be money well spent. When we consider the difficulties through which these people have passed, the amount of unemployment that has existed, and the number of sheep that have been lost, both directly and what would ordinarily have been actual increase, one wonders how any State could go through a period such as we have been undergoing without more stagnation and disturbance than we have undergone. I realise that, as the result of this drought, things are bad in Queensland; but it is surprising they are not worse. They were

worse in this State in 1902, and I can only assume that the improved position is due to the good management of this Government.

MR. TAYLOR: What about the unfavourable trade balance?

MR. POLLOCK: Our exports fell off to the tune of £13,000,000 as the result of the loss of wool. That speaks for itself. Whatever our trade balance may be, we have lost that amount in wool production, and, as I said at the opening of my remarks, wool production has been the main source of the community's spending power. When that source is dried up there must be stagnation, disturbance, unemployment, and hard times for business people and others. I ask why the Opposition pick on the question of unemployment in the last session of a dying Parliament? Purely to make capital for the elections!

MR. MAXWELL: Because there is so much of it.

[3 p.m.]

MR. POLLOCK: I admit that there is unemployment, and I have shown that there is a reason for unemployment because of drought. This State must have a certain number of unemployed in order to work its seasonal industries. How could these industries be carried on unless surplus labour was available? I ask the Opposition to answer that question. But outside of that, I know there is unemployment, and I am very sorry that it is so; but I have not heard any suggestion from the Opposition that would minimise the unemployment in this State, nor has there been any argument advanced as to how the Government could solve the problem in a constructive way. When seasons return again to normal the problem will largely solve itself, but until that time I cannot see any hope for any Government, whether it be Nationalist or Labour, solving this problem in a satisfactory way. If the Opposition came over here to-morrow, the very fact that the industry I have referred to is still in a bad way and will remain so until rain falls, would prevent them or anyone else from doing anything of an effective nature to relieve unemployment. The present Labour Government, under the circumstances, are doing all that can be done in that regard.

MR. MAXWELL: When you were in Opposition you raised the question of unemployment, and said that, when you got over there, you would solve it.

MR. POLLOCK: I was never in Opposition. The main feature from the workers' viewpoint and the viewpoint of the general business man in this State, is that Labour has been able to hold its own for a period of thirteen years through very trying times. I said in Winton, prior to the last election, that, if the working people were able to hold for the next five or six years all that they had obtained, they would be doing remarkably well, and I still think so. Considering the period Queensland is going through, to have been able to hold the wages and conditions as they were, even with unemployment as bad as it is, is a remarkable performance; and, if the Government can continue to do that for the next three or four years, it will be a performance that will redound to their credit.

I said a while ago that it was a peculiar thing that the Opposition should raise this

question of unemployment in the last session of a dying Parliament. Their attitude is somewhat similar to the action of the Bruce Government in raising catch cries on the eve of an election. Before the last Federal election that Government played the same confidence trick on the public with regard to industrial disputes. They went to the country after having fostered an industrial dispute. I use that word advisedly—I believe they encouraged the dispute, and that their agents helped to fan the flames—and in the middle of this dispute they went to the country, and the principal plank in their platform was the deportation of the two men whom they considered primarily responsible—Walsh and Johnson. That was the main plank in their platform. After the election they did not deport those two men, and they have taken every opportunity since then, particularly during the last three months, to seize on every industrial dispute in the hope of being able to fan it into a national-wide conflagration that would enable them to go again to the country on the same spurious issue. See how they picked on the cooks' dispute. What an effort they made to encourage that dispute to reach the dimensions of a real honest-to-goodness strike; and, if they had been successful, I suppose the Prime Minister would have gone to the country with the deportation of the head chef as the principal plank in his platform; but it did not work. The Commonwealth Government are trying again, and by means of their industrial legislation, doing everything they can to create the most spurious of political issues for the coming Federal election. They have not been able to settle industrial disputes. In spite of all the argument about the wonderful Bruce-Page Government, they have not settled any industrial disputes satisfactorily, though they have been able to promote them. They have won elections upon false issues regarding them; but they have not been able to do anything with men who are out on strike. They are quite helpless when a strike is on, as was evidenced in the case of the cooks' dispute.

HON. W. H. BARNES: As the State Government were in the case of Cairns.

MR. POLLOCK: The Commonwealth Government have not been able to do anything in the way of adjusting to the satisfaction of those concerned any industrial disputes. If their industrial legislation is as good as it is claimed to be, why do they not do it?

I wish to draw attention to what I consider a very regrettable attitude on the part of the Bruce-Page Government, and one that does not appear to be generally understood—that is the desire to take away from the States all power in the matter of industrial awards and to usurp State functions in industrial matters, one of the reasons being that men who are working under Commonwealth awards are not eligible for unemployment insurance. Perhaps they hope by that means to break down some of the benefits which Labour has given to men who have to work for a living in the State. The general attitude of the Bruce-Page Government is in favour of butting into State awards and making as much political capital as possible out of it.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: What did you do over the railway strike?

Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. POLLOCK: I never had any apology to make in regard to the attitude of this Government on the railway strike, which the hon. member may wish to call a lockout. I have always adopted the attitude which I considered in the best interests of the State in regard to these disputes.

Mr. KERR: We know your attitude all right.

Mr. POLLOCK: My attitude is very well known. It is to the effect that these industrial disputes can only be settled by conciliation as a general rule. They cannot be settled by making an example of irresponsible leaders—we only make martyrs of them, if we do that. The general idea of the hide-bound Tory is that you can settle all disputes by persecuting someone.

Mr. KERR: No.

Mr. POLLOCK: You cannot do it. You only make martyrs of them, and give to their propaganda a significance that fifty years of their own lecturing would not do. You have to settle these disputes by the cold light of reason, and not by coercion or force.

Mr. KERR: I agree with you; but that is not the policy of your party.

Mr. POLLOCK: Whatever may be said of the policy of this party, it is there for everyone to see; one cannot say that of the policy of the Opposition. Throughout the whole of this debate hon. members opposite have been telling us that they would come over here and put Queensland back into what they consider its former position if they got the chance; but they very carefully refrain from saying how they would do it, or what policy they would adopt.

Whether they will be able to trot out a policy at election time is another matter. As a matter of fact, one of the most noticeable features during the session has been the efforts of the press to make out that members opposite are making a good showing, when, as a matter of fact, their speeches are still the same old dreary efforts that we have had to listen to during the last fifteen years. If you read the press every morning, and believe it, you would be led to the conclusion, for instance, that the hon. member for Sandgate made a remarkable speech.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: So he did.

Mr. POLLOCK: You would think that some other hon. member spoke in unhurried and dulcet tones; that another hon. member slated the Government fore and aft. If you sat here, however—and you, Mr. Speaker, are probably in the best position to judge—you would know that it was the same dreary drivelling effort that we have been accustomed to all along. This effort on the part of the press to glorify the Opposition by means of propaganda is doomed to failure because the people know the hon. members whom it is desired to bring into the limelight.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You are making fairly heavy weather of it.

Mr. POLLOCK: I cannot help it if the hon. gentleman does not like the truth. I thought he did at one time. I do not intend to quote from the press "Gallery Notes"; but even members of the Opposition must sometimes blush when they see what is written about them. You can find this idea of press glorification of the Nationalists nowhere better exemplified than in a report of a

speech delivered by the Prime Minister the other day. He was telling some funny stories at a gathering in Brisbane—I do not think he knew they were funny—and this is the one I think was funnier than any other—he was referring to his selection for a Federal seat—

"There were no fewer than thirteen candidates, and he had to wait his turn. Outside the hotel there was one of those old-fashioned gutters with a kerbstone, and while he was waiting he sat on the kerbstone, pulled out his pipe, and puffed away. A man had come from the back part of the electorate who had a good deal of influence, and when the favoured candidate went wrong they had to get another. That man said to the others: 'There was one poor devil who did not seem to have a friend, and was sitting in the gutter; let us vote for him.' (Laughter.) They did vote for him, and he became the candidate and was elected."

What a sight he would be—sitting in the gutter—spats and all! If that is not the dizzy limit, I do not know what is—that a man well-known in business, reputed to have an income of £50,000 per annum should be unknown to anybody on the election committee, and should be sitting outside in the gutter and smoking—without a friend—and that for that reason they elected him. That is the sort of stuff served up to the public before an election; and it is the same sort of stuff that the press of this city is endeavouring to serve up to the public every morning about hon. members opposite. "Coming down to the House the democratic hon. member for Wynnum shook hands with a widow!" How wonderful! (Laughter.) "The hon. member for Albert, when walking down the street, talked for five minutes to a cripple, who did not know who he was, and then walked away after having given him 5s."—a thing I think the hon. member might do, as a matter of fact. (Laughter.) That sort of thing amuses me.

Mr. KELSO: What Mr. Bruce said was said at a smoke social.

Mr. POLLOCK: It seems a most appropriate place to say it; and, if the hon. member was there and in the same condition as the others, he would appreciate it; but to expect me to believe that the party opposite has any policy—on the mere say so of the press—and to expect the people to swallow it, is a bit too much.

During the course of this debate, one of the allegedly serious suggestions made by the hon. member for Enoggera was that, if his party were returned to power, they would appoint commissions to inquire into railways, State enterprises, and various other things. That seems to be the prevailing Tory idea of how to settle a problem—appoint a commission; pay the members unlimited expenses; let them tour the country for months, and then forget all about them. That is a wonderful brain wave.

Mr. MOORE: Like the Local Authorities Boundaries Commission.

Mr. POLLOCK: It has been the policy of Mr. Bruce for many years to appoint commissions, send them all round the country spending the taxpayers' money, and then drop them.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: What about the Local Authorities Boundaries Commission?

[Mr. Pollock.

Mr. POLLOCK: I understand that that commission has presented a report. It was a matter in connection with which a commission should be asked to inquire; but other matters are in a very different category.

Mr. KERR: Did not the present Secretary for Public Works serve on a commission?

Mr. POLLOCK: He will be able to deal with that himself. I am not in favour, and I do not think any man who knows his job, or ought to know his job, would be in favour of being returned to Parliament to do certain things, then deputing the job to others, and refusing to attend to the matter after a report had been made. That policy is characteristic of the Bruce Government, and has been characteristic of all National Governments throughout the world during the last ten or fifteen years. It is a most convenient way of disposing of a problem. This Government tackles the problem itself.

Mr. MOORE: The Land Settlement Advisory Board was appointed to remedy your administration.

Mr. POLLOCK: That was not a parliamentary commission, but a commission of experts. They presented a very valuable report, which was carried out almost in its entirety by this Government at the very first opportunity. That is the difference between a committee of inquiry appointed by a Labour Government and a commission that would be appointed by the Opposition.

Mr. KERR: We desire an independent body of experts to inquire into the railways.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Opposition would require the experts if they were returned to power, because they would be thoroughly incapable of doing the job themselves.

Mr. KELSO: We have as much brains on this side as you have over there.

Mr. POLLOCK: Reiteration of this sort of thing by the Opposition will not solve this question. To assert that they have more brains than the Government does not convey anything except extreme optimism. It does not convey any proof that they have the capacity to govern; and the conduct of affairs by their party is sufficient indication that they could not agree amongst themselves long enough even to form a Cabinet.

Mr. KELSO: You are up against a dead end.

Mr. POLLOCK: Take the incident of the past few days in connection with the hon. member for Oxley. I am not going to profess any spurious sympathy for the hon. member, but I really do think that he is the only man on the Opposition side with sufficient courage to stand up and say what that party would do if they were returned to power. I think he is the only man in my time who has been game to say so; and because he makes that statement he is politely asked by the Leader of the Opposition to vacate his seat on the front Opposition bench.

Mr. CLAYTON: That is not true.

Mr. BRUCE: He says so.

Mr. POLLOCK: He was asked to vacate his seat on the front Opposition bench, and it is strange that he was asked to do so immediately after making one of the most damning statements—from the viewpoint of the Opposition—that have been made in this House for many years.

Mr. CLAYTON: What you say is untrue.

Mr. KELSO: You don't know anything about it.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is a curious thing that this subject seems to hurt hon. members opposite.

Mr. KELSO: It does not.

Mr. POLLOCK: I cannot understand for the life of me how the Leader of the Opposition can ask the hon. member for Oxley to leave the front Opposition bench. (Opposition interjections.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: The only rule that this House has bearing on that question is the rule of practice that the front Opposition bench and the front cross-bench on either side of the Chamber are reserved for ex-Ministers of the Crown. There is no Standing Order or other practice bearing on it, so the Leader of the Opposition himself has really no right to sit on the front Opposition bench; and how he can ask any other hon. member of the Opposition to get off it is beyond me.

Mr. MOORE: Why not ask for the truth of the matter?

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member for Oxley has such a habit of telling the truth about the Opposition that to do so will be unnecessary; and it is for the reason that he has done so on this occasion that he has been asked to vacate his position. I hope he will be man enough to stand to his guns and refuse to do so.

Mr. MORCAN: What are you butting in for?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not butting in; but I hate to see a man being victimised because he has the courage to stand up and say what he thinks. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. member for Wynnun will remember the time when the Opposition wanted to push him out of his position. (Opposition laughter.) You remember, Mr. Speaker, some two or three years ago that the hon. members for Windsor, Wynnun, and Nundah were told that they were no longer members of the Opposition and were asked to vacate their seats; but they did not do so.

Mr. KELSO: You are fishing now.

Mr. POLLOCK: I have the utmost sympathy for them. They represent, and have faithfully represented here for years, the bigger city interests, and the Country Party were afraid of them. They did not want them in their party. It was not profitable to have them there, and they asked them to leave, notwithstanding the fact that they were amongst the most capable members of their party. When I see an hon. member representing certain interests and being honest about it—we know that the hon. member for Wynnun represents the bigger city interests—I like to extend to him my sympathy; and, when those hon. members were being victimised, my sympathy went out to them, just as it now goes out to the hon. member for Oxley because he stated to the country truthfully what the Opposition would do if they succeeded in getting into power. I hope he will stick to his guns and show the same independence of thought in that matter as he does on the floor of this House, although in the main hon. members opposite have, as most party

Mr. Pollock.]

members have to do, answered to the crack of the party whip.

A matter of the utmost importance to Western people, and one which I have been asked by a number of graziers to ventilate in this House, is the attitude of the Bruce Government on the question of the importation of Alsatian dogs.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: At one time I prohibited the importation of Alsatian dogs.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Bruce Government have done a wise thing in prohibiting the importation of Alsatian dogs.

Mr. MORGAN: What do you think we ought to do with the Alsatian dogs already here?

Mr. POLLOCK: It is understood that the Bruce-Page Government are likely to give way on this important question.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I hope they do not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Albert to cease from interrupting the hon. member for Gregory.

Mr. POLLOCK: In regard to the importation of the Alsatian dog, there is a good deal of concern in Western districts, where there has been considerable trouble for years in keeping the dingoes under control. While some of us are not concerned about how many pets people may make of prize dogs in the city, we are concerned with the spreading of pests. That brings me to the point that, although some people say that the Alsatian is of the shepherd dog family—that it is used in its own country to protect sheep from wolves, and therefore ought to be a protector rather than a devourer of sheep—it does not alter the fact that quite a number of sheep dogs in Western Queensland have inbred with the dingoes, and the product of that alliance is just as savage as and is more cunning than the really wild dingo. The experience of all men who have done much sheep breeding in Western Queensland and New South Wales goes to show that the half-tamed dog is a greater menace than the wild dog. When I was travelling across from Duchess to Boulia in a motor car, three dingoes trotted up behind the car, which was going very slowly. As soon as the real dingo saw what it was he kept on following out of curiosity, but the two half-tamed dogs that were with him went straight across country. That is an indication that the real dingo, seeing the unknown, was not afraid of it, but that the half-tamed dog knew what a human being in a motor car was, and was not going to be caught too easily. It is feared by the people in the West that the importation of the Alsatian dog will result in a breed of dingoes more dangerous than the existing breed.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I am with the hon. member.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Albert reminds me of the adage, "Save me from my friends."

On quite a number of the Western stations which have no sheep at all on them at the present time there is a dog poisoner busily engaged, so that the work of restocking may be commenced without the dog menace after the drought has broken. The people there are really afraid of the inbreeding of the Alsatian dogs with dingoes. Per-

sonally, I think that the only argument that can be adduced in favour of importing the Alsatian is that it is a particularly sagacious dog—one that is very quick to pick up tricks, and that sort of thing. If the public desire to have pets I think it is a very good thing that we should discourage the importation of savage ones that are likely to become a nuisance; and I do not think any harm will be done as a result of the importation of Alsatian dogs being prohibited. I remember some twenty years ago a pastoralist named Robert Christison at Tower Hill Creek, in the vicinity of Prairie, imported half-a-dozen staghounds for the purpose of killing dingoes which were a serious menace to his cattle-raising activities; he had about 40,000 head of pure-bred Hereford cattle. After having these staghounds on the station for two years, he found that, instead of killing the dingoes, they had commenced to breed in with them, with the result that in the vicinity of Hughenden and Prairie there is a breed of dingoes big enough in size for two of them to pull down a yearling calf. That is the menace that the

[3.30 p.m.] sheep-growers of Western Queensland are afraid of in regard to these Alsatian dogs. Men who understand the sheep industry realise that portions of Hughenden Station, Redcliffe, and other properties in the vicinity of Hughenden close to the basalt country, which is infested with these half-bred staghound-dingoes, cannot be successfully settled until a large amount of money has been spent on dog-proof netting. That in itself is a sufficient argument to induce the Bruce Government to refuse to back down on their prohibition of the importation of these Alsatians. If a man desires a pet, an Airedale or any other sort of house dog is a good enough and safe enough pet for any man to have without importing a real menace.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL (*Fassifern*): It is rather difficult to introduce new arguments into the debate, particularly after so many hon. members have spoken; but the hon. member who has just spoken certainly introduced a sense of humour into the debate. He complained about the lack of interest shown by the Opposition in the censure motion. It is rather a difficult thing to show a great deal of interest. In no part of the House does there seem to be an absorbing interest in it—because in these days of machine-made politics only a hopeless optimist would expect to have an adverse vote in the Government carried. In these days of machine-made politics one may convince by argument, but the vote will always be the same. That sort of thing largely kills the force of argument, and very largely kills interest in the debates; but I was rather struck by the claim of the hon. member for Gregory that the present Government are really the friends of the pastoralists. Surely it is hard to believe that he is sincere in that statement! Are they at last about to hold out a helping hand to those whom they have done their best to destroy?

The hon. member also claimed that the drought was very largely responsible for the unemployment which is in existence in Queensland to-day. The drought has had some influence, but only a very small influence, because unemployment in country areas is limited in extent, whereas it is very prevalent in large city areas, in which areas we see secondary industries declining and going to the other States. That is the main cause

[Mr. Pollock.

of unemployment in Queensland to-day. The real effects of the drought have not been felt in Queensland yet. As the hon. member for Gregory well knows, that is a matter for the future, when, he said, economies will have to be practised to meet the situation. In my opinion the Government should be putting that policy into effect now in order to meet the situation before it gets too bad.

MR. POLLOCK: This is the only Government that has shown a surplus this year.

MR. BELL: How they got the surplus is another question. The hon. member for Gregory mentioned how satisfied he was that the Labour Party had maintained their position in the Mitchell electorate. If he is satisfied, I am sure we are satisfied. I shall give the figures, which show that the Government have lost a considerable amount of ground, despite the effect of the drought and other considerations.

MR. POLLOCK: That is not correct.

MR. BELL: In 1923, the last contested election in Mitchell before the recent by-election, the total number of votes polled was 3,630. At the recent by-election, at which Mr. Bow was returned, there was a total poll of 3,502 votes. The Government majority in 1923 was 1,106, while the majority at the recent by-election was only 356. If the hon. member for Gregory and his party are satisfied, so are we.

During this debate one has been particularly struck with the way hon. members opposite have delved into the past. They went back to the inception of the Labour Party; but they did not say how they are going to meet the difficulties which face us to-day. They have delved into the past to show what they did many years ago as a justification for their existence to-day. In fact, they claimed credit for things for which they were never responsible. They accuse the Opposition of having no policy, but our policy is open for anyone to see. We stand for a square deal to all, which unfortunately all sections of the community are not getting to-day.

We know that the result of this censure motion is a foregone conclusion. I only wish that the electors of Queensland had an opportunity of giving a vote on it, as the result would then be very different. Labour in politics has been a ghastly failure. The Government have put the policy of Socialism into operation, and have proved it a failure! and they have now come to a dead end, and do not know which way to turn. They are seeking for something to lay hold upon. They are like drowning men grasping at any straw that presents itself. In proof of that, we had twenty-eight Bills last session, every one of which except the Loan Bill was an amending measure. This year we have twenty-three Bills outlined in the Governor's Speech, all of which with two exceptions are amending measures previously passed by this Government. They can only carry on by amending legislation previously passed by themselves. The Premier at least realised the situation they are up against when he said, referring to State enterprises, that he has seen many fine theories murdered by hard economic facts. If the rest of his party realise this, it will necessarily mean a change in their policy.

One of the planks of the Labour platform, however, is socialisation, and the present

Premier or possibly another Premier will be forced to put that policy into operation sooner or later. That is the ultimate objective of the Labour Party, and the electors of Queensland should not have dust thrown in their eyes. We have seen a part of the policy of socialisation put into operation, and it has been a ghastly and costly failure to the taxpayers of Queensland, who have to foot the bill. The result has been that more men and women have been thrown out of employment.

The Government are deserving of condemnation for not facing the industrial situation, which is of paramount importance to Queensland. It is tragic to see so much unemployment in a young country like Queensland needing so much development and possessing such great resources. It is estimated that between 10,000 and 15,000 persons are out of work. Unemployment entails suffering, not only by the workers, but also their wives and families. A man who is not employed is not satisfied. He is discontented. He has nothing to look forward to and no comforts to give his family, whom he cannot bring up in the way he would like. I claim that this is the most serious problem we have to face; but the Government have shown no evidence of a desire to face it. The best method which can be used by us lies in the direction of organising our primary and secondary industries and encouraging capital to come here to help our development, so that industry, both primary and secondary, can employ more men and more women. We on this side realise that private enterprise should be encouraged. Private enterprise alone can develop our great natural resources at no cost to the taxpayer of the State; and it would be the aim of the Opposition so to encourage private enterprise that capital would be induced to come here, that work would be offering to the workers, and our natural resources would be developed.

We have also to consider the necessary reduction of taxation. To-day taxation has reached an uneconomic level, and it is having a very harmful effect on employment and industry. It has caused stagnation on every side, quite irrespective of drought, because droughts have occurred in Queensland before, and will occur again. It is the maladministration of the Government that has been largely responsible for the position, and taxation will have to be reduced to an economic level so that money which is being taken out of industry will be made available for private enterprise. Any amount of money is available in the world to-day. It only needs to be induced to come to this State. We have abundant opportunities for the investment of it, but, if the Government tax it uneconomically, it will not come here.

The charge has sometimes been levelled against this party that we are a low-wage party. That is wrong. I say that the standard of living should be maintained; that is absolutely essential. Let me go further. We say that co-operation in industry should be encouraged, with payment by results, so that the worker who is willing to work can earn more than the standard wage. It is only by offering inducements to the workers that you will encourage men to give of their best and enable them to make more than a fair wage. We also realise that the individual worker has to be protected against the unscrupulous employer. Unfortunately, there are some employers ready to take advantage of the

Mr. Bell.]

worker, and we must see to it that he is protected. We need also a better understanding between capital and labour. Labour cannot get on without capital, and capital cannot exist without labour. How absurd, then, is this eternal warfare between them, which is not in the best interests of the worker or the country! The Opposition propose to foster a better understanding between capital and labour by the encouragement of the co-operative principle.

The Premier to-day speaks of difficulties. Every Government has difficulties and problems to face; but the best government is the Government that can solve those problems. The present Government are responsible largely for many of the difficulties with which they are faced to-day in the industrial sphere. For decades past the Labour Party have been preaching discontent and advocating go-slow methods, and to-day they are reaping as they have sown, and are up against some of the difficulties that they themselves have created.

To illustrate and prove my point, I should like to read some extracts from a speech made by Mr. W. H. Demaine, President of the Queensland Central Executive and the mouthpiece of the inner council or Labour junta, at the opening of the Labour Convention in Brisbane in January, 1913, to show how this spirit has been fostered and encouraged by the Government. He said—

“One of the educational needs of the hour is to bring the workers to a fuller realisation of the need for a fuller class-consciousness amongst them. The fond hope that some of them have that they may become employers and exploiters of labour in due course must be dispelled, and the fact that there can be no possible identity of interest between employer and employee must be driven into their minds. We cannot have a true democracy until capitalism is overthrown, and only a class-conscious people can do the overthrowing. Therefore, we must have Labour class-conscious and imbued with the knowledge that only by the communisation or socialisation of capital can the interests of Labour and capital become identical.”

That has been backed up by every hon. member on the Government side. They have been preaching class consciousness and bitter hatred during the whole of their existence. In 1920, Mr. Demaine also said—

“In the matter of State enterprises, I believe that a bolder policy would have received the approval of the great majority of the people, and I would suggest that this be undertaken as soon as possible. State meat and fish shops, State stations, and pineapple preserving factories and sawmills are all right, but we want more than these to-day. We want a State line of steamers, we want State farms, State factories, woollen and cotton mills, and State distributing stores on the universal provider plan. In a word we want, as soon as possible, the necessities of life, food, and clothing provided by the State. The luxuries can come after. This is a State of Socialism. It will be said we are ultra-Communists and I say what of it. Every advance in this direction, every trust or combine

[Mr. Bell.

nationalised, every new enterprise established by the State, will be one step nearer to our ultimate objective, and State ownership or nationalisation, though you term it State capitalism, will be much more easily turned into communal ownership.”

That has also been supported by the supporters of the Government. The difficulties that the Premier mentioned as existing to-day are very largely his own creation and the creation of his own party and organisation, which is the real power outside Parliament. They have found their policy a ghastly failure, and are now endeavouring to get rid of State enterprises. Another plank in the platform “gone west.” One wonders what the left wing of the Government are doing to-day. They are particularly quiet. Perhaps the selection ballots are keeping them too busy to enable them to say anything about their platform. We now hear very little about the platform. All we hear is in defence of the Government, and in order to defend their actions they must go back into the past. They do not point to the future, and show how the Government are going to do things. I claim that a solution of the present difficulties is a Government with a bold and statesmanlike policy—something sorely lacking on the other side to-day.

Mr. KERR: Their trouble is that they have lost their initiative.

Mr. BELL: Some followers of the Government party are advocating going further along the socialistic road. Some advocate revolution. They say that things are so bad now that they could not be any worse in the event of a revolution. I would like to draw their attention, at the same time issue a warning, and quote what a former member of the English Labour Party, Dr. Haden Guest, said in a little pamphlet—that to lead men toward “the revolution” is to lead them to a mirage where they will perish of thirst amid the arid sands of reality. I would also refer them to Anatole France’s book, “Isle of the Penguins,” in which he shows where, after an orgy of revolution and bloodshed, the people slipped back into a quiet rural life once more, wherein each man lived peaceably with his own crops, and the revolutionaries and agitators cut their own throats because they found, after dissipation and destruction, that there was nothing to gain by their orgy of revolution.

Mr. FOLEY: That is the bogey which you use at election time.

Mr. BELL: It is the bogey that hon. members opposite hold up to their own supporters now. Hon. members on the other side now repudiate the revolutionaries and ultra-Communists, although they succeeded to power on their votes and assistance. It suits the Government to dissociate themselves from them at election time.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: They are busy fixing up their plebiscites.

Mr. BELL: Some of their plebiscites are giving them concern, for they are very quiet indeed.

Mr. DASH: You are having trouble in your own ranks.

Mr. BELL: We say that the Government, after being in power for some thirteen years and placing, or endeavouring to place, some

of their planks upon the statute-book, have found that their policy has been a failure, and they now do not know which way to turn. Their party is fast becoming disintegrated, and they are not the force in politics that they were previously either inside or outside of Parliament. The Government are loud in their declamations both inside and outside this House in an endeavour to bolster up their insecure position and make it appear that their disintegration is not so bad as it really is. They have no policy, and do not know which way to turn. It is the duty of the Government to face the difficulties that confront them and attempt to solve the many problems which await solution. They cannot solve them, and are looking to the Opposition to give some hint or even a straw to which they may clutch.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Are they not calling out, "Throw out the life line!"

Mr. BELL: They have reached a desperate position, and it is only by loud declamation that they are keeping up their courage and the courage of the people of Queensland. But the people of Queensland are not so easily gulled. In fact, for some years past one would think that the Premier and his party have looked upon the electors as rabbits, who were most easily caught by the ears. They have been tickling the ears of the electors for years past. Now they have nothing more to offer them. The electors are getting very sore, and are only looking for an opportunity to pass their verdict on the Government.

We must look very largely for our salvation to the primary industries of this State. Our secondary industries have languished, creating much unemployment. To show the importance of the primary industries as compared with the manufacturing activities of the State, the following figures for 1925-26 are interesting:—

	£
Agricultural production ...	12,500,000
Dairy, poultry, etc. ...	6,300,000
Pastoral ...	21,100,000
Mining ...	2,100,000
Forestry, fisheries, etc. ...	2,800,000
Total ...	£44,800,000
Manufacturing ...	£18,100,000

Those figures show how important the primary industries are; and, when we remember that 74 per cent. of our exports are the products of the primary industries, we realise how essential it is that we should maintain our position as an exporting country, because we have a large interest bill to meet, and our commitments in that respect can only be met by the export of our primary produce. The hope of the primary producer lies very largely in an extension of the secondary industries, and it is essential, therefore, that secondary industries should be fostered concurrently with an extension of primary activities. After all, the best market that the producer can have is his home market.

In that connection, I desire to refer to the rural schools which have been established in Queensland. I should like to see a larger number of these schools, which are rendering an excellent service to the children in the country, for whom they are in the nature of a secondary education. Various country school shows which I have recently visited have proved to me the good work that is being

done by the calf, pig, and poultry clubs at the various schools.

There can be no doubt that scientific production should be encouraged, but, further than that, it is essential that we should have a Commonwealth system of organised marketing. Unfortunately, the producer in one State is very often competing with the producer in another State, so that it is necessary that any scheme evolved should be Commonwealth-wide in its application. More work along these lines is wanted, because at the present time there is not a healthy co-operative spirit existing amongst the primary producers. That I found to my cost when I was striving to put forward a co-operative scheme some time ago—a scheme that had for its objective the welfare of the producers. Much can be done by instilling into the minds of our children the desirability of co-operation.

I desire to refer also to the decline in manufacturing activities in Queensland—a point that was stressed by the hon. member for Gregory, who claimed that drought was largely responsible for the position. The figures which I am about to quote show how manufacturing has declined in Queensland.

[4 p.m.]

According to the latest figures available, the increase in factory employees per 10,000 between 1914 and 1926 was—

New South Wales ...	140
South Australia ...	125
Victoria ...	83
Tasmania ...	73
Western Australia ...	56
Queensland (decrease) ...	48

That shows how manufactures have declined in this State, and I claim that heavy uneconomic taxation and absurd conditions are hampering and restricting the expansion of our secondary industries. That being so, they should immediately be reviewed by the Government with a view to righting the position as soon as possible in the interests of Queensland generally.

Mr. HANTON: Industries do not pay taxes unless they are profitable.

Mr. BELL: It is a remarkable thing that ever since the Labour Government came into power there has been a decline here, and Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth in which there has been a decline in this respect. There must be some reason for it.

I should like to refer for a moment to the report of the Beef Cattle Industry Commission. The cattle industry is of very great importance to the State of Queensland, and I would like to congratulate the members of the commission upon their report. They have compiled the information well and set out the position in a plain, straightforward manner so that it can be understood by anyone. The report has also brought home to the people the great necessity there is that this industry should be maintained, because over half the lands of Queensland are utilised for the production of cattle. It is also essential that an export surplus should be maintained so that local supplies will always be available. Certain recommendations have been made by the commission, and I can only hope that the Government will put them into operation. One recommendation is the abolition of price-fixing. It is absolutely essential, in the interests of the industry, that this price-fixing should be discontinued. The commission

Mr. Bell.]

made this recommendation for various reasons. One of the greatest criticisms that have been levelled against us in Australia has been that we do not produce first-quality stock. Well, price-fixing is going to have a very bad effect upon the quality if growers are paid according to weight, independent altogether of quality. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that quality should command the highest price.

Also, the commission made recommendations with reference to taxation and rentals, and, like the Land Settlement Advisory Board, it also recommended the averaging of income. That is absolutely necessary in the pastoral or any primary industry. We have our droughts, and it is absolutely essential that some reserve should be built up to meet these periods of drought. The commission also recommended the establishment of abattoirs as a public utility for Brisbane. That is essential in the interests of the people of Brisbane. It is also essential in the interests of the industry, and I hope the Government will give due consideration to the recommendations put forward by the commission, because they are on sound lines.

There is one matter that I should like to refer to which has had rather a disturbing effect, and which, to my mind, is unconstitutional; that is the action taken by the Victorian Government in placing a prohibition upon Queensland chilled beef going to Victoria. This has had a very great effect upon Queensland, and will have in future. It appears that the railway refreshment-rooms in Victoria have been instructed not to use Queensland chilled beef, and that means a sum of £20,000. I am pleased to hear that the Premier has had a wire from the Victorian Government in regard to the operation of that restriction. Their action appears to me to be most un-Federal in spirit and provincial in outlook, and I hope the Victorian Government will not persist in that attitude.

I would also like to refer to the oil policy of the Government. We all realise what a wonderful thing it would be if oil were struck in payable quantities in Queensland. The Government are justified in giving every encouragement to companies and individuals who are prepared to sink their money in prospecting for oil in this State. Up to the present they have not been given the encouragement which they deserve. Boring for oil is very expensive, and no one can say when or where oil is going to be got. Scientists can give some indication as to the character of country and the most likely places to bore, but they cannot say where the oil is. We have to depend on people who are prepared to put their money into sinking for oil. The Government are not giving every encouragement possible, because they are charging the highest rates on machinery and casing required by these companies. If oil is struck in the State the Government secure a royalty of 12½ per cent.; and it is in the interests of Queensland that tariff concessions should be given to oil prospectors in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Federal Government are responsible for this high tariff.

Mr. BELL: The Federal Government should be approached for assistance in the direction of granting a rebate of duties on machinery and casing which cannot be manufactured in this country. At one period the

Commonwealth Government offered a reward of £50,000 for the discovery of oil; but it is much more important that the oil prospector should be encouraged before he strikes oil, because after he has struck oil the £50,000 will not be of so much importance. If they had the assistance in the beginning of their operations they would be better able to carry on the work of prospecting.

There are other matters which I could mention, but after so many hon. members have spoken on this want-of-confidence motion it is very hard to break new ground. The Government are open to condemnation for not solving some of the difficulties in which Queensland is placed to-day, and the Leader of the Opposition was quite justified in launching his motion, because, if not carried, it will certainly draw the attention of the electors of Queensland to the position we are in. It is high time that we had a change of Government, and I think the electors of Queensland are only looking for an opportunity to get that change.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): I desire to join with other hon. members in expressing my regret at the loss that has occurred through the death of two hon. members who passed away during the recess—the late hon. member for Stanley and the late hon. member for Mitchell. Both gentlemen were of an amiable disposition and acquisitions to this House. Both were exceedingly earnest in their opinions, and always freely expressed them. I am satisfied that their death is a loss to the House and to society generally.

I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Mitchell, first, upon his speech in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, and then upon the fact that he has entered this Chamber. He is one of the oldest members of the Labour Party, and has always possessed a keen sense of duty. I knew him during the period when hardships rather than kindnesses were the experience of those who advocated the cause of Labour, and he was one of those who bore a full share of the burden. It is a privilege to meet him in this Chamber, where I know he will carry on the good work in the interests of the masses of the people for whom he has always stood.

I have been interested in the remarks which have been made on this amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and I have listened with a good deal of amusement as well as interest to the statements made by members on the other side. They have given us a thousand and one reasons why this Government should not sit on this side of the House. They have told us that unemployment is the result of the land tax. They have told us that unemployment is the result of short hours and high wages. Indeed the general tenor of their remarks has been to this effect: "We are in favour of increasing the hours and reducing the wages of the worker." Only this time last year the hon. member for Oxley conveyed to this House the sentiments of hon. members opposite in this regard when, in reply to the hon. member for Gregory, he made the following remark:—

"It is not correct to say that indiscriminate introduction of immigrants here is the cause of unemployment. In my opinion, the finest thing that could happen to Queensland to-day would be

[Mr. Bell.

to dump 500,000 people on her shores to break down all the artificial conditions which exist here."

To that Opposition members said, "Hear, hear!" Following that, to show that the hon. member for Oxley was not alone in expressing the opinion of hon. members on the other side in this matter, the hon. member for Windsor made these remarks in regard to those of the hon. member for Gregory about immigration—

"The hon. member knows that what I am saying is perfectly true, and that our suffering is not due in any way to the action of the Prime Minister in bringing migrants to the State. I claim that, if there is one big Australian in Australia to-day, it is the present Prime Minister."

And Opposition members again said, "Hear, hear!"

Mr. MAXWELL: Quite so to that.

Mr. CARTER: Every hon. member on the other side, when speaking on the question of unemployment, has told this House that what he wants is a lower wage—at least if they have not said so, they have implied it. (Opposition dissent.) Only yesterday the hon. member for Cooroora made it quite clear what was in the minds of hon. members opposite—that is, those of them who have anything in their minds. The hon. member said that the mining industry could not be carried on because the wages were too high and the hours too short. The hon. member for Murilla, who is one of the recognised leaders on the other side, was quite bold in making his statement. I have a very great personal liking for him, but I do not agree with his opinion.

The hon. member made it quite clear that the policy of hon. members opposite is a reduction of wages. (Opposition dissent.) The hon. member for Oxley has not betrayed the Opposition. He has probably pulled the curtain away from the skeleton, and allowed us to see what is in the minds of hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Fassifern said that the policy of the Opposition is to give the public a square deal. Every confidence man tells us that. A confidence man is a most plausible individual. He says that you should have the fairest deal in the world; that, if you back this horse, it is sure to win, and so on. Hon. members opposite have not proclaimed it straight out, but by inference they have indicated that their policy would be a reduction of wages and an increase in hours. Several of them have made it quite clear that they believe that, if wages were reduced and hours increased, there would be more employment and more production; but it does not seem to occur to them that, if you reduce the purchasing power of the consumer, he must consume less. It is paradoxical to believe that you can increase production by reducing the consuming power of the people who use those products. Yet hon. members opposite tell us, and try to tell the people through "Hansard," that the only way to make the country prosperous is to reduce the consuming power of the people who consume in Australia what is produced in Australia. That is their logic. The hon. member for Oxley made it quite clear that in Great Britain wages were less than half what they are here, indicating that it was his desire to bring sufficient migrants here to reduce the wages and the

standard of living to what existed in Great Britain. I am sorry for the people of Great Britain. I should like to see them enjoying better conditions and better times. The hon. member for Oxley—the Opposition claim that he has not said anything unkind about them—must be recognised as one of the mouthpieces of the Opposition, and one of the most eloquent of their mouthpieces has indicated the policy of the other side, and, as the hon. member for Gregory said, the hon. member for Oxley says exactly what he thinks. That is the position with regard to the Opposition. One hon. member opposite says that unemployment is the result of land taxation; another claims that unemployment can be reduced by bringing 500,000 people here; another claims that unemployment can be reduced by increasing hours and decreasing wages. They claim that, if wages were lower, the country would be more prosperous and more people would be employed. The whole thing is paradoxical, and almost too stupid to be worth discussing. They have told us that the legislation introduced by this Government has assisted to create the present bad condition.

Although hon. members opposite claim that conditions are bad in this State, in other States they are infinitely worse. I can support that statement both by reading and by personal observation. I take the opportunity of going to the other States and inquiring personally into the conditions, mixing with the people, talking to the people, and ascertaining something of what is going on in those States; and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that things are more prosperous in this State than they are in any of the other States. We have a lower percentage of unemployment. We have a constant ingress of population from the other States. You would look in vain amongst the body of idle people in the other States to find a Queenslander; but you would not look in vain here to find men from other States. Our labour market is flooded with men from the other States.

Hon. members on the other side have said that our legislation has not had any good effect. Let me quote what some of their supporters have said. I have one statement showing some of the advantages of the legislation introduced by this Government in the interests of the primary producers, and I speak as one representing a primary producing electorate, so I can speak with some force and truthfulness. I am returned in a farming electorate by people who are satisfied with the legislation of this party and with my representation of that electorate. It cannot be said that attempts have not been made to wrest my seat from me, because last election not only was a Nationalist representative put up against me, but also a hireling of the Nationalists who styled himself Labour. Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that this man did not have a cent, or, to quote his own words "a brass razoo," and he could not run an election on nothing.

Mr. MOORE: You know that the meat workers' union found the funds for him.

Mr. CARTER: They did not do so.

Mr. MOORE: They did.

Mr. CARTER: The people of my electorate withstood all these attempts to displace me, because, as an intelligent body of primary

Mr. Carter.]

producers, they were satisfied with my representation and with the legislation passed by the Government in their interests. Why were they satisfied? In answer to that let me quote a statement made by Mr. James Purcell, the chairman of the Butter Pool Board, who we know is a supporter of the Opposition. I do not mention this fact out of any disrespect to him, for I hold him in the very highest respect. I consider that no better man could hold the position of chairman of the Butter Pool Board. He is a capable farmer and a good citizen. Mr. Purcell, without desiring to boost this party, made this statement at the dairy farmers' conference in Melbourne in January last—

"Active co-operation of all branches of the industry was necessary. The three big producing States must unite. Federal legislation was not possible, but State legislation should be secured to provide a pool. There were thirteen pools in Queensland, all working satisfactorily.

"2D. TO 3D. GAINED.

"As a result of the pool in Queensland butter producers received 2d. to 3d. a pound more than in other States, he said.

"Competition in the State was eliminated, and price-cutting prevented by giving all producers in Queensland the same price whether the butter was sold in Queensland, interstate, or in London."

According to Mr. Purcell, the producers of butter-fat in Queensland are better off under the butter pool than they would be in any other State in Australia, and receive roughly £1 per cwt. more for their butter-fat than is received in any other State. That is a very great compliment to this Government. Mr. Purcell said there were thirteen pools operating in Queensland, all of which were successful. I am not going to enumerate them.

MR. MOORE: What about the canary seed pool?

MR. CARTER: The butter producers in my district would vote dead against any candidate who informed them that he would dissolve the butter pool. No Nationalist candidate would dare go to the farmers in my electorate and advocate the abolition of the pool. The hon. member for Aubigny would not be game to go to his electorate and advocate the withdrawal of the peanut pool or the wheat pool. The Prime Minister has done his best to destroy the peanut industry. Some twelve months ago I paid a visit to the Atherton Tableland, and the maize-growers there assured me that but for the maize pool the industry in that district would not be the success that it is to-day.

During a holiday visit to Victoria last January I travelled in various farming centres, and when I spoke to the people there about pooling in relation to primary industries they were quite interested and enthusiastic, many of them requesting me to furnish them with copies of the Acts creating legislation in that regard in Queensland. They are satisfied that, if a butter pool operated in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, the three States would bring about a state of affairs that would ensure to the butter producer at least the cost of producing his product.

MR. MOORE: What about the Paterson scheme?

[Mr. Carter.

MR. CARTER: As a matter of fact, that scheme was devised originally by Mr. Delroy, of this State, and was rejected by Mr. Paterson until he was convinced that it would be of advantage to the farmers to put it into operation. The Paterson scheme is a Queensland scheme, which is only partially successful. I favour the bringing about of a scheme whereby New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, working in conjunction, could place the farmer in a position in which he would receive the full cost of production for his product; and no man better deserves that than the farmer. Hon. members opposite, when they were in power, made no attempt to stabilise the position of the primary producers. Even in the sugar industry it remained for the Labour Party to give the cane farmer such legislation as would safeguard his interests. (Opposition dissent.) Hon. members opposite are not game to advocate the repeal of the legislation creating the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. They do not like my saying that they made no attempt to place the farmers in a satisfactory position, whereas the farmers of Queensland are satisfied that our Government have done something in that direction. An attempt was made in Victoria to introduce a butter pool. The Assistant Minister for Agriculture in Victoria had very grave doubts as to the result of pool legislation if introduced. In the Melbourne "Argus" of 31st January, 1928, we find the following:—

"The Assistant Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Cain) said on Saturday that he believed that as a result of the pool in Queensland producers there had benefited considerably. Owing to the attitude of the Legislative Council, however, it seemed impossible to pass legislation of that kind in Victoria. That was indicated by the manner in which the Legislative Council had treated the two milk Bills introduced by the Ministry and the Farm Produce Agents' Bill. The milk Bills were intended to help milk producers, and the Farm Produce Agents Bill had been specifically designed to protect producers against unscrupulous agents, many of whom were evading the existing law. The Minister would consider the question of introducing legislation on the lines suggested by the conference."

It is quite safe to say that in Victoria, where a Labour Government is now in office, an endeavour will be made to introduce such legislation; and it is also safe to say that the members of the Legislative Council in Victoria, voicing the same opinions as hon. members in opposition here, will make a decided effort to prevent the passage of that legislation.

[4.30 p.m.]

Hon. members of the Legislative Council are not representatives of the Government there, but represent the same opinions as hon. members sitting on the other side in this Chamber. Mr. Cain said he was quite satisfied they would not get measures through which would be of benefit to the farmer because they had already blocked some and were strong enough to block them again. Therefore you can see quite well that in that State, although they have a Labour Premier, they have not the power to pass the necessary legislation, which is blocked by people who hold the same opinions as hon. members

opposite. I remember how various measures for the benefit of the primary producer that were brought forward in this House were fought to the bitter end by hon. members on the other side. I recollect, when a Bill was brought in to provide for a wheat pool, that the hon. member for Warwick and others in this Chamber made a very bitter stand against it.

MR. G. P. BARNES: Your statement is absolutely untrue. I challenge you on that. I took a leading part in that matter.

MR. CARTER: When the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill was introduced into this House the hon. member said it savoured of Sovietism. What Act has been more useful to the primary producers of Queensland than the Primary Producers' Organisation Act? It has at least put these people on their feet. It has at least taught them how to conduct their own affairs. No industry has been better conducted than the pooling and the handling of wheat by the farmers. The farmer, given the opportunity, will handle his own product satisfactorily with profit to himself and all those interested. We have been told by hon. members on the other side that our legislation has been injurious to the primary industries and that secondary industries have declined. Whilst in Melbourne I was very interested in reading an article by Mr. Yarwood in the "Argus" of 4th January last. Mr. Yarwood is a writer of some importance. He has just returned from the old country, and evidently in this article he was quoting from the Commonwealth statistics in regard to production in Australia, and gave the number of persons employed in the different States in the rural industries. He is a bitter opponent of Labour, yet in making this statement, as our opponents are sometimes liable to do, he unconsciously praised the Labour Government of Queensland. These are the figures he gave—

NUMBER EMPLOYED IN RURAL INDUSTRIES.

	1910.	1926.	Increase.
New South Wales	134,342	137,300	2,958
Victoria	154,031	117,183	*36,848
South Australia..	54,966	41,765	*13,201
Western Australia	24,588	37,099	12,511
Queensland ..	58,169	79,668	21,499

* Decrease.

That has occurred during the greater part of the period the Labour Party have been in office. During those thirteen years there was an increase in three States only—New South Wales, Western Australia, and Queensland—while in Victoria and South Australia—two primary-producing States which are well cultivated—there was a falling away. There has been no decrease in production under the legislation of Labour in Queensland during the years mentioned. That should be sufficient evidence to satisfy hon. members opposite that we have done something for the primary producers.

We are told by hon. members opposite that our high taxation is the cause of unemployment. The effect of taxation depends upon its incidence. We all know how interested the Tories are in taxation. We were told by people of the same political colour as the Bavin Government of New South Wales that things would be better in

that respect when that Government came into office. I have here a cutting from the "Courier" of 20th August with regard to taxation on products. This is a method which hon. members opposite would adopt, as they would say, in the interests of the people generally—

"Hobart, 19th August.

"Advice of a disturbing nature has been received in Hobart from the Associated Agents in Sydney. In a message to the Premier (Mr. J. McPhee) the president of the Associated Agents indicates that it is the intention of the New South Wales Government to ask the agents to furnish returns of produce and fruit sold for two years on account of Tasmanian growers, for purposes of income taxation. Five per cent. on the gross sales is to be considered the income, and the tax is to amount to 9d. in the £ up to £250, thence increasing to 3s. in the £. The Premier has obtained a report from the Commissioner of Taxes (Mr. H. E. Downe) and is taking up the matter immediately with the New South Wales Government. Tasmania is at present taxing goods brought into the State and sold by mainland firms, all States having power to do so under their own Acts. Hitherto Tasmanian producers have not been taxed for commodities sent to the New South Wales markets. If the proposed tax becomes an accomplished fact it means that the New South Wales grower will be protected to the extent of the tax rate per case on his apples, while the Tasmanian grower will have to pay income tax in Tasmania, and also on the sales of his produce in New South Wales."

Hon. members opposite, if in power, would bring in exactly the same kind of legislation as the Premier of New South Wales, who proposes not only to tax the people in his own State but to tax the primary producer in Tasmania to the tune of 9d. in the £1 up to £250, thence increasing to 3s. in the £1. That is how friends of hon. members opposite regard the primary producer. In the past the primary producer was their great milch cow. What the agents left him, their Governments took from him by a poll tax or some other method. Hon. members opposite are trying to tell the farmers that, if they go to the country, they will give him a square deal. Was it a square deal to tax the unfortunate fruitgrowers of Tasmania not only in that State but also in New South Wales? That is the attitude taken up by hon. members opposite.

Hon. members opposite made a great song of the land tax, which they regard as the most injurious of all. Is it injurious to the farmer? Not a bit of it. The farmer in this State does not pay a land tax. The city men pay it, and hon. members opposite represent those wealthy interests which find the funds to assist them to get back to Parliament. Naturally they regard the land tax as a most injurious tax. I regard the land tax as not a tax but an economic rent. It is revenue derived from the value created by the whole of the people. Take, for instance, an area of ground like that upon which the "Courier" building stands. In 1861 the "Courier" block was sold for £80, and to-day, if every brick were razed and the ground was in exactly the same position

Mr. Carter.]

as in 1861, when it brought £80, it would fetch £1,000 per foot. That was sixty-seven years ago.

During those sixty-seven years the people of Queensland, by borrowing money and expending their efforts and their money, have increased the value of the land it stands upon from £80 for the block to £1,000 per foot frontage. The whole of that increased value is, therefore, made by the people, and not by those who own the land, therefore the collection of that tax is but the collection of an economic rent in return for the value brought about by the efforts of the people. I do not say that, if we were freed from freehold, that amount would be put upon it, but I am satisfied that, if it carried that amount, it would only be making a just return. Land tax is not a tax on the people, but a collection of that amount of value which properly belongs to the people who created it.

I regard unemployment as probably the most important question that can be discussed by any Parliament in the world. To my mind it is a very vital question, and, as unemployment is constantly occurring, and there seems to be no definite way of checking it, some form of inquiry should be made as to what should be done. We are all agreed that land is the primary source from which all wealth is drawn. That being so, all obstacles to the accessibility of land and all obstacles in the way of the distribution of the produce of the land are causes of unemployment. I shall deal with that phase of the question a little later. The fact that land under freehold tenure is in the hands of private individuals and, therefore, gives them the opportunity of imposing a burden on the production and distribution of wealth really means in many cases that it costs nearly as much to distribute the fruits of the soil as to produce it. In a little fruit shop in Brunswick street just opposite to where I am living we have an example. It is an area with a frontage of about 16 feet, with a building on it in such a state of disrepair that sooner or later it will have to be pulled down; yet the owner of that site is in a position to compel the tenant to pay a rent of £14 and a rate of £4 5s. a week, so that every evening before he can take anything out of his business he has to take £3 for rates and rent. A burden is thereby imposed on the people, a tax upon the usable land, and the consumer is burdened with a cost which does not benefit the producer. If the tax is got in the form of rent to the Crown, then the user is relieved of other forms of tax; but this private owner who contributes nothing to distribution or production, who gives nothing for it, collects £2 a day, or £14 a week, from the selling of that fruit. That cost of £2 has to be placed on the consumer for the fruit sold in that shop. On top of that come the rates. Naturally, the Council takes rates for the value which they have created. They say, "We have lighted your city. We have furnished you with water. We have furnished you with a sewerage system. We have given you streets and pavements which can be used by you and your customers, and for these facilities we are going to charge you £4 5s. a week." If that land belonged to the Government or the Council, they would not need to collect the £4 5s., because they would take the economic rent which justly belongs to them. I justify the collection of the rate by the Council, but the owner of the property

has created nothing and given nothing. Yet he takes £14 every week for the use of that piece of ground. That is evidence that considerable obstacles are thrown in the way of distributing the product of the land, so that the charges on the sale of fruit in Brisbane are actually greater than the cost of production and railage to the city. There is no doubt about that.

The question of unemployment is of such great importance that to my mind it requires a great deal more consideration than we have given to it. When we are looking for a remedy we should inquire as to the cause of the malady, and I think the matter is deserving of a great deal of consideration. I know of no better method of inquiry than by going to older countries, particularly the countries from which our forefathers came, and make inquiries there. I know of no country the economic history of which is more interesting than that of Great Britain. In following the history of Great Britain and Ireland, one ascertains that there was a period in the history of Great Britain and Ireland when there was no unemployment. Indeed, right up to about the middle or towards the end of the fifteenth century there were no unemployed in Great Britain. It is true that conditions were tending towards the period when there would be unemployment. I commend to hon. members opposite quite a number of economic works on the history of Great Britain, amongst them Thorold Rogers' "Six Centuries of Work and Wages." During the Saxon period, owing to the condition of those who lived upon the land, unemployment was entirely unknown, although the use of the land was somewhat interfered with after the Norman Conquest, when the feudal system was introduced. Still the people of Great Britain continued to use the land almost without inaccessibility right up to the end of the fifteenth century. Prior to that there was a steady enclosure of land going on. The people were fully entitled to use the land, with some inaccessibility, but no great inaccessibility, that is the owners, the greater people amongst them, were in a position to demand some of their efforts, but not to such an extent as to interfere materially with the people making a living from the land as an evidence of the evil effects of the enclosure of lands previously the common rights of the people.

I should like to refer to a piece of legislation introduced during the reign of Richard III. This should be interesting as giving some indication of the causes of unemployment. Prior to that there had been no such thing as freehold in land in Great Britain, but about that time they began to take lump sum commutations instead of service or rent. I propose to quote portion of a speech delivered by the Lord Chancellor, John Russell, who opened the first Parliament of Richard III. in 1483. This is a very significant statement—

"And yet, be he never so great, if by his doing this body (the English people) falleth in decay, as we see dayly it doth by enclosures and emparking, by driving away of tenants and letting down of tenancies; and yet, that is most to be sorrowed, by unlawful assemblies and insurrections, putting not only the people but also the nobles to extreme jeopardy and peril of life and limb whereby the country is greatly depeopled."

[Mr. Carter.

That statement was made at a time when unemployment was commencing in Great Britain, and the Lord Chancellor of the day was wise enough to realise that steps should be taken to protect the people on the land, and he introduced this measure to safeguard the users of the land in Great Britain. The law was more or less ineffective, and enclosures in areas that belonged to the people continued. Lords and others, by dishonest practices, took the land from the mass of the people, and this continued slowly, and then with greater force until about the end of the seventeenth century. Coincident with this enclosure of land, there was evidence of a steady increase in unemployment. The people were driven off the land into the cities. These citations are very valuable, as they give some evidence of what may happen in the future if the policy of the Opposition were put into force in this State.

I now desire to quote another economist of some importance, and that is the late Karl Marx. I do not necessarily agree with all his doctrines, but whether one agrees with an economist or not he always finds some things in his expressions which may be true. Karl Marx said—

“The starting point of the development that gave rise to the wage labourer as well as to the capitalist was the servitude of the labourer. The expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process.”

Karl Marx was clear sighted enough on that occasion to see the evil of the expropriation of the people from the soil. It may be argued that in a State like Queensland the system of land tenure cannot affect the position very much, but I have just pointed out two instances in the city which go to show that where obstacles are thrown in the way of the use of the land to the detriment of the people, unemployment results. I am satisfied that, if the land in the cities belonged to the people, as well as the land in the country, and if the system of perpetual leasehold had been established in Australia when settlement was first inaugurated, a better state of affairs would exist to-day. Unfortunately we followed the footsteps of older countries. We allowed the land to be freehold, and every kind of obstacle thrown in the way of the people desiring to use it. In New Zealand, the country of my birth, when I was a boy wheat could be grown and sold profitably in Australia at 2s. 6d. per bushel. When I was in New Zealand four years ago I made inquiries, and found that wheat to the value of £1,000,000 was being imported into that Dominion, which is a country of primary production. They cannot now grow wheat in New Zealand under 5s. 6d. a bushel and make it pay. Why? Because the whole of the arable land of New Zealand was freehold and speculated in years ago, and thus became over-capitalised.

Mr. MOORE: It pays them better to grow sheep.

Mr. CARTER: The land on Canterbury Plains, where they used to grow wheat, is now valued up to £160 an acre. Imagine a

man having to pay £10 an acre per annum for the use of the soil and in order to live on it! There is an obstacle in the way of a man desirous of growing wheat, the staple product of the people. In the North Island land which could formerly be obtained for £1 or £2 an acre has now gone up to £160 and £170 per acre, and is leased for £10 an acre per annum. In my boyhood days these lands were valued at a low figure. The freeholding of these lands put the owners in a position to turn the people out of their own country. It is quite rational to suppose that, if one man were allowed to get the whole of the land in the country, he could make the whole of the rest of the people unemployed, and the people should be wise enough to see that the unemployment question is inextricably interwoven with the land question.

Mr. KELSO: Can you say why in Queensland under the perpetual leasehold system land settlement is decreasing?

Mr. CARTER: I am satisfied that it is increasing. If the hon. member went away from the bank of which he is a director and travelled the country as much as I do, he would soon find that settlement in Queensland under the perpetual leasehold system is improving. (Opposition interjection.) If he went into the Upper Burnett district he would be told that they would have no other system.

Mr. BRAND: You will find that the people there want freehold.

Mr. CARTER: That is not so.

Mr. BRAND: Every man wants freehold tenure.

Mr. CARTER: I know that the sons of people with whom freehold tenure was formerly in the nature of a belief are now realising the value of the leasehold system; but, whether the individuals realise it or not, the people of Australia should appreciate the fact that land cannot be held in private hands without causing unemployment. Unemployment is the result of the private ownership of land and the exclusion of the use of that land by people who are justly entitled to it. If the people of Australia set to work to correct this position, they would realise that the unemployment problem could to a great extent be overcome. I do not say that there are not also minor causes. Mass production has been resorted to in industrial activities by the introduction of machinery. Hon. members opposite stress the necessity of the capitalist, who, they say, cannot be done without. What is capital? Is it not a product derived from land by labour and used again in the production of more wealth? People can produce what they require if they are given the opportunity, and that opportunity should be afforded them. The greatest cause of unemployment in this or any other country is the pernicious system of allowing people to hold land without putting it to productive use.

Coming back to the question of land tax, hon. members opposite say that the imposition of that tax has been the greatest cause.

Mr. Carter.]

of unemployment. My answer to that is that the lack of the collection of the economic rent of the land is the cause of unemployment. If people who hold the land out of use were compelled to pay heavily for so doing, or to hand the land over to people who would put it to use, I am safe in saying that unemployment would decrease. Since a land tax was imposed many owners of freehold land in the city have erected big buildings. Hon. members opposite say that the land tax is passed on by the people on whom it is imposed; but, if the tax is exacted in the way it should be, it will cheapen the tenure of land and cheapen the use of land. When hon. members opposite tell the people that a tax upon land values is a danger to the State, an impediment to production, and the greatest cause of unemployment, they are talking without any knowledge of economics, and are showing clearly that they have not read any works which would indicate what has taken place in older countries. If those hon. members made a complete study of the economic state of the older countries, they would be of a different opinion, unless, of course, they were swayed by the large money interests which they represent. I know that a land tax may be a hardship on some people. For example, it might be a hardship on the man who purchased the "Courier" block at £1,000 per foot; but that does not say that the Government should consider that man. If one person sells another man's horse, the person who owned it would be still entitled to the horse; and, whilst it would be a hardship on the person who bought the horse because some thief sold it to him, it would not alter the position. That is the position in regard to the land tax, which should be imposed to conserve the interests of the people of this State. I know that hon. members opposite are actuated in their objection to the land tax by the fact that it hurts their wealthy friends. They know perfectly well that comparatively few people in the country pay it; but because some of their wealthy friends in the city come within the ambit of the land tax provisions they are up in arms to protect those people, whose influence and monetary assistance send them to this Chamber.

[5 p.m.]

We have the "Courier," the "Daily Mail," and wealthy interests contributing large sums of money to assist hon. members opposite—all taken out of this wealth which ought to go back to the people. I have stated the case for the land tax quite clearly, and I am satisfied that the amendment, based upon the evidence brought forward by the Opposition, is not worthy of consideration, and I am further satisfied that, when the vote is taken, it will not be carried—not because we have a majority, but because the majority have the common sense to understand the situation.

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*): 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 5.2 p.m.

[*Mr. Carter.*