

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 1929

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER, 1929.

The SPEAKER (Hon. C. Taylor, *Windsor*)
took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

QUESTIONS.

FINE INFLICTED FOR ADULTERATION OF MILK.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*) asked the Home Secretary—

“ 1. Has his attention been drawn to certain proceedings in the Brisbane Magistrates Court yesterday, which resulted in a certain milk vendor being convicted for selling milk to which 6.5 per cent. of water had been added, and for which crime he was fined £2, with £1 4s. 6d. costs?

“ 2. Does he consider the penalty adequate?

“ 3. If not, will he take such steps as are necessary to protect milk consumers, consisting largely of children, from this particular form of injury and robbery?

“ 4. In the case mentioned, why was the practice of inflicting fines equal to £1 for every unit of added water departed from?

"5. Does the meagre fine inflicted represent the application of the Government's proclaimed policy of no interference with private industry?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2 to 4. The imposition of the penalty was a matter entirely for the presiding magistrate who heard the evidence, and had all the facts before him. As the questions involve a serious reflection upon the Chief Police Magistrate, who heard the case, he was given an opportunity to report upon the matter to the Crown Law Department. His report is as follows:—

Brisbane, 30th August, 1929.

William Henry Kelly *v.* John Templeton Wood.

SELLING ADULTERATED MILK.

Report.

1. Copy official record of proceedings attached hereto with special reference to the statement of the Prosecuting Crown Officer (Mr. Robert Martin).

2. In consequence of Mr. Martin's submission, in addition, the youth and complete obvious inexperience of the defendant, and no water being found in the cart, I chose to depart from my universal practice of imposing a fine of £1 for each per cent. of water. Again, to demonstrate the ignorance of the defendant, he could have secured insistent legal immunity and non-liability for his act had he obtained from the vendor the guarantee provided by section 129 of the Health Acts. The method adopted of measuring the punishment by £1 per each per cent. of water is mine, and mine alone. Perhaps further attention may be invited to Mr. Martin's statement that since the date of offence on no less than three occasions have samples of milk then in process of sale by the defendant to consumers been tested and found to be of the required legal standard. That officer also intimated that the youth was not the owner of any dairy cattle, but exercised his calling by purchasing from a wholesale vendor.

"The submission of the Prosecuting Crown Officer (Mr. Robert Martin), to which the Chief Magistrate directs special reference, was as follows:—

Martin for prosecution states—Defendant a young man (about twenty or twenty-one years). His father bought him a milk run from a man named Gadsby. About 3.40 a.m. took delivery of milk in bulk (about 16 to 18 gallons) from a wholesaler. About 5 a.m. sample taken which which was later found to be adulterated (as per analyst's certificate). Defendant did not then know that the milk taken was adulterated. Also overlooked method of self-protection by obtaining the guarantee provided under section 129 of the Health Acts.

Excuse was that he had pursued this occupation for period of one week only. Three samples have since been taken from this vendor and found to be up to the standard required.

5. The Commissioner of Public Health authorised the prosecution on the 21st June last without any reference to me or the Home Department, which is the usual practice. My attention was first directed to the matter by the questions of the hon. member. As the implication of the hon. member is that the Government has given instructions to a court of justice to impose meagre fines in the interests of private industry as against the public interest, I have to inform the hon. member that I gave instructions some weeks ago for the institution of an effective motor transportation service for the inspectors engaged upon milk inspection. I desire also to mention that several prosecutions have been made since the Government took office, and a number are now pending, and not one of these cases was or has been referred to me or my department, nor have I issued instructions with regard to any of them, or in any way affecting the discretion of the Commissioner of Public Health in these matters."

PRODUCTION AT COLLINSVILLE STATE COAL MINE.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. What was the production of coal at the State coalmine, Collinsville, during each of the years ended 30th June, 1927, 1928, and 1929, respectively?

"2. What was the average cost of production during each of the periods mentioned in (1)?

"3. What tonnage of coal was exported during each of the aforementioned periods?

"4. For each of the periods mentioned, what were (a) the profits of the mine; (b) the amounts paid in interest and redemption to the Treasury; and (c) the amounts of royalties paid to the Mines Department?

"5. What has been the total profits of the mine since its inception to 30th June, 1929?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. E. A. Atherton, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"1. Saleable coal produced—1926-27, 106,481 tons; 1927-28, 114,802 tons; 1928-29, 129,100 tons.

"2. Average cost of production—1926-27, 15s. 1.2d.; 1927-28, 13s. 9.3d.; 1928-29, 13s. 11.95d.

"3. Export and bunker to interstate and oversea—1926-27, 3,466 tons; 1927-28, 12,388 tons; 1928-29, 35,935 tons.

"4. (a) Profits—1926-27, £6,079 14s. 6d.; 1927-28, £8,070 2s. 6d.; 1928-29, £4,718 17s. 10d. (b) Interest and depreciation—1926-27, £5,601 18s. 6d.; 1927-28, £5,478 8s. 11d.; 1928-29, £5,478 3s. 11d. (c)

Royalties—1926-27, £2,754 16s. 1d.; 1927-28, £5,523 15s. 2d.; 1928-29, £6,455 0s. 2d.
 “5. £46,773 18s.”

REBATES BY HARBOUR BOARDS OF PORT CHARGES ON COAL FOR EXPORT.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*) asked the Treasurer—

“1. When was the system first established of granting rebates of port charges, etc., by harbour boards, in connection with coal for export?”

“2. What is the exact nature of such rebates, and at what ports is it applicable?”

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Wynnum*) replied—

“The rebate is not allowed by harbour boards. It applies to dues payable on vessels under the provisions of the Port Dues Revision Act Amendment Act of 1920. Collections under this Act are payable to consolidated revenue. The concession was first granted in the year 1906, when a rebate of 9d. per ton was allowed in respect of not less than 500 tons of coal for bunkering purposes from any Queensland colliery, and it was continued, at reducing rates, until 1st July, 1911. The rebate was again granted for the period 1st December, 1922, to 30th November, 1923, at the rate of 9d. per ton on not less than 300 tons of coal from the Ipswich district taken by overseas vessels for bunkering purposes. On 1st March, 1924, the Government decided to allow a rebate of 9d. per ton on not less than 300 tons of Ipswich coal taken by overseas vessels for either bunkering or cargo purposes. This concession is still in operation, and it was extended to Bowen coal on the 1st May, 1924, to Burrum coal on the 1st July, 1923, and to Central district coal on the 1st November, 1923.

“2. Any oversea vessel loading for bunkering or cargo purposes 300 tons or over of coal is granted a rebate of dues payable under the provisions of the Port Dues Revision Act Amendment Act of 1920, not exceeding 9d. per ton on the quantity of coal so loaded; such rebate not to exceed the amount of dues under the said Act payable on account of the vessel, and, in calculating the rebate, the amount of rebate allowed to the vessel at all ports to be taken into account.”

RAILWAY COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. As he admits that there are more than two persons (in Queensland) qualified to do the work that Messrs. Harris and Cameron are capable of doing, why did he appoint the above persons in preference to two Queenslanders?”

“2. What wages, fees, or salary is being paid Messrs. Cameron and Harris for their services as Commissioners?”

“3. As Messrs. Cameron and Harris are on holiday leave and on pay from their employers (the Victorian

Nationalist Government), does he consider it is right and proper for Messrs. Cameron and Harris to be also in receipt of payment from the Queensland Nationalist Government?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

“1. I consider Messrs. Harris and Cameron are two of the most suitable men in Australia to conduct such an inquiry.

“2. The total cost will be made public on completion of the inquiry.

“3. I am not concerned whether Messrs. Harris and Cameron are on holidays or not, as the fact of being on holidays will not affect them in making a full and thorough investigation.”

STAFFING OF SOUTH BRISBANE-KYOGLE RAILWAY.

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“In view of his reply to my question of 27th ultimo re the staffing of the South Brisbane-Kyogle Railway, will he give an undertaking that he will staff such train with Queensland railway employees?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

“I have already agreed to receive a deputation representative of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen in regard to a quota of the work on the Kyogle-Sydney line being performed by employees of the Queensland service, and it is my intention to see what can be done to secure a proportion of the work for employees in my department.”

RELEASE OF OPOSSUMS PURCHASED IN SPRINGSURE DISTRICT.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

“Where does the Department of Agriculture intend to release the young opossums purchased by that department in the Springsure district?”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. F. Walker, *Cooroora*) replied—

“The Department of Agriculture and Stock has released on Facing Island Sanctuary a number of opossums sufficiently matured and capable of fending for themselves. In addition, young opossums are being liberated in the recently proclaimed sanctuary on Westgrove Station with a view to determine the influence exerted by the opossum in curtailing the losses in stock as a result of the Sawfly pest.”

SUGGESTED SUPPLY OF ELECTRIC LIGHT BY RAILWAY DEPARTMENT TO BUSINESS PREMISES IN EMERALD.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“Would the Railway Department favourably consider the supply of electric

light to business premises at Emerald from the railway plant?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

"The plant is not of sufficient capacity to supply electric light to the business premises at Emerald. Should representatives of Emerald approach me and submit a business proposition it will be given full consideration."

DIFFERENCE IN PRICE OF COLLINSVILLE STATE AND BURRUM COAL FOR EXPORT.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*), for Mr. JONES (*Paaddington*), asked the Secretary for Mines—

"What is the difference in the price of run-of-mine coal between the Bowen State coal and the coal from the mines mentioned by him for export, in reply to a question without notice by the hon. member for Burrum?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. E. A. Atherton, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"The price of run-of-mine Bowen coal to Mr. Sleigh under his 1927 contract is 12s. per ton on trucks at pithead; the price for recent sales from the other mines in question for export was 26s. 6d. per ton f.o.b., equal to 22s. 2d. per ton at pithead, the difference being 10s. 2d. per ton in Mr. Sleigh's favour."

EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES OF MR. W. FORGAN SMITH ON TRIP TO NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) asked the Premier—

"1. What was the total of expenses and allowances charged to the State in respect of the trip to New Zealand taken by the Honourable W. Forgan Smith, while Secretary for Agriculture and Stock during 1928?"

"2. What was the date of his departure and return, and the period of his absence on this trip?"

"3. What was the average charge per day for expenses and allowances for this trip?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*), for the PREMIER (Hon. A. E. Moore, *Aubigny*), replied—

"1. £613 0s. 3d.

"2. Departure, 9th January, 1928; return, 24th February, 1928; 47 days (inclusive).

"3. £13 0s. 10d.

EXPENDITURE BY MAIN ROADS COMMISSION.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

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

"2. Of the actual expenditure by the Main Roads Commission during the last financial year under the Commonwealth

Main Roads Agreement, what amount was contributed by (a) Commonwealth grant; (b) State subsidy; (c) motor taxation?"

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

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

"1. (a) £853,689; (b) £92,272; (c) £180,596.

"2. (a) £401,664; (b) £137,695; (c) £163,553 paid from revenues of Main Roads Fund, which largely consists of motor vehicle registration fees. (b) and (c) comprise State subsidy under Federal Aid Roads Agreement.

"3. Total amount available—(a) £625,608; (b) £448,000; (c) £410,000."

MEN DISCHARGED FROM IPSWICH RAILWAY STATION CONSTRUCTION WORK AFTER GENERAL ELECTION.

Mr. COOPER (*Bremer*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"How many men working upon the new Ipswich railway station were discharged some time after the recent general election?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. Godfrey Morgan, *Murilla*) replied—

"The work, which is situated in the hon. member's electorate, was recommenced shortly before the last election, and owing to its unproductive nature was again suspended in May, when the services of eleven men were dispensed with."

Mr. COOPER (*Bremer*) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

"1. Was any communication sent by him or by his department to the Ipswich City Council asking that consideration be given by the council to the men discharged from the new railway station upon any work undertaken by the council with a view to the relief of unemployment?"

"2. What reply was received from the council?"

"3. What was the date of the reply?"

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. H. E. Sizer, *Sandgate*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. and 3. None."

HOSPITAL DISTRICTS; PRECEPTS LEVIED UPON LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. What were the amounts of the precepts levied upon local authorities component in the several hospital districts throughout the State in respect to the financial year 1928-29?"

"2. What were the contributions payable by the Government to the respective hospital boards during the same period?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*) replied—
"1 and 2.—

HOSPITAL BOARDS.

PRECEPTS LEVIED UPON LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE BY THE GOVERNMENT DURING 1928—1929.

Hospital Board.	Component Local Authorities in District.	Local Authority Precepts.			Government Contribution.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Adavale	Shire of Adavale	1,069	19	3	1,604	18	11
Atherton	Shires of Eacham and Tinaroo	2,165	3	6	3,247	15	4
Brisbane and South Coast	City of Brisbane. Towns of Coolangatta, Redcliffe, and Southport. Shires of Beenleigh, Caboolture, Cleveland, Coomera, Nerang, Pine, Tambourine, Tingalpa, and Waterford	31,896	8	0	47,829	12	0
Bundaberg	City of Bundaberg. Shires of Gooburrum, Isis, Kolan, Perry, and Woongarra	8,522	8	0	12,783	12	0
Cairns	City of Cairns and Shire of Cairns	5,932	0	0	8,898	0	0
Central Burnett	Shires of Degilbo, Gayndah, and Mundubbera	4,188	12	9	6,282	19	2
Cook	Town of Cooktown and Shire of Cook	450	8	0	675	12	0
Gladstone	Town of Gladstone. Shires of Calliope and Miriam Vale	1,545	12	0	2,318	8	0
Goondiwindi	Town of Goondiwindi and Shire of Waggamba	1,560	0	0	2,340	0	0
Gympie	City of Gympie. Shires of Kilkivan, Noosa, and Widgee	1,788	19	2	2,683	8	9
Jericho	Shire of Jericho	1,100	16	7	1,651	4	11
Mackay	City of Mackay. Shires of Mirani, Nebo, Pioneer, and Sarina	3,358	3	5	5,037	5	2
Maryborough	City of Maryborough. Shires of Burrum, Tiaro, and Woocoo	4,786	11	0	7,179	16	6
Port Douglas	Shire of Douglas	1,091	14	8	1,637	12	0
Rockhampton	City of Rockhampton. Shires of Duaringa, Fitzroy, and Livingstone	7,303	4	1	10,954	16	2
Tambo (for period May and June)	Shire of Tambo	164	8	0	246	12	0
Toowoomba	City of Toowoomba. Shires of Cambooya, Clifton, Crow's Nest, Drayton, Highfields, Jondaryan, Millmerran, Pittsworth, Rosalie, and Tarampa	7,070	9	9	10,605	14	7
Townsville	City of Townsville. Shires of Hinchinbrook and Thuringowa	6,571	5	5	9,856	18	1

ADVANCES FOR RINGBARKING.

Mr. CONROY (*Maranoa*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. How many applications have been received for advances for ringbarking?"

"2. What is the total amount of advances applied for?"

"3. Are applications for advances for ringbarking only open to pastoral lessees and lessees of grazing homesteads?"

"4. As I understand £600,000 is available for advances for ringbarking, is there any limit to the amount which may be advanced to any applicant for an advance?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. A. Deacon, *Cunningham*) replied—

"1 to 4. Negotiations with the Commonwealth Government have not yet been completed in the matter of the State obtaining a loan for ringbarking purposes under the terms of the £34,000,000 agreement. Legislation specifying the terms and conditions on which ringbarking advances will be made will shortly be introduced."

[3 p.m.]

PAPERS IN RE SLEIGH AGREEMENT FOR SALE OF COAL FROM COLLINSVILLE STATE MINE.

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*), without notice, asked the hon. member for Bowen—

"(1) Has the hon. member perused the papers at the Mines Department

relating to the Sleigh contract with the State Coalmine, Collinsville?"

"(2) Was the reply given the hon. member for Cook by the Minister for Mines, wherein he quoted the comments of Mr. J. Stafford, Supervisor of Mines, complete or were important qualifications omitted?"

"(3) If any important omission was made, what words were omitted?"

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*) replied—

"(1) Yes."

"(2) The reply given by the Minister for Mines omitted an important qualification.

"(3) The words omitted from Mr. Stafford's comments were the following paragraph, which should follow immediately after the word 'production' on the third last line of Mr. Atherton's reply to Mr. Kenny, as reported on page 53 of 'Hansard'—

If an outlet for slack were available, then costs would be considerably reduced, and the increased output by export trade would also lower costs of production, as overhead charges are constant and are dividable by the output.

The papers disclose a proper effort to build up the export trade from Bowen, and do not disclose any justification for the inferences drawn by the Minister."

ANALYSIS OF VOTING AT GENERAL ELECTION.

RETURN TO ORDER.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 29th August last, on the motion of Mr. Maxwell, showing the detailed results of the voting at the various polling-booths throughout the State at the recent general election.

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulations under The State Children Acts, 1911 to 1923, dated 1st August, 1923.

Rule under The Police Acts, 1838 to 1924, dated 15th August, 1929.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBERS.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*), for the PREMIER (Hon. A. E. Moore, *Aubigny*): I beg to move—

“That leave of absence, for the remainder of this Session, be granted to Mr. William McCormack, Member for the Electoral District of Cairns, and Mr. John Mullan, Member for the Electoral District of Flinders.”

Mr. DUNLOP (*Rockhampton*): I called “Not formal” to this motion for the purpose of obtaining information as to whether there is any system existing in this Legislature regarding holidays or leave of absence to members of Parliament. I understand that the hon. member for Flinders was sworn in before leaving, but that the late Premier, Mr. McCormack, was not. I also saw only a few days ago where a ruling was given that, when a parliamentarian was away for a full session, his seat was declared vacant. If a medical certificate setting forth illness has been tendered to the Premier by either of these hon. gentlemen, there might be something in the motion, but seeing that public servants to-day receive only a certain amount of leave of absence on full pay, those who are the makers of the law should not receive preferential treatment as against our public servants. I would like to know from you, Mr. Speaker, or from the Secretary for Public Instruction, who is acting on behalf of the Premier, what is the true position in regard to the hon. member for Cairns going away. So far as I am concerned, what is right for the goose is right for the gander, and I, as a one-time public servant, maintain that those outside Parliament should be treated just as liberally as the late Premier is being treated. I called “Not formal” in order to get that necessary information for the benefit of Queensland as a whole.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat apparently is not very well acquainted with the courtesies and decencies that are usually observed in this Chamber. For his information, I might say that a motion of this kind is a courtesy usually extended by every Premier, no matter to which party he may belong. The Government of which I was a member over a period of years very frequently granted leave of absence to hon. members. The hon. member for Fassifern

is one hon. member that I call to mind who received a similar courtesy. The position with regard to the two hon. gentlemen mentioned in the motion is that the hon. member for Cairns decided to take a trip abroad on account of his health. His health has been bad for a number of years, and he is now undergoing a certain form of medical treatment in London.

In addition to that, he has rendered very valuable service to Queensland in London. As the Premier and other Ministers know, when the question of preferential duties or rebates on existing sugar duties in Great Britain was being discussed, I, in consultation with the Premier, made certain representations to the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments. Every effort that could be made by this party in conjunction with the Government was made. In addition to that, the services of the hon. member for Cairns, as ex-Premier of the State, have been availed of in London as an advocate for the important sugar industry of Queensland. Only this morning I received a letter from that hon. gentleman intimating that he had had interviews with practically every Minister of the Cabinet in Great Britain, outlining the position as it affected Queensland and Australia, and, in addition to that, he had been given the opportunity of addressing an important Dominions Committee of the House of Commons on the case for the retention of the existing preferential duties on sugar. In countless different ways, as the Premier knows, the hon. member is making use of his special knowledge to advance the best interests of Queensland industries. Everyone who knows the hon. member knows that, prior to his leaving Queensland, he was a sick man. He has been a sick man for a number of years. He is carrying out very important functions in London on behalf of Queensland at the present time, and the courtesy of the Premier in proposing this motion is one that should appeal to every member of this House. It certainly does to me.

With regard to the hon. member for Flinders, he also has been in bad health for some time. He is taking the opportunity to visit his native land, and also to visit France, to see the grave of his son who was killed in the great war—a very commendable and laudable enterprise on the part of any parent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): The hon. member for Rockhampton, who called “Not formal” on his own initiative, apparently does not understand the position. It has been truly stated by the Leader of the Opposition that this granting of leave of absence is a privilege which is granted to members of the House. There is a precedent for granting leave of absence to members of Parliament who are away, notwithstanding the fact that they have not been sworn. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the case of the hon. member of Fassifern in 1920, notwithstanding the fact that he had not taken the oath.

Regarding the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to assure the House and that hon. member that the Government are well able to look after the interests of Queensland in Great Britain notwithstanding that the hon. member for Cairns is there.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. M. King.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. member for Cairns ostensibly went to the old country for health reasons. We have our business to do in the old country, and we know how to carry it out. We also know that, in connection with the threatened removal of preference by the new Labour Government in England, the Premier took all the necessary steps at the time for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of Queensland; and we are very well able to continue that course of conduct without the aid of the hon. member for Cairns. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the interests of Queensland will be perfectly well safeguarded in the hands of the Government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. N. F. Macgroarty, *South Brisbane*), who was received with Government cheers, said: Mr. Speaker, in common with other speakers who have preceded me, I have great pleasure in congratulating you on your elevation to the Speakership of this House. I have no doubt that your long parliamentary career and experience, coupled with your undoubted standing as a man of character in this community, will help you to preserve the high traditions of the office to which you have been called.

I also take the opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for Bulimba and the hon. member for Cook on the manner in which they moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I would like to say one special word with regard to the first lady who has entered this Parliament of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have been associated with her sufficiently long to know that she is a very worthy lady member of Parliament. She is a most intellectual and ladylike woman, and that makes us all feel that her entry into Parliament is a desirable thing. (Hear, hear!)

Before proceeding with my speech, I think it will be fitting to say that I consider that I stand on this front Treasury bench a very lucky man, fully realising the great responsibilities I am taking upon my shoulders, appreciating the reasons why this position has been conferred upon me, and assuring hon. members that I shall do everything to carry out my duties in an honourable manner.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In speaking to the Address in Reply, I want to say that I was very pleased with His Excellency the Governor's Speech. I was very pleased to hear the Governor deliver it, and I was very disappointed to hear the Leader of the Opposition describe it as a "dull, sordid document." Such a description by the hon. member made me look round for a reason, and I did not have to look long, because of necessity the document had something to say about the removal of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues from the Treasury benches. Of course, he is not

pleased with that. But I think I can say confidently that the hon. member did not read the Speech as the people of Queensland read it. In addition to reading it under circumstances which were not at all pleasant to him, he did not have the great privilege that you, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, myself, and other hon. members had of hearing His Excellency deliver it in another room. He did not see the glorious spectacle of the opening of this Parliament nor did he hear that great Speech delivered. He did not see the display of enthusiasm, which would uplift anybody. I even thought that Labour supporters would be ready to get up and cheer. Have you, Mr. Speaker, ever seen a finer display of enthusiasm and confidence in this building? I was told by one Labour supporter that he had been attending the opening of Parliament for many years and he had never seen such a great opening. (Opposition interruption.) Hon. members opposite have to remember that that opening was a remarkable demonstration of the confidence of the people in hon. members on this side of the House, and proved their support of this Government, whether hon. members opposite like it or not.

Mr. HYNES: It was a great circus.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It was a noteworthy demonstration; it was an undoubted expression of confidence in the Government by the people who attended that function. That, I say, may have been one of the reasons why the Leader of the Opposition described His Excellency's Speech in the way he did. He read it away in a quiet room, and it reminded him that he was one of the Government who had been displaced from office. In reference to the hon. member's protest against the holding of that opening in the Legislative Council Chamber, as a member of the Cabinet I would like to add that, as another hon. member has remarked, it was simply for the reason that one hundred and fifty more people could be accommodated there than here. That is the only significance attaching to the fact that the opening took place in another room. Of course, it may be a fact—I do not know, because I have not had the necessary previous experience—that the Labour Government, or the Labour Party, could not demand or command such support and interest in opening their Parliaments as to fill that Chamber, whereas we, anticipating the large number of people who would want to be present, accommodated them to their satisfaction.

The Leader of the Opposition also said that our policy is not constructive—that it is 95 per cent. destructive. Perhaps he is right; but what a sorry spectacle that, after fourteen years of Labour Government, their successors find that they must of necessity be destructive rather than constructive! We—when I say "we," I refer to the members of this party who were then seeking admission to Parliament—went through the whole country telling the people in no unmistakable terms that we should have to be destructive in order to be constructive; and they returned us to power on those lines. It is a fact that, as a consequence, we must first of all put our house in order, and then proceed with further constructive legislation. Ever since I have been a politician and a member of the Cabinet requests to

[Hon. R. M. King.]

my own department for constructive legislation have been numerous.

Mr. HANLON: Why not get on with them?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will get on with them in my own good time; that time will come. The time will come when there will be law reform; when the State will be working under a modern and consolidated Companies Act, and not one that dates from 1853. There is any amount of legislation that can be initiated in my department, and that legislation will come in due time after we put our house in order. The requests have been numerous, but they will be dealt with in good time.

The Leader of the Opposition, claiming to know the problems of government, expressed some doubt as to whether he should congratulate or sympathise with the Premier on his success at the poll. My association with the Premier assures me that he is fully seized with the important problems of government, and there are two foremost reasons that impart that assurance so convincingly. First, his long and honourable career in Parliament; second, the fact that he sat for so many years on Opposition benches watching the mistakes of the Labour Party. For those two reasons I am sure he undoubtedly realises the problems of government better than the Leader of the Opposition, and will solve them accordingly. The Leader of the Opposition also said that he realised that in the upward struggle towards the Labour objective—good old objective!—there were many reverses that would be sustained. I am very pleased that the hon. member used the phrase, "Labour objective," and on this, my first opportunity of speaking on the floor of this Parliament, I have no hesitation in saying that I have nothing but ridicule for those members of Parliament in Queensland and in Australia who pretend to stand for that Labour objective.

Mr. BEDFORD: You wished to be there yourself.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is a deliberate falsehood. I never wished it at any time in my life, whether in war time or at any other time. I could not.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is the Attorney-General in order in saying that my remark was a deliberate falsehood?

The SPEAKER: The expression used by the Attorney-General is not parliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I withdraw the expression, Mr. Speaker, but I say unhesitatingly that at no period in my life have I made any approach to any political party. I was approached in the early stages of this campaign to stand for political honours, which I did with success. I say emphatically that I was never before associated with any political party. As to saying that I ever believed in the Labour objective, I could never see any common sense in endeavouring to delude the people into the belief that socialisation is practicable. I do not believe that any member of Parliament representing the Labour Party believes in his own heart that socialisation is practicable.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Of course they do not.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There is not one member on the other side who

believes that such a thing is possible. But, Mr. Speaker, the Australian Workers' Union and the other bodies controlling the Labour movement insist upon it. I have the utmost respect for those people outside Parliament who believe in the socialisation of everything. I believe they are honest in their belief; and I have every sympathy for them because we must recognise that we, whether in Australia or any other part of the world, are too selfish honestly to believe in the socialisation of the things set out in the Labour objective. The socialisation of those things must mean the establishment of a common fund into which every person must place his and her earnings for the common benefit of every citizen.

Mr. BEDFORD: Nonsense.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We can readily understand that Labour Cabinet Ministers, who have toured the country at a tremendous expense, do not believe in such an objective. I say that with the utmost respect. Those are my convictions, and I have always held them. It is ridiculous for any man to stand up and say that I at one time desired to be in the Labour movement. I have answered the hon. member who made that suggestion by way of interjection just as I answered at South Brisbane the same charge which was levelled against me by the late Premier; but, for the reason that he is not present in this House, and being charitably disposed towards anyone who is not present when I answer a charge, I do not intend to pursue this matter any further. Suffice it to say, in answer to the hon. member for Warrego, that it is incorrect that I at any time made any approaches to Labour to join the movement.

I shall now proceed to pass on to what are the concerns of the Government to-day—the vital things that concern the Government. I first desire to touch upon the acute financial position this State finds itself in to-day. When the Labour Government assumed office in 1914, the public debt of the State stood at £56,000,000.

Mr. PEASE: That is wrong.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: When they left the Treasury benches the public debt had increased to £111,000,000. The Labour Government which controlled this House during that time must take some responsibility for that increase. The members of the late Government may try to argue that the good they did and the money they expended justified that increase, and that the State in time will recuperate. We must, nevertheless, realise that there have been millions of pounds squandered in State enterprises, and millions of pounds pitched away in day-labour systems. That being so, we must place at their door some responsibility for the great increase in the State debt.

Mr. HYNES: Give us a new record.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will give you anything you want.

Mr. KELSO: We will give you more than you want.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I would like to give the hon. member for Townsville a message that he will, perhaps, be able to take back to the people of Townsville, who are looking for a reason for his absence in that city as the parliamentary

Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.]

representative of that city, during their greatest week in the year—their exhibition carnival.

Mr. HYNES: You did not have the courtesy to invite me up there.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I did not have the issuing of the invitations.

Mr. HYNES: No, but you took three or four up there with you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I did not have the inviting of anyone.

Another concern of the Government is land administration. Settlers have been debarred from possessing the freehold tenure of the land they have settled and worked.

Mr. BEDFORD: Give us something you understand.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The ownership of land is a great bogey of the Labour party. They claim that no one should own the freehold title of land. Could anything be more reasonably desirable than a policy that the people who work and cultivate the land should possess the freehold title to it? Yet the Labour Party and the late Labour Government denied that right to the people who work and develop the land. Is that not a great concern of the people of this State? Is this not a matter that the people have, by returning this party to office, demanded to have put right? The Premier has never tired of telling the people that the prosperity of Queensland must come from the land.

[3.30 p.m.]

Mr. COLLINS: We all know that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: But, unfortunately, most of us do not act up to it. As the representative of a metropolitan constituency, I want to express my agreement with the Premier in that statement. It is essential that the people on the land should not be hampered unnecessarily; and I stand behind the Premier and his Government in seeing that every consideration is meted out to those on the land. Those who put their capital into the development of the land and undertake such improvements as ring-barking should receive the benefit of their enterprise. They are doing work that will mean increased wealth production, and every consideration should be shown to them.

Mr. HYNES: When are you going to ring-bark the Arbitration Court?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We will ring-bark the Arbitration Court at a very early opportunity.

The rural workers' award is another matter to which I wish to refer. Perhaps in dealing with an Address in Reply criticism from one side or the other may be productive of some good. Now, the Government took the first opportunity of suspending or abolishing the rural workers' award because it hampered the man on the land.

Mr. PEASE: You did not do it in a proper way.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that we did not do it according to law. There is no safer and more proper manner of doing anything than doing it according to law. We did it according to a law that was established by the party of which the hon. member is a member. If it was done by

the Labour Government it must have been right; therefore, where is the sense in saying that we did not do it in a proper manner? The Leader of the Opposition says we were flouting Parliament—that we should have brought it before Parliament. The common-sense practical answer to that is that we took action under an Act passed by the Labour Government. How, then, can they now take exception to it? Am I not fair in criticising the Leader of the Opposition for saying what he did? And was he not absolutely ridiculous when he stood up in this House and said we were flouting Parliament?

The hon. gentleman also says that he is doing his best to keep the Government up to their pledges. I hope he will, and I also hope he means that, by keeping our pledges, we shall receive the support of his party. Speaking of pledges, what were the pledges of the Opposition when they were in power? Only a few years ago they promised childhood endowment. We never got that! Pensions for widows and orphans. We never got them! No increase in railway charges. We got those! Preference to Queensland interests. We never got that! All these were definite pledges made by Labour on the eve of an election campaign; and I can recall the electioneering pamphlets which definitely contained promises that those things would be put into operation. Yet the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues join in this bright chorus, "What about the £2,000,000 and the 10,000 jobs?"

Mr. HYNES: What about it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will tell the hon. member all about it. We are not going to alter that pledge, and we did not say that we would alter that pledge.

Mr. KIRWAN: The Deputy Leader of the Government said so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have heard hon. members opposite say that the Premier said he would do these things immediately. I defy any hon. member on that side of the House to show me the word "immediately" in any of the cartoons or advertisements to which reference has been made. If I can be shown that word in any of these cartoons or advertisements, then I will withdraw.

Mr. POLLOCK: Do you want one or a dozen?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I only want one. We are not expected in three months to carry out all our pledges; but we will provide that £2,000,000, and we will provide work for the unemployed in a reasonable time. We told the people so, and we have to answer to the people, and not to the Opposition. When it comes to the time to go back to the people of Queensland in three years—

Mr. BEDFORD: You will not come back.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We shall go back with the utmost confidence, and we shall come back here again. When we go before the people again we shall go in a proper manner, and we shall have accomplished the task we set out to do. But we are not supposed to do it in three or four months. (Opposition interjections.) Hon. members opposite have to join in the chorus like this. They have all to broadcast to their electors, "Look how I attacked the Government! Look how I told them they

[Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.]

have not fulfilled their promises in a couple of months." I have not been in politics very long—

Mr. BEDFORD: Dunlop will be jealous of you.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If he gets jealous of me, he certainly will never get jealous of the hon. member for Warrego. (Laughter.) I do not think there is any room in this House for parochial jealousy.

Another matter of great concern to this Government is the industrial position in Queensland to-day. We consider that conciliation methods are the most hopeful, and that the assistance of the Arbitration Court should only be invoked as a last resort. The Leader of the Opposition—I want him to listen to this—makes this admission: "No system that can be devised in regard to Queensland industries will give complete satisfaction to all sections of the community." The Leader of the Opposition, after a long period as a member of the Government of this State, makes that admission—"No system can be satisfactory to all sections of the people." It is time that a new Government got into power and introduced a system that will be satisfactory to every section of the community. That is the way in which we are going to approach it. We are going to introduce a system which we have every confidence will be satisfactory to every section of the community. What is the good of a man who holds the views of the Leader of the Opposition in that regard being in power and trying to grapple with the difficulties concerning Queensland's industries? We hold that we have a system that will give satisfaction, and we are going to put it into practice.

The Leader of the Opposition also said—"One difficulty in regard to arbitration is that the question is always regarded as a political question." Let us set out by trying to have it regarded as a question that is not political. We do not agree with the hon. member in that statement; and we propose to introduce a system into Queensland arbitration that will not be regarded as political. If the people of Queensland, whether they are employers or employees, look at the question in a broad and unbiassed manner, they will not consider it a political question. There will be conciliation right up to the hilt, and the Arbitration Court will only be resorted to in the last analysis. I may be an optimist, and I am always going to be an optimist. I am not going to be like the Leader of the Opposition, who says there is no system that will satisfy every section of the people. Where is anyone who holds such views likely to get? Unless you go before the people with a system and full of confidence in your system, you may as well stay away, because, if you go before them as a pessimist, you will not get them to work with you, nor will they adopt your system and ideas and try to make them practicable.

We hope to introduce a Bill on the lines of the Trade Facilities Bill; we hope to establish a Bureau of Economics, and to use the credit of the State to help to bring that about. We hope to encourage the expenditure of capital—and that is a point I wish to stress. It is my honest opinion that in Queensland capital has been withheld and has not been expended in industries in a manner in which the people would like to see. It was no use people putting money into industries during the last few years

in Queensland. The taxation imposed did not warrant it. Those with money could not let it go. They withheld it on purpose because of the position into which the Labour Government had got the industries of the State. It is a positive fact that the taxation on private enterprise absorbed 8s. 4d. in the £1.

Mr. BEDFORD: Is that including Federal taxation?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Under those circumstances you cannot expect people with capital to put it into industry in Queensland. We are going to seek the co-operation of the people with capital, giving them every encouragement and the credit of the State, so that they may be induced to put their money into industry and bring the industries of the State from the awful position in which we find them to-day. While there were over 2,000 factories established in New South Wales in the period from 1914 to 1927, there were only eighty-one established in Queensland. Capital has been withheld because people would not entrust it to Queensland during the reign of the Labour Government. We have now had a change of Government by an overwhelming vote of the people of Queensland, and we hope to encourage capital. We believe that capital must have just as fair a run as the people on the other side of the industry. It is my honest opinion that Labour members and Labour Governments told the people, while not definitely believing in their theory, that they would not tax capital in the hands of the working people or the wages of the workers, and that people with capital should not be given a due reward for the use of their money. That is my interpretation of their arguments. People with capital cannot be done without, and Queensland is in a bad state to-day because of the lack of capital. Until a Labour Government, or any other Government, are prepared to give the people with capital a fair run the State must go back further and further. We are determined that people with capital shall be invited and encouraged to put their capital into Queensland industries and receive a fair return; just as we shall see that the working people and the wage-earners also get a fair deal.

Mr. KIRWAN: Like you gave the rural workers.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We realise to the full that we are in power to-day to a large extent by reason of the working-class vote.

Mr. KELSO: By the will of the people.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: By the will of the working people almost as much as by the will of anybody else; therefore, we must be regarded as being men of some common sense. Having been returned by those people, we realise that we have obligations to them, and we are not going back on them. While we realise our obligations to the working people we are not going to tell them we are going to abolish capitalists.

Mr. BEDFORD: On what occasion did the present Opposition say that it would abolish capital?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said that, from my own experience of Labour people and those who stood behind the Labour movement, that was my impression of the message they conveyed to the working people.

Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.]

The Leader of the Opposition also said—

“I have not yet seen any indication of that development in industry, nor have I seen any great expansion in the amount of capital available for the development of Queensland.”

How could he in three months? He and his party were on this side of the House for a number of years, and he was in the Ministry for a number of years. It was his Ministry that drove capital out of Queensland; yet now he turns round and says that after three months he has seen no indication of any development of industry or expansion of capital available for development. I venture to say that a different position will exist in Queensland early in the new year, when it becomes known what we are prepared to do to assist people with capital in a reasonable manner. Then the hon. member will see a great expansion in the amount of capital available for the development of Queensland's industries.

Another thing to be remembered with regard to capitalism, and one on which I want to make myself very clear, is that I believe wholeheartedly in the right to work. I do not believe in any man being penalised by any union or secretary of a union, or in any way hindered in his right to work. I want to make it perfectly plain and clear that I do not, and never will, believe in preference to unionists.

Mr. COLLINS: What about the lawyers' union?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I want to make it perfectly plain that the reason why I do not believe in preference to unionists—

Mr. POLLOCK: Is because you are a barrister.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is because I have seen the people who have been exercising and controlling that system making it a complete farce and so hindering honourable men as to deprive them of the right to work. If a man is able and willing to work and there is a job for him to go to—if you, Mr. Speaker, or I want to employ him—why should he have to go to a union to obtain permission? Why should a union official have the right to say, “No, I refuse to you the right to employ him. You must employ the man I select.” It is for that reason that I do not believe in preference. The right of preference to unionists is not practicable in that form. The Labour Administration proved conclusively that they knew nothing about the legal profession. They thought that anybody could occupy a legal position, and they only did that because they thought to curry favour with their Labour supporters. It is easy to do these things up to a certain point, but the people outside woke up to hon. members opposite, and now they are in opposition. The people put up with hon. members opposite for a time, but eventually they drove them out of office. Hon. members opposite thought anything was good enough for the legal profession.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We amended an Act of Parliament to allow men to become barristers.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I can assure the hon. member that that Act was not passed for my benefit; it was passed for somebody else. I passed my examinations.

[Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.]

I know hon. members will take my word, but, if by any chance there are any of them who will not do so, I can produce my certificates to show that I passed my examinations. I say with all due deference to hon. members on the other side of the Chamber that during their term of office they did not regard the legal profession—I say it with the utmost diffidence and with the respect they deserve. The legal profession is an honourable profession.

Mr. COLLINS: We had one of them as our leader at one time.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Although I say it myself, hon. members opposite put men without any qualifications into legal positions, and they had no right to do so. That is the position as I see it and as the members of the legal profession see it.

I am very pleased to know that it is the intention of the Government to amend the Jury Act; and I shall be very proud to have the opportunity of introducing the Bill into this Chamber. There is another instance of where the Labour Party endeavoured to injure the legal profession. They made it possible for persons twenty-one years of age to be empanelled on a jury to decide matters involving thousands of pounds in the commercial world. They did that deliberately; but they did not do it thinking that it was reasonable legislation for the people of Queensland. They did it to injure the legal profession.

The Jury Act was amended, not for the betterment of the people of Queensland or the improvement of legislation, but with the idea of making little of the legal profession and of anybody connected in any way with the law. The Labour Party believed that, by making little of the law, they would be able to secure greater political patronage.

Mr. HYNES: Do you not think that the present judicial bench is equal to any judicial bench in Australia?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The bench in Queensland to-day—

Mr. HYNES: Appointed by a Labour Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member has asked the question, so permit me to answer it. The bench in Queensland to-day is a very strong, intellectual, and satisfactory bench; but it was only on the eve of the last elections that the Labour Government strengthened it in order that they might command a little respect at the elections. The last three appointments were very commendable appointments. Realising that the people were strongly of the opinion that they had not acted wisely towards the legal profession, the Labour Government at the eleventh hour made three excellent appointments to the judicial bench.

Mr. STOPFORD: To what appointments do you object?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I distinctly said that the last three appointments were excellent; but some of the appointments by the Labour Government were not good appointments.

Mr. STOPFORD: Name them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I prefer not; the hon. member knows them.

Mr. BEDFORD: You are disappointed because you were passed over.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There are numerous reasons why the Jury Act should be amended, particularly with regard to the restoration of special juries.

Mr. HYNES: Another retrograde movement.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Another retrograde movement! My complaint against the Labour Party on this matter is that they acted blindly in the belief that anything was good enough for a jury. If the hon. member for Townsville were concerned in a case involving him in some thousands of pounds, he would not be satisfied to have a jury empanelled from persons twenty-one years of age living within one mile of the Supreme Court, having as qualifications only that they were enrolled on the electoral roll.

Mr. HYNES: They were quite good enough to send overseas during the war.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is an entirely different matter. As jurymen they were called upon to decide highly technical matters calling for high intellectual ability. The present position will be remedied; and I shall have an opportunity to say more when that is being done.

I am very pleased to intimate that the electoral laws will be amended, and I shall have an opportunity of dealing at length with that matter later. It is intended to institute a system of having a joint electoral roll, and there will be a redistribution of electoral seats.

Mr. HYNES: Digging yourselves in.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am not digging myself in; but I shall, perhaps, be digging a lot of the others out. (Laughter.) Personally, I do not care whether I am dug in or dug out. There is not the slightest doubt that hon. members opposite realise that the last redistribution of seats was not a just one.

Mr. HYNES: Apparently, it was a good one.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: In parts it was ridiculous. Hon. members know full well that areas were excised from Labour strongholds and placed in other areas that were considered weak from a Labour point of view.

Mr. BEDFORD: How do you propose to redistribute the seats this time?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will not redistribute them at all. The part that I shall play in it will be that I, as Attorney-General, will have the pleasure of appointing an entirely independent commission which will do its work in an honourable manner.

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

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. C. Peterson, *Normanby*): I beg to move—

“That the Attorney-General be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech.”

The SPEAKER: Is it the wish of hon. members that the Attorney-General be granted an extension of time?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am very grateful for the courtesy and generosity of hon. members in granting me an extension of time. I thank them very much.

Speaking of the redistribution of seats, whether the late Government carried out the redistribution of seats in a proper manner or not, or whether they thought that it was done in a proper way, we on this side of the House do not think that it was an equal redistribution of the electorates in this State.

Mr. STOPFORD: You won an election on it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is all the more to our credit. I shall be quite candid with hon. members opposite. Take, for instance, a man living on Wickham terrace. Under the late Government's redistribution of seats he must vote in the Paddington electorate; but we all know that Wickham terrace is not in Paddington. Wickham terrace is always recognised as a part of the city of Brisbane, for it is only a few steps from Queen street. That is only one anomaly. We must all admit that the last redistribution of seats was not in accordance with equity.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Look at the Rosewood electorate!

Mr. STOPFORD: You say you are going to do all this.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member must pardon my lack of familiarity with the conventions of parliamentary procedure. When I say “I,” I mean that the Government of the day will appoint the commission; but I can assure hon. members that the commission will be appointed through the department that I am concerned with, and that its members will do what is fair and honourable.

Mr. STOPFORD: How can you anticipate they will do what is fair and honourable?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I anticipate that its members will do the fair and honourable thing.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I can assure hon. members that one fair and honourable thing will be the inclusion in the electorate of Brisbane of those electors living on Wickham terrace.

Another great concern of the Government is the position of our railways, which has been brought about by the tremendous deficits they have shown for the last thirteen years. Hon. members opposite must take the responsibility for those deficits just as we shall have to accept the responsibility of our administration in another seven, fourteen, or fifteen years, if we are here for that length of time. If at the end of that period we show a deficit of £17,000,000, the Opposition of the day will be entitled to attack us upon that fact. The railways, after fourteen years of administration by a Labour Government, showed that tremendous deficit; and we are entitled to attack their members on that deficit. It is our duty to tell the people of Queensland—and we do so in an honourable manner—that it is necessary for us to face the railway problem in a determined manner.

There has been a good deal of talk on the subject of railways. I did not roam very far from my electorate during the recent election, but on one occasion I spoke at Ipswich. There was then talk about workers being dismissed if my party were returned. I then said that any worker holding a Government position, whether it be a permanent job in the railway workshops or otherwise,

Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.]

would not be dispensed with while there was work for him to do. But this Government have to face the railway position, and, if there are people in the railways and there is no work for them to do, then we, as custodians of the people's money, and having to spend it in a proper way, cannot afford to pay any person, whether he be in the railways or anywhere else, if there is no work there for him to do. The purpose of the Government is to go through the Ipswich workshops and other workshops, and see what ought to be done, and the Government, as a body of honourable men, will have to accept the responsibility for any action they may take in that respect.

There are many other matters of grave concern to this Government of which I can speak, but I do not propose to continue any longer. The Government are approaching the present position in which they find Queensland with the utmost hope and confidence that, by careful and businesslike administration, the State will come out all right. I

approach the position with the [4 p.m.] feeling that Queensland will come out all right by reason of the good legislation that will be put on the statute-book by this Government; and I sincerely appreciate my own responsibility in helping to carry out a policy which will be for the good of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make reference to your appointment. I am sure you will understand that it is not my desire to congratulate you at present. I think the cautious and the sensible thing to do is to wait until the end of the session. The work of this session will let us know whether at the end of that time you are, as we hope you will be, a thoroughly fair and impartial Speaker. I really believe that you are the most impartial man that could have been selected from the Government side for the position. I only hope that your work at the end of three years—if this Parliament runs as long as that—will be sufficient to indicate to us that you have borne out the good opinion regarding your qualifications for your high office which your party believe you possess.

Mr. BRAND: Which the House believe.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is only a matter of waiting to see if that good opinion is borne out.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is rather a backhanded compliment.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is one of those cautious compliments that a parliamentarian of any experience always desires to pass on any man he admires.

Mr. EDWARDS: We have had too much experience of you. (Government laughter.)

Mr. POLLOCK: The Attorney-General, who has just resumed his seat, made some references to the Governor's Speech which were to me at least very amusing. Should I call it a Speech? I suppose to be polite I must. The hon. gentleman said that, when this document was read out by His Excellency the Governor, there was unbounded enthusiasm. It is true that the present Treasurer led a chorus of "God Save the King!" That may have been for effect.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I was referring to the general enthusiasm—a different thing altogether.

[*Hon. N. F. Macgroarty.*]

Mr. POLLOCK: It is true that the social gathering which attended the delivery of that Speech did make it its business to swarm upon the new members. Naturally the new members invited their friends and had a packed audience of the élite of Brisbane present. It is true that that gathering did evince considerable enthusiasm so far as the "cats" were concerned after the Speech was delivered, but I am not aware that anybody who can lay any claim to common sense could regard the document read out by His Excellency as being an intellectual contribution.

Mr. STOPFORD: It nearly killed the Governor!

Mr. POLLOCK: The Attorney-General was one of those who framed and prepared this Speech. Naturally he is anxious to make the public believe that the Speech he had a hand in preparing was a good one. The majority of the people, however, will be bitterly disappointed at that Speech. After months of press publicity in which Queensland was represented as having just escaped from a band of Labour ogres, after three or four months of ministerial guzzling at victory socials—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not at the Government expense.

Mr. POLLOCK: After a great deal of press publicity, in which every effort was made to represent the present Government as being a band of men who were at last to lead Queensland on to the path of prosperity, I am surprised after all these things that we had this meatless bone, in the form of a Governor's Speech, thrown down to a hungry public. We are asked to be pleased at it; we are asked to join in what the Attorney-General considers the general enthusiasm at this being thrown down to a public who were led to expect something from these new political champions.

Mr. EDWARDS: You know you took the meat off the bone and left it dry.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am wondering just what must have been the thoughts of the Governor when he was asked to read out this considered product of a Government that had been in office for three or four months. I am wondering just what Brisbane's social "400" thought of this maiden effort of their new political champions. I am wondering whether they did see in it anything to be enthusiastic about. No doubt those who had friends newly arrived in the Ministry, and others who could see for themselves a chance of getting a little picking when the State enterprises were being disposed of, would show some enthusiasm. You could expect them to be pleased. But the general public who were looking for the Government to carry out their promises could see little or nothing to be pleased about or become enthusiastic about in that Speech. There is not a constructive thought in it. It is a continuation of previous Speeches which were put into the hands of previous Governors by the Labour Party. It consists of promised amendments to Acts which, from time to time, have been found by experience to require amending. There is not a vestige of a constructive or statesmanlike idea in the Speech. I stand corrected. Time will show if there is, but I give that as my opinion.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. POLLOCK: You can call it a document or you can call it a Speech. It might be less charitable to call it what I called it when dealing with another question. I prefer not to do so again. After shrill trumpetings like an elephant in labour pains, the Government have given birth to an ant, and a white ant at that. They propose merely to give us amendment after amendment of unimportant Acts instead of dealing with the biggest and most vital questions that have confronted Queensland for many a day. Take the fall in wool prices and the effects of the drought on the pastoral industry—which is the greatest industry Queensland has, and is at present requiring drastic action on the part of the Government to see that it is again put on an even keel. They do not propose to attend to all this by finding out what is wrong with the price of wool overseas. They give us an idea of how they are going to deal with the unemployed question by introducing about twenty Bills to amend, in minor particulars, Acts that were passed by the Labour Government.

The TREASURER: It was very unfortunate that they were passed.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is what we are expected to become enthusiastic about. So far as I have been able to judge, every amendment of every Act is designed to take a sheet of iron off the roof that Labour built for the shelter of the general public. Every amendment is designed either to get rid of some State enterprise, or to throw wide the door to the profiteer so that he can have an "open go" at the public, or to give the contractor a chance to rake in huge profits.

The TREASURER: No, to give people value for their money.

Mr. POLLOCK: Or to give the employer the big stick over the employee at the round-table conference. Every Bill is designed to do something in that direction. We are asked to be enthusiastic about this Governor's Speech, and we are told that the public were enthusiastic about it. Go down the street and ask the public what they think of it, and they will tell you. They will say that it is the product of the weakest Government that has ever held office in Queensland. (Government laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK: That it is a Government that is leaderless, a Government that does not even know ordinary parliamentary tactics, let alone how to carry on a campaign to remove the evils that Queensland may suffer from time to time. (Government interjections.) I am afraid that hon. members who gave you the nomination for the Chair, Mr. Speaker, will have to receive a lesson in manners from you—sooner, perhaps, than they may like. We were told after the elections in no unmeasured terms, both by the Government and their supporters, that there would be, and that since the elections there has been, a return of confidence—this mysterious thing called confidence, which automatically makes its presence felt immediately a Labour Government is defeated and a Nationalist Government secures the reins of office. We were led to believe that this mysterious thing called confidence would so make its presence felt that all our evils would disappear; but that has not proved to be the case. Is there sufficient confidence to warrant people doing one of the things necessary to give the country producer suffi-

cient confidence, or to justify woolbuyers in paying a higher price for our wool, or buyers a higher price for our sugar, because Mr. Moore happens to be Premier of Queensland? It does not look like it. It does not look, either, as though our primary or secondary industries are receiving any fillip as the result of this change of Government. But, if you examine the newspapers, you will see that, instead of there being a return of confidence as was predicted and which is boasted about to-day, there has been, if anything, a decided slump in the prosperity of this State since the Government took office.

Mr. EDWARDS: You know that is not true while you are saying it.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not asking hon. members to take my word; I propose to give some evidence on the point. I would not quote the Treasurer's remarks against him, because he would not like it, and I hate to offend him.

The TREASURER: You need not worry your head about that.

Mr. POLLOCK: A deputation waited on Mayor Jolly in Brisbane regarding a new ordinance which the mayor proposed to pass in order to arrange for the removal of certain houses and dwellings which he said were unfit for people to live in. The deputation consisted of Messrs. H. H. Gayford, secretary; G. K. Seabrook, J. Pike, and B. Hart, Property Owners' Association—they would hardly be Labourites; W. M. Hall, Taxpayers' Association; M. S. Herring, Queensland Trustees Limited; Udell, Union Trustees; J. Campbell, Real Estate Institute; C. Musgrave, Brisbane Permanent and Building Society; F. W. Mole, Public Curator; Stewart Cameron, J. T. Thorpe, Miss Taylor, Bartley, and Mrs. Wylie, Boarding-house Keepers' Association. It was represented to Mr. Jolly that things were so bad in Brisbane at the present time that it would be unwise to have this ordinance introduced.

According to the "Courier" of 29th August last—only a few days ago—

"Speakers expressed the hope that, if the ordinance did become law, some drastic alterations would be made beforehand. No harm would be done if the whole thing were postponed for twelve months. Property was by no means a good investment at present, and it could not carry any more burdens. Taxation could not go any higher. This ordinance would constitute an impost which would be worse than any rise in rates for a considerable time."

And here is the meat of it—

"It would have a blighting effect on the city. At the present time, no matter what the suburb might be, empty houses could be seen in dozens. Houses which a few months ago were worth 25s. a week could not be let now for 15s."

In spite of the return of the Nationalist Party!

"Rental value had depreciated more than 25 per cent."

That shows that the public are not prosperous to-day, although they were a few months ago!

"while bad tenants had increased by 120 per cent."

Mr. Pollock.]

In spite of this confidence that had led people to be prosperous in Queensland! The paragraph concludes—

“There would be a great disturbance and many people with money sunk in property would be at their wits’ end to know what to do with it.”

That is the result of this mysterious thing called “confidence” which the election of the present Nationalist Government was supposed to bring to Queensland!

One of the things that the Attorney-General said was true. He said he was lucky to be here. He is. As a matter of fact, he was snoring under the political plum tree with his mouth open when one of his friends shook the tree and the plum fell into his mouth. That is the position as nearly as I can gauge it. And a nice ripe plum it was! I am told that it was worth, with marked briefs, between £4,000 and £5,000 a year.

He said in the course of his remarks one thing, at any rate, that is not borne out by facts. That might be a roundabout way of saying that it is not true. His statement was that the Premier, or the Government, had made no promise regarding a proposal to relieve unemployment immediately. I say that the Government did make that promise. On 6th May, 1929, the Townsville “Daily Bulletin” and other papers—I can get at least twenty of them if it is necessary—had this to say—

“Mr. Moore, who returned to Brisbane from his northern tour on 1st May, issued an important statement of his proposals for the purpose of providing immediate relief for a large number of unemployed.”

“Immediate relief,” he said.

“Mr. Moore said he fully realised the necessity of providing some immediate relief for the unemployed.”

Mr. G. P. BARNES: “Same.”

Mr. POLLOCK: He has not provided any. The Government have in every way endeavoured to get rid of men. Why was this board brought here from Victoria to inquire into our railways? Is not the object of that to get rid of men?

The TREASURER: To seek to bring to light the mistakes of your Government.

Mr. POLLOCK: To seek to bring to light ways and means of getting rid of them. If that is what the hon. gentleman means, without putting it so brutally, then we understand him.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Place the responsibility on a board.

Mr. POLLOCK: One of the proposals of the present Government, according to the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor, is to establish round-table conferences to deal with disputes between employers and employees. The Government have gone back fifteen years—back to where they failed fifteen years ago. They did not fail if you take into account the interests of their wealthy supporters; but they did fail if you regard their action at that time from the viewpoint of the welfare of the people and the duty of a Government to see that fair dealing takes place between employer and employee.

The TREASURER: That can be brought about only at a conference between the two.

[Mr. Pollock.

Mr. POLLOCK: I propose to show, as one who has had a little experience in round-table conferences, just how far that goes. Some sixteen years ago a round-table conference was held in Cloncurry. There were representatives of mineowners present, and to carry out the idea that the present Government have in mind—of reintroducing that scheme—we, as representatives of the miners, working with the miners—we had to be working men—were allowed to represent them at one of these round-table conferences. I remember that the leader of the employers in the mines around Cloncurry, who appeared at that conference, was a man named Erle Huntley. The hon. member for Mundingburra, the hon. member for Kennedy, the present parliamentary representative for Dalley in the Federal Parliament, Mr. Theodore, myself, and others were present.

The TREASURER: One of your number said the other night that immediately wages were increased 5s. a week.

Mr. POLLOCK: He was not referring to this conference; this is an entirely different conference. However, we met, and Mr. Huntley had a few nice words to address to us because he wanted something from us. He told us that we were hard-working, horny-handed sons of toil whom the country could not do without, and that we had best enter the conference in a spirit of give-and-take. He told us that, if we conducted ourselves properly and entered the conference in a spirit of give-and-take and sweet reasonableness, so beloved of the employer, we would get somewhere. He started off, first of all, by discussing the question of wet ground. That is a very important question with miners, as usually extra pay is given to men who work in wet ground. It is dangerous from many aspects. Certainly, ground is likely to fall on you if water is percolating through in such a quantity as to loosen the ground from the soapy heads and elsewhere. In order to start off the proceedings, Mr. Huntley said that his definition was one upon which we ought to be able to agree. It was to the effect that, “when water was pouring from overhead in such quantities—” He had got only that far when Mr. Theodore said, “As to require the need of an umbrella or a mackintosh.”

He gave us to understand that we had entered the conference in a spirit of give-and-take, and that, if the employers gained in one direction, the employees would probably gain in another. We gave in on the question of wet ground; but, when we came to the other questions, Mr. Huntley and his crowd told us that they had got all that mattered, and that, if we wanted to get the rest, we could fight them for it. That is what a round-table conference means. You get in a crowd of working men—I worked with them until I came to Parliament, and I know what the work is—you get a group of half a dozen working men representing the mining industry at a round-table conference, and the bosses get around the same table, and say, “Now, are you prepared to agree to this?” Each man working in the industry knows that, if he does not agree to the proposal, he will get sacked when he goes back to work. The proof of that lies in the fact that, when I went back to work in the Duchess mine, I did not last three days before I got the sack. No man ever found fault with my work before, either in the mines or elsewhere. That only

goes to show that the rank and file of working men need some man to speak and work on their behalf—some man who has not the fear of the sack hanging over him because he is working for them. That is the basis of arbitration—that the workers can appoint an attorney to do the job on their behalf, thus rendering it impossible for the employer to victimise them, as he always has done when this position has arisen. I attended another round-table conference, and the public in the North as well as those hon. members who associated with me know that I was appointed chairman of a committee that sought to have frightful conditions in a mine at Charters Towers rectified. It was only a week after we had accepted the dictates of the employers at the round-table conference that I was fired out of the same mine—not that I could not do my work, which I attended to as well as anybody else—but simply because I happened to be the spokesman of the men. When a thing like that goes on, when the men have a grievance against the employers that they desire to have redressed—when they have a grievance against nigger drivers, as they have at times—is it right and fair that they should appoint one of their number to “bell the cat”? The very fundamentals of arbitration are that a dispute or grievance should be submitted to a totally independent tribunal, so that the men will have an opportunity of having that dispute or grievance determined without fear of victimisation.

The reason why employers object to arbitration is because to-day the unions have specialised in arbitration and have trained their court advocates, which has enabled them to put before the court a mighty good case. They desire to abolish that principle because it gets results for the workers. They want to abolish it now because to-day they know there are unemployed; and they know that every man working on a job at the present time dare not lift his head at a round-table conference to demand his rights.

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

Mr. POLLOCK: It is correct. It is when there are unemployed that the employers intimidate men at a round-table conference because there are so many unemployed and so few jobs. Is it not obvious why they intend to introduce this legislation? They cannot deceive us or anybody else by it.

Mr. KELSO: It works well in America. (Government interjections.)

Mr. POLLOCK: I have only forty minutes to speak in, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will not allow members of the Government Party to exhaust my time. We have heard a great deal about unemployment, especially during the election. (Interjections.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: I have not heard anything from the Government on the unemployment question since the election except what has been wrung from them by this party. Not a word have they said. In fact, they utilise the occasion when we make reference to the unemployment question to laugh at our discomfiture. They used this question as a means to climb into power; but now, having their legs under

the table, as it were, they are feeling their oats.

[4.30 p.m.]

The TREASURER: And you are feeling very sorry.

Mr. POLLOCK: They want to laugh every time the subject is mentioned.

Mr. KELSO: That is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: I am feeling sorry. Who would not be sorry to see such a Government as that in power? Who would not blush at the thought that Queensland is being run by ten men, two of whom are complete novices to the business of government, and a Government that has not even a Leader or a Deputy Leader.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: Prior to and since the election, this is what has happened so far as the Government are concerned, taking events in their categorical order: Prior to the election the Premier said in effect, “If you vote for me, you are voting yourself a job. There is £2,000,000 available for 10,000 of you. I will do it immediately. Vote yourself a slice of this pie.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What are you quoting from?

Mr. POLLOCK: Would you like me to quote his exact words?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes.

Mr. POLLOCK: They have been quoted so often that I am afraid Mr. Speaker would call me to order for tedious repetition were I to quote them again. The Premier said, “It can be done; it will be done.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: We have heard you say that before, but give us the Premier's own words.

Mr. POLLOCK: “I pledge myself and my party to make available £2,000,000 immediately.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I challenge you to produce a statement setting forth what you are saying now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: “In order to provide 10,000 jobs.”

Mr. KELSO: What are you quoting from?

Mr. POLLOCK: From the Townsville “Bulletin” of 6th May, 1929, which states—

“It can be done! It will be done!

If my party is successful at the polls, we pledge ourselves to arrange for the expenditure of £2,000,000 to find early employment for 10,000 workers.

“Workers, safeguard your jobs and your children's future.—A. E. Moore.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Does that say “early” or “immediately?”

Mr. POLLOCK: All the shuffling, all the quibbling, all the grizzling by the Government on this question will not remove from them the stigma of having told the public that they would spend £2,000,000 to provide 10,000 jobs immediately.

Mr. CLAYTON: “Early.”

Mr. BEDFORD: The early bird is out before noon. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. POLLOCK: Mr. Speaker, am I in a bear garden or in a deliberative assembly? Is this the way I am to be permitted to put the case for my constituents? I hope that you will teach the supporters of the Government a lesson in manners. I will not read the extract. Here it is (produces newspaper). You can read it from over there, for it is in huge type.

After the election was over the Premier said, "We must carry out our promises to the unemployed. Every pledge will be honoured." That was two or three days after the election. The hon. gentleman next saw that he had over-reached himself by saying that these pledges would be carried out immediately, so he endeavoured to shuffle by saying, "The public must not expect miracles." Then, afterwards, one of the panjandrums of Nationalism called Campbell, who is an alderman of the Brisbane City Council, decided that employers could show how much confidence they had in the present Government by providing a job for at least one man. He said that, if employers gave a job to at least one man, they would show that they, as well as the Government, were going to see that this promise was given effect to. This desire was met with the most complete vote of "no-confidence" in the Government that they could possibly have received, for we have not heard of anybody giving employment to that one man just to show that he had confidence in the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It shows that you do not know everything.

Mr. HYNES: Campbells put off five the following week.

Mr. POLLOCK: Just after that the Premier had a brain wave and he said that he could not right in three months fourteen years of bad government. He was sparring for time. A couple of days later the official statement maker of the Government, the Secretary for Labour and Industry, took advantage of the labours of his private secretary, who was a candidate at the election opposed to Labour, to prepare a statement which he alleged showed that there had been a diminution in unemployment in the first month that the Government had been in power. He forgot, of course, that there were fewer men registered at the Labour Bureau, because even at that early day the unemployed had awakened to the fact that they were not likely to get any jobs from the Government.

The TREASURER: What an extraordinary argument!

Mr. POLLOCK: The Secretary for Labour and Industry based his statement that there were fewer unemployed a month after election day on the fact that there were fewer men registered at the Labour Bureaux. As a matter of fact, the number registered at the Labour Bureaux never at any time—I say this frankly—comprises all the unemployed. Quite a number of men will not register at Labour Bureaux.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You admit that now.

Mr. POLLOCK: But, because there were fewer registered at the Labour Bureaux after the elections, the hon. member decided that there were fewer unemployed. The fact is that at that stage the workers had become disgusted at the trick that had been played

on them. (Government dissent.) Just at this stage somebody advised the Secretary for Labour and Industry that a shut mouth catches no flies, and since then, if you have followed matters as closely as I have, Mr. Speaker, you will have found that very few flies have had an opportunity of committing suicide so far as that hon. gentleman is concerned.

Then the Secretary for Public Instruction took a hand and sat in the game. He decided to employ a man for two hours to cut the grass at the State Stores Board building, and to publish the fact that he was giving some employment. He thought, perhaps, that some other official fodder might help to fill the bellies of the little "kiddies" whose fathers were on this tramp, tramp, tramp, in search of work, so he decided to get them to salute the flag.

The TREASURER: Is that not one of our greatest sins?

Mr. POLLOCK: One of the sins in regard to the saluting of the flag that does hurt people in Australia is that the Australian flag was only to be saluted if there was no Union Jack available. That is the thing that hurts. The Minister made it quite clear that on no account was the Australian flag to be used while there was a Union Jack available.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What is wrong with the Union Jack?

Mr. KIRWAN: What is wrong with the Australian flag?

Mr. POLLOCK: There is nothing wrong either with the Union Jack or with the Australian flag so far as I am concerned, but personally I prefer the Australian flag for the Australian people. Be that as it may, one cannot but wonder if one of these precocious "kiddies," in saluting the flag one of these days when he finds his dad walking about out of work in spite of this means of providing work, will not indulge in that five-finger gesture that is so often indulged in by Australian kiddies. Is there any indication from the Government that they propose to do anything which will get to the root of the unemployed question? I say no. What is responsible for most of the unemployment in the cities? A large number of people, who are being continually added to, are thrown out of employment through labour-saving devices. That cannot be gained.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That was said years ago.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is true to-day, and I am surprised at a Government supported by hon. members who are supposed to possess the best brains of the community not being aware that the introduction of automatic telephones meant the dismissal of 320 employees. I am sorry that a Government who professed to the public that they would be able to cure all the ills associated with unemployment do not know that the fact that farm machinery is being improved and brought up to date is responsible for hundreds of people being driven to the cities every year, where the only means, apparently, the Government have of absorbing—

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

[Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. CONROY (*Marano*): I beg to move—
“That the hon. member for Gregory be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech.”

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

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK: Thank you very much! If you want an illustration, look at all the machinery for handling, whether it is on a wharf, a railway siding, or wherever you go, and compare it with the out-of-date methods utilised years ago in employing men. It is obvious that every year this new machinery is creating further unemployment. If you want another illustration, look at the Texaco Oil Company's plant at the Hamilton—a very fine storage plant, by which oil and petrol are being run through a pipe line from an oil tanker direct into the storage tanks. It appears that the services of scores of men have been dispensed with there; and so it goes on all over Queensland. In America the same position has arisen, only it is much more intensive there, and the result is that there are over 3,000,000 unemployed in America.

Mr. KELSO: What percentage is that?

Mr. POLLOCK: Eight per cent. was the percentage some time ago. I understand that there are at least over 3,000,000 out of work at present even though the seasonal industries are in many cases operating.

Mr. KELSO: Do you want to go back to the stone age?

Mr. POLLOCK: I have only to look at the hon. member and I am back there. This is not question time, and I propose to continue my own speech in my own way. The hon. member has no desire to obtain information by his interjections, but merely wishes to upset the train of my thoughts. I hope you will deal with him, Mr. Speaker. He has proved himself a nuisance before this. I have had to deal with him before this, and I hope that you will carry on the good work.

Mr. KELSO: Don't mislead the House.

At 4.45 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr Roberts, *East Toowoomba*) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. POLLOCK: In America there are thousands of workmen and families who were put on the land who are being driven into the cities because of the introduction of automatic and semi-automatic machinery—farming machinery—and because big syndicates are able to secure control of large areas of land. They are able to utilise the latest inventions in connection with farming machinery. Instead of having one man driving a couple of plough horses, as was the case many years ago, to-day they have one man driving a 30 or 40 furrow motor plough. That means that, as we go along in Queensland, syndicates will ultimately get all of our rich land and develop it with the latest machinery, and thus send more of our people into the cities. I ask the Government if they propose to do anything to relieve this position. What are they going to do about that?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is not the true position at all.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is going to become increasingly difficult for us to settle these people whom machinery is throwing out of their ordinary avocations.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Would you interfere with the march of progress?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not proposing to interfere with the march of progress. No man can do that; but it is a significant thing that the greatest thinkers of our time propose to handle this question—not in the manner in which the Government propose to handle it, but in a totally different manner altogether. I suppose that Edison is one of the greatest thinkers of our time. Edison's idea of handling this problem is not to reduce wages, is not to lengthen hours. He says that those things are unnecessary; but he says that, if a syndicate of half a dozen men take up a large tract of land and apply labour-saving machinery to it, then only one alternative is left for the Government who propose to absorb unemployment. He says that, as the unemployed cannot be absorbed, because of the introduction of new machinery, automatic and semi-automatic, there must be another alternative, and that is the adjustment of wages. Now, we hear nothing about that. If one man by means of a semi-automatic machine can do as much work as twenty labourers did previously, is it not obvious that the profits to the employer from the employment of that one man will be very much greater than otherwise? It is obvious that they will, and Edison—who, I say, is one of the greatest thinkers of our time—argues quite logically that, with that position, there must be no lengthening of hours or reduction of wages. There must be adjustment of wages so that the man who operates that machine must be able to keep his whole family and, perhaps, get sufficient money to keep his neighbour also. He says that is the only alternative. I must myself admit that it is the only other alternative I can see.

Mr. EDWARDS: Surely you do not agree with that?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am not saying that there is no other alternative. I am saying that some of our great thinkers believe there is not, and you must respect a great thinker who gives attention to these problems. I am not going to insult a man like Edison by comparing him with the hon. member for Nanango.

Mr. KENNY: Or yourself.

Mr. POLLOCK: Or myself. I have too high a regard for the standing of Edison to attempt to dispute his convictions as disclosed by his recent utterances. I say, therefore, that, with this growth of automatic machinery, you have either to have an adjustment of wages or wholesale unemployment.

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

Mr. POLLOCK: The question of what we did when we were in power does not matter to-day. The public want to know how hon. members opposite are going to handle the situation. (Government interjection.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Nundah to remain silent. He is not satisfied with asking questions, but is continually interrupting.

Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. POLLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, although both you and the hon. member have broken the thread of my thought. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION interjected.

Mr. POLLOCK: I argue that this is no laughing matter. We are trying to find a way out, and I hope that the Deputy Leader of the Government will give me the opportunity of stating my views and not make asinine interjections.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I am only asking you what you mean by the adjustment of wages.

Mr. POLLOCK: Adjustment of wages I can see necessarily is this—that, if you have such a growth of automatic machinery as to throw a large number of persons out of work both in your primary and your secondary city industries, then you must have an alternative—that is, if you cannot employ those persons in some other avenues—and the experience of America and England shows that you cannot employ those persons in any other avenues. What is the alternative? The alternative must be that, if the employer is getting greater profits out of that machinery than he was previously, there must be a better distribution and an adjustment of wages. It may be, as Edison thinks, that we shall get to that stage where one man will have to provide for three or four families. He says that quite openly.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where did he say that?

Mr. POLLOCK: In a special article in the "Saturday Evening Post" a few weeks ago. My authority is quite sound. I am not attempting to mislead the House. Mr. Edison says that he can see no other way out of the difficulty in America. I argue that the same problem that obtains in America is facing us in this State to a limited degree. You must either seek an adjustment of wages, or you must be content to have wholesale unemployment and revolution. You can take what you like; you cannot escape it. I am no preacher of revolutionary doctrines, as every hon. member knows; but you cannot have 20,000 unemployed in a country like this—educated men and women, as well educated as, and better educated than, some of us, walking the streets without the necessities of life and with their families starving. You cannot have that state of affairs in this country without revolution. There might have been a time in the history of all countries when the toilers could not read or write—when they were all illiterate, and believed that slavery was about their right level, that you could do these things. Do you think that you are going to have the unemployed permanently, without any action being taken to alleviate the distress? Thousands of young people, twenty-one years of age and upwards, who know that they are as good as you and I, are going to demand that they be given the same right to obtain the same decent living as we enjoy. Do you think you can keep those people out of employment without the necessities of life for any length of time? I say that you cannot. I say that in a free and enlightened democracy such as we have in Australia it must inevitably mean that we must either face wholesale unemployment and revolution, or have some form of adjustment in wages that will give

[Mr. Pollock.

the breadwinner greater purchasing power. This proposal of the Government to amend the Apprenticeship Act is merely a miserable effort to provide jobs for a dozen boys. How are they going to solve a problem such as this? Not by this idea of round-table conferences, where the employer can hit the head of his employee as it shows up above the level of the table. Is that going to solve this problem? Only a fool could hope to solve such a difficult problem by those means. I do not intend to deal further with the unemployment question.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Leave that to us.

Mr. POLLOCK: God help the unemployed if we must leave the problem to the Government!

I desire now to deal with a question that is occupying the public mind to a great extent at the present time. That is the position of the ex-Premier of Queensland, Mr. McCormack, and I speak as his friend. Rumour is being very sedulously cultivated by interested parties, whether they be politicians, whether they be members of the Nationalist organisation, or just plain people who do not like the colour of Mr. McCormack's eyes—that he is not game to come back to Queensland. I want to give that the lie direct. There is a very definite reference being made in the streets, in the clubs, and wherever men foregather that the ex-Premier is afraid of the Mungana inquiry, and will not come back.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What said that?

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not take any notice of it, but the rumour is being circulated among the public, who are taking notice of it. In case too much notice is taken of such rumours, I just want to say that the hon. member for Cairns has made arrangements to be here if the Government go on with their proposal to hold an inquiry into Mungana. The second point is that he is receiving medical attention in London at the present time for a bad throat. He wrote me a letter a few days ago, in which he said that he was told that his throat was in a very serious condition, and that he stood a fair chance of strangulation if he did not take care of it. That is the opinion of a specialist.

The Government must proceed with an inquiry into Chillagoe and Mungana. They started the rumour in the first place because they wanted to attach some odium to prominent public men whom the rumours would affect. Such action is always the act of a weakling and coward, who starts out to try to ruin a man's reputation by slander. If you are not prepared to make a statement openly—and the present Government were not game to do that—you have to throw a bit of mud. We and everybody else know that they will continue to throw that mud because, if they can serve up a nice, juicy scandal for the public and get a one-eyed Royal Commission to find that someone was guilty of a dereliction of duty, they will do so. That would keep the public mind off the question of the £2,000,000, the 10,000 jobs, and other things—anything to have public attention drawn away from those questions. The Government have been endeavouring to tell Queensland that they cannot rid the State of the effects of fourteen years' bad government in three months. They realise that attack is the best defence when you have no defence. They will endeavour by every means in their power, as the Prime

Minister did in the Federal arena, to besmirch the name of the late Premier, just as Mr. Bruce did with Mr. Theodore. They will both fail.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That remains to be seen.

Mr. POLLOCK: These men during their term in the Legislative Assembly dwarfed every other hon. member, no matter what party he was attached to. There was not a man on either side of the House who intellectually could be compared with either the hon. member for Cairns or Mr. Theodore.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: In making money.

Mr. WARREN: They made money here.

Mr. POLLOCK: The only chance the Government have of detracting from their public service is to belittle them and serve up a scandal to the public. I know they will never be successful, but every opportunity they get they will take the fullest possible advantage of.

Mr. J. E. WALKER (*Ipswich*), who was received with Government cheers, said: I should like to add to the many tributes that have been paid to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, more especially to the hon. member for Bulimba, the first lady to grace this Chamber, for the excellence of her address. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in hoping that the hon. member for Bulimba may prove the forerunner of many public-spirited women who may be called from time to time to occupy seats on these benches. We all regard the intrusion of women into politics as a bold progressive move. Therefore, it is eminently natural that the first representative of this movement should be found on the progressive side of this House rather than in the ranks of Labour, who live and dwell so much in the past.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. E. WALKER: The hon. member for Maree said that this was the season for felicitations, and, such being the case, may I offer congratulations to the members of the Opposition in finding themselves in such a congenial sphere for their activities? (Government laughter.) As the late Premier at one time put it very astutely, the difference between the Government and the Opposition was that the Opposition had no responsibility. As a new member, I have been struck with the almost boyish irresponsibility shown by many members of the Opposition, who show a temerity and hardihood in criticising with consummate assurance those conditions which they largely brought into existence. It must be an encouragement and stimulus to hon. members on this side of the House to realise how so large a portion of our fellow citizens are turning with revived hope to the realisation of the policy so ably outlined by the present Premier in the recent elections.

The hopes and the schemes propounded by theorists lacking experience have often been shattered to pieces in the past, but we are all confident that the hopes for the realisation of the policy of the Government will receive a large measure of fulfilment in the changed atmosphere brought about by a charge of Government. No person for a

[5 p.m.] moment would suggest that those hopes are capable of fulfilment overnight. To achieve that the first essential is to remove the accumulation and the debris

of fourteen years of Labour rule—and that in itself is a task of no small magnitude. There is no doubt that legislation during recent years has created obstacles which have prevented us from passing along the road to prosperity; and before we have a clear run it is necessary that those obstacles should be removed. They must be removed if we are not to sink further and further into the slough of despond. It seems to me that during recent years partisan politicians and misguided economists have created fences which have been fondly designed to protect a section of our workers; but these same fences have proved in practice to be barriers against prosperity and even prison walls to an unfortunate—and unfortunately increasing—section of our workers, until we are now brought face to face in this richly endowed land of ours with the problem of unemployment, which has during recent years assumed such menacing form. It is strange that it is only now that so many hon. members opposite can hear the “tramp, tramp, tramp of that great army.” Perhaps it is less remarkable that they did not hear that tramp when they were in the vanguard of the march leading on to the present position. It is truly delightful to hear the Leader of the Opposition explain in such simple terms the cause of unemployment. The hon. gentleman certainly does use the vague term “sociological,” but, in effect, he says that the cause of unemployment is over-production.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: Under-consumption.

Mr. J. E. WALKER: It seems to me that, if over-production is the cause, all we have to do is to sit back and do less work, and the problem will solve itself automatically. What an obvious fallacy! What a dangerous doctrine! What a hopeless confession! With due deference from a novice in parliamentary life to such an experienced tactician, and without laying myself open to the charge which he so ungraciously levelled against the hon. member for Cook, I might suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that one of the main factors which relegated the late Government to the cold shades of opposition was their hopeless confession, which was repeated from one end of the State to the other, “We can do nothing about unemployment: we cannot tackle it.”

I want to show that the paths followed by the late Government have led to this state of things. The Leader of the Opposition in his very clever speech introduced some literature from the limbo of the last elections, and condemned it because it was an appeal to the imagination. Surely it will be safe for me to follow such an example, and appeal to some literature which was issued by the party under the guidance of the Leader of the Opposition! This literature does not make an appeal to the imagination, but it grossly distorts facts and seriously misrepresents the true position. But that is not the reason why I am referring to it. I am referring to this literature because it gives support to the argument that I wish to make.

But before referring to this pamphlet, which is really intended to be a comparison of figures between the years 1914 and 1927, covering the period in which the Labour Party were in power in Queensland, may I restate a very pertinent and relevant fact which has been well established, and which

Mr. J. E. Walker.]

has been admitted by the late Premier, Mr. McCormack, to be absolutely true? In 1914, 12s. could purchase goods which in 1927 could not be purchased for less than £1. That is, in 1927 goods that were valued at £1 were exactly equivalent to the goods that were valued at 12s. in 1914. Now, we have to reduce figures for these periods to a common denominator in order to get a fair, just, and accurate comparison; and I want to show how these figures, when that comparison is applied, entirely support the argument that I wish to put before the House. In all fairness, it is right for me to say that, as far as I have been able to check the figures given in this pamphlet, they are literally correct. The pamphlet is issued by the Labour Party and it contains a portrait of their late leader, Mr. McCormack, and the caption is in these high-sounding phrases:—

“On the broad highway—Queensland bounding ahead.”

It goes on to say—

“Our sunny State of Queensland is being developed, strengthened and enriched under sane Labour administration. Here are figures which give the lie direct and the final quietus to those moribund misanthropes masquerading as an Opposition in Queensland politics.”

The first figures deal with the population of Queensland and they say—

“In 1914 the population was 688,260; in 1928 it had grown to 914,471. An increase in population of 226,211.”

That, standing alone, may be taken as an evidence of remarkable advancement and apparent prosperity, because it represents a growth of the population of 32 per cent., which is certainly a very gratifying result.

Now we come to the production from industry. This pamphlet says that it increased from £38,396,000 in 1914 to £54,418,000 in 1927.

That, taken literally, is a very satisfactory increase; but, when you apply the ratio of relative values, which must be applied to all figures dealing with money and money's worth, then we find something entirely different. I shall show what it would take to produce in 1927 the same amount of goods—and, after all, goods are the only real form of material wealth, and they are the one source from which wages can be paid. We find that, if they had only produced from the whole of the industries in Queensland in 1927 exactly the same quantity of goods—not value—in that year they would have produced £63,993,333 worth. They failed to produce that by over £9,000,000. That is a very serious falling off. In spite of all the increase of population, which must be supported out of the production of industry, we had far less to divide.

In the same way the output from factories increased from £25,491,955 in 1914 to £41,327,767 in 1927. That, again, looks well if you take the figures at their face value, but, when you take them at the real value, you find that, if the factories in 1927 had produced only the same quantity of goods produced by a much less population in 1914, they would have produced at the higher values goods worth £42,486,591. When you take the whole of the industries of the State, or the production from the secondary industries alone, the same facts are clearly

[Mr. J. E. Walker.

apparent—we have a greatly increased population, 32 per cent. more—we had an absolutely lesser production during that time. Does not that make unemployment not only comprehensible but absolutely inevitable? There is far less to go round.

The same applies in regard to wages. Nominal wages went up very considerably during that time, but did the effective wages go up? The effective wages are those necessities of life which the nominal wages can buy. Though nominal wages have increased by probably 70 or 80 per cent., the effective wage has hardly gone up at all. I got a great shock in studying that irreproachable authority, the “Australian Year Book,” when I found this startling fact—that, in spite of all the developments in machinery, in spite, most of all, of fourteen years of Labour rule, the effective wage of adult males in Queensland from 1901 to 1927 had gone up by 4½ per cent.—less than 1s. in the £1—in spite of the great increase in nominal wages. The effective wage has not gone up appreciably after fourteen years of Labour rule. If we have not the same wage fund as we had in 1914 it is inevitable that there must be a large decrease in the total amount of wages paid. So we understand one important reason why unemployment is such a dire problem in our conditions at the present time.

At 5.15 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. J. E. WALKER: It is not due to over-production. I contend that over-production is absolutely impossible until every man, woman, and child in our midst has all the actual necessities for a decent life, and some at least of the comforts of that life; and it is the policy of hon. members sitting on the Government side to strive by every means in their power to accomplish that desirable objective.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. E. WALKER: Other hon. members have no doubt seen, as I have seen, cases of a father and mother and several young children without a single blanket in the home to guard them against the severe weather from which we are but now emerging. That is the main direct cause of unemployment. We find that, however good the motives of those responsible may have been, the late Labour Administration put so many obstacles in the path of progress that we now are in that position where prices have been so forced up that many commodities have been placed beyond the reach of many of our fellow citizens, and so the demand for them has fallen off. So, as I have tried to show by these figures so kindly furnished by the Opposition themselves, we are in this position—that we have an increased population and diminished production, which supplies us with a very large explanation of the state of things from which we are suffering so severely.

These results would have been much more apparent and deplorable were it not for the lavish expenditure of loan money during recent years. Other hon. members have pointed out that during the fourteen years of Labour rule the public debt of this State has been doubled; and, unfortunately, a large proportion of that borrowed money has been spent on entirely unproductive works, and so its expenditure has placed a heavy burden on the rising generation of this

State, who must, out of their industry, pay not only the interest but in the course of years the redemption as well. The present Government have succeeded to this cruel legacy—and it is a cruel legacy—and it is they who have not only to face those deficiencies, which have in consequence been brought about, but at the same time must strive to ease the burden on the shoulders of those on whom it will fall. Surely a task for lion-hearted men! We as a State must inevitably face a period of serious deflation. I think that to any careful observer that is absolutely apparent.

It is always well if periods of deflation can be made gradual. Any sudden deflation is one of the greatest hardships that can come upon a community. Unfortunately, these results are not always within our control. We want, as far as we can, to make that deflation gradual, so that we can adjust ourselves to the changing conditions; but there are portents on the horizon that make it doubtful whether we can do it to the extent we desire. The editor of the "Statist," a world-wide authority recognised on all hands, some months ago expressed the opinion that the limit of credit not only on the part of Great Britain but also on the part of the United States of America had been almost reached. That opinion has been borne out by two recent facts. Those hon. members who have followed financial questions in the newspapers will remember that only a very short time ago money at short call in New York rose to 12 per cent., 15 per cent., and even 20 per cent. That showed a considerable shrinkage in credit.

We have had a more ominous reminder during the past day or two that our credit is not by any means unlimited. The Commonwealth Government have just placed on the English market a loan for £5,000,000, and it had to be placed at the highest level of interest payment that the Commonwealth Government have ever paid. A fraction over £6 3s. per cent. has to be paid for that short-term loan for only one year. These facts are certainly ominous, and are causing every Government in Australia very grave anxiety indeed. Were it not for the loss of emoluments and prestige of office, hon. members opposite should be shaking hands with themselves very heartily indeed to have escaped the burden of carrying these cares, which are now placed on other and more capable shoulders. They must be borne, and we have to face them. The Government have a right to demand, not only from their own followers, but from the Opposition and from every citizen of Queensland, the fullest support and sympathy in dealing with these grave problems before us. We must face them, and we will face them. (Hear, hear!) We are face to face with the immense difficulty, if not the absolute impossibility, of securing from overseas an adequate supply of loan funds. After all, that might prove to be a blessing in disguise. It will throw us back on our own resources, and it will call for that self-reliance and that initiative that have always been, and still are, an inherent part of the Australian character.

During this period of deflation we feel confident that the present Government will exercise every care and consideration towards the public servants of this State. The public servants are not responsible for the position in which we find ourselves to-day. Many economies will have to be faced. They will be necessary; and I think the

public servants themselves will realise that it is in their own highest and best interests that the service should be placed in a sound and healthy economic position. But, while achieving that, the State should prove itself a model employer, and, as such, should extend every care and consideration compatible with the highest interests of the community to the public service of the State. We on this side stand for efficiency and economy. We also stand for the whole State, in spite of that old and too common appeal made by the hon. member for Gregory this afternoon, when he appealed to class consciousness, and even to class bitterness. During the difficult period ahead we feel that deflation can be made somewhat more gradual—probably by refraining from filling the different positions in the State as they become vacant, and by avoiding any measure of retrenchment.

But, as I say, this party stands not only for efficiency and economy but for co-operation in industry. That same spirit which will help us so largely in the problems which confront industry to-day might well find scope of exercise by the Government in their dealings with the public servants, especially in regard to that great railway service wherein so many of our citizens find constant employment. I feel that the Government will stand to their policy and pledges by striving to show the same spirit of co-operation and the same regard for the general welfare which is an important part of our policy in practice in the daily life of these great concerns. Efficiency depends very largely on a healthy measure of confidence, and it is the duty of our Government to see that that confidence is well founded. We, as a party, stand for every section of the community. As such we have the highest welfare of every individual in the State dearly at heart. We desire to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, yet feeling a special responsibility towards those who are least able to protect themselves. That is the policy of the Government. I am proud, indeed, to belong to a party which does not represent any section, but represents the whole community, and wants to conserve that feeling of oneness and not to substitute that party outlook which creates a constant feeling of class bitterness and hatred which is the last resort of the demagogue. We also want to remove from our path all obstacles to the renewal of prosperity and the restoration of a sound economic position. If we get the support not only of the party but of the public in the high ideals we have set before us, this richly endowed State will once more attain to the position of confidence and prosperity which is its natural right.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): I listened with some interest to the speech of the hon. member for Ipswich, who has just resumed his seat, and I am glad to hear that he is one of those who have ideals, for the simple reason that on a previous occasion I heard one hon. member opposite refer to an hon. member on this side who declared for ideals as a visionary. We have some visionaries on this side of the House, and evidently there are some on the other side as well. But, if one is not very careful, he will have his ideals shattered. Every man ought to have an ideal, as an ideal is a good thing to possess; and I have not much time for the man who has not a high ideal.

Mr. Winstanley.]

I must confess that, with so much of the sordid, mundane, and material things in life to-day, it is very difficult to maintain ideals.

The hon. member for Ipswich rather gave his case away at the close of his address when he drew a picture of the Opposition with respect to finance, for the simple reason that the position not only applies to Labour Governments but to Nationalist Governments as well—to wit, the present financial position of the Commonwealth Government. The hon. member for Ipswich stated that the present position of the Commonwealth Government was due to circumstances over which that Government had no control; and the same argument applies in quite a number of other directions in regard to the past Government of Queensland.

I have something to say in reference to the Address in Reply before I pass on to the more important measures with which we are to deal this session. I take this opportunity of expressing my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on the position you occupy. I know you sufficiently well, and have known you long enough, to believe that you are possessed of that patience, forbearance, and temperament which will enable you to see that the business of this Chamber is conducted in an orderly manner.

I might also suggest that some hon. members who seem to have been disillusioned on their appearance in this Chamber and to think that things are not conducted as orderly as they might be ought to take the opportunity of visiting some [5.30 p.m.] other deliberative Assembly in the Commonwealth. I venture the opinion that a comparison would reveal that this Parliament is as well conducted and as well behaved as any other Assembly in the Commonwealth, and probably outside it, if not much better conducted. Of course, there is room for give-and-take and differences of opinion so long as one expresses one's opinions courteously and good-naturedly.

I listened with a good deal of interest to many matters to which the Governor referred when delivering his Speech in another place. His Excellency, not content only with reading or hearing about Queensland, is learning to appreciate the resources and the conditions of Queensland by extensive travel over all parts of it. I am more than pleased to find that the Governor, who is a high medical authority, and who is also a keen and shrewd observer, confirms what many members on this side have said for a long time past—that is that, notwithstanding many of the disadvantages under which people live in North Queensland, the boys and girls of the North are both physically and mentally of a very fine type. I reiterate what I have said frequently—that the boys and girls of North Queensland are equal to the children in other parts of the State and Commonwealth. That says a good deal for the North Queensland climate, notwithstanding that sometimes it gets a bit on the hot and uncomfortable side.

The rest of His Excellency's Speech was a dull, drab, and dreary affair, and His Excellency proved the truth of Solomon's proverb that "Much reading is a weariness of the flesh," because he found it so before he had finished his Speech. One would have imagined that a party coming in flushed with victory and full of enthusiasm would have had something more original and con-

structive than we have found in the Speech. I listened to it carefully and I have reread it; but it can only be described as a "necklace of negatives." It foreshadows twenty-four Bills, twenty of which are amending. I am very doubtful whether they are not going to destroy some of the good things that have been placed on the statute-book in the days gone by.

Speaking generally with reference to the speeches that have been delivered on the motion for the adoption of an Address in Reply, I am never carried away with maiden speeches. I have been here long enough to know that many make a brilliant speech, but that is the only speech they make worthy of the name. They come into Parliament like lions, and go out like lambs. On the other hand, many men who have entered Parliament without any flourish of trumpets on the part of other people, and without any blowing of their own trumpets, have in time developed into useful and important members of the House; so that I am well aware of the fact that quite a number of people, so far as their speeches are concerned, do not always come up to sample. From that standpoint I am by no means carried away by a man's first speech, or a woman's either, and I reserve my opinion regarding those members. While new members are entitled to every consideration, and I think they always get it here—I know when I came here first I received every consideration—it does seem to me bordering on presumption when new members begin to dictate as to how other hon. members shall conduct themselves. In addition to that, when they state that they do not want any advice from this side, it does seem to me that even the youngest of these people, whoever they may be, or wherever they may come from, have something to learn when they come into this House. In addition to that, as hon. members have been told on two or three occasions by interjection, they should make sure of their facts. That is very good advice. They should make sure of their facts, but, unfortunately, they do not always do so, and in their use of figures, they do not always stick strictly to the truth. The hon. member for Ipswich, who has just sat down, showed to his own satisfaction that, although the nominal wage had increased during the past fourteen years, the real wage had not increased. One naturally wonders, if that is so, how it is that the people have been able to live and spend like they have done during the past thirteen years. Without going into statistics, I am confident that the people in 1914 could not have lived as they have been living during the past few years if money is of less value now than it was in 1914. If that argument applies to wages, it certainly applies in quite a number of other directions; but the hon. member did not make the same application when he referred to the loan money spent during the last fourteen years. As a matter of fact, the same argument can be applied to his second lot of figures, as the loan money spent during recent years did not purchase anything like the same amount of goods that an equal amount of loan money would have purchased in 1914.

Coming back to the point I raised about dealing with facts, some of the statements that have been made in this House have not been based on facts, and apparently proved quite a number of things that are not true.

[Mr. Winstanley.]

I shall take one illustration which will serve for quite a number of instances. A straw shows which way the wind blows, and, if an hon. member makes sure of his figures before quoting them in this House, and gives some evidence of having confirmed his statements, his words will get more credence than if he just says anything that comes to his mind without any concern as to whether it is true or whether it is false. The hon. member for Cook made quite a number of statements that would not be difficult to disprove; but I shall only deal with one in order to prove my point. The hon. member said—

“We have an area of 98,000 square miles, carrying under 5,000 of a population; yet there is available £34,000,000 under the Development and Migration Commission. The past Administration did not take advantage of that money for the development of Queensland; but I venture to say that the whole of that money could be spent in the Cook electorate with advantage and to the advantage of the people of Queensland.”

The hon. member for Cook—and quite likely other hon. members opposite are of the same opinion—is labouring under a sad misapprehension when he talks about £34,000,000 being available under the Development and Migration agreement. Nothing could be further from the truth. Anything that is made available for expenditure under that agreement has to be raised in the open market by the State which is going to spend it. That is indisputable. If there is any dispute about it, I will furnish hon. members with proof of what I say. Here is an extract from a speech delivered in Melbourne by the chairman of the Development and Migration Commission, Mr. H. W. Gepp, who, it will be admitted, knows something about the matter. He said—

“So far as borrowing by the States is concerned, the Development and Migration Commission has a definite locus standi only when it is proposed that a loan should be raised under what is known as the £34,000,000 Agreement, because the Development and Migration Commission is a body created by and responsible to the Commonwealth Government, and it is only when State loans are raised under the £34,000,000 Agreement that the Commonwealth Government is directly concerned in them.”

Surely that should be plain enough for anybody! The advantages which would accrue under the Development and Migration agreement are these: The State must raise money in the open market, just as it does at any other time. The Imperial Government impose certain conditions in regard to settlement. For the first five years the State will get the money at 1 per cent.; for the second five years at half the cost of the money; and after the second five years it will have to take the whole burden; so that it is quite evident that the statement made about there being £34,000,000 available under this agreement is so much nonsense. I do not wonder at new members who have just come into the House accepting statements of this description from those who have had much more experience, and certainly ought to know much better; yet statements have been made from time to time in a similar strain.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry made the statement in my electorate during

the election campaign that the late Government's surplus had been built up by the sacrifice of the poor “Teddy bear.” The hon. gentleman either did not know that that money went to the Trust Fund, or else he wanted deliberately to mislead the people he was talking to. He can take which explanation suits him best. Statements are made on the spur of the moment, without any regard as to whether they are true or untrue, if it is thought they will serve the purpose and score a point.

I want to say a few words in reference to land settlement. We are told that land settlement is going to mean the salvation of this country. Ringbarking and freehold tenure are two planks of the salvation platform. We are agreed on this point—that the salvation not only of this country but of other countries depends very largely upon the policy and the way our lands are administered and used. Whatever problem the Government may meet with or whatever difficulty may arise, if you only trace it to its source, you will find its roots are in the land.

I would just like to say that it would be very interesting indeed to have a definition of land settlement from some hon. member who sits on the Government side. The statement has been made that only about 2 per cent. of our lands have been alienated, and hon. members or others who quote figures like that no doubt do so with the idea of conveying the impression that the amount alienated is so small that it is comparatively insignificant. I have no hesitation in saying that not 2 per cent., but in all probability 75 per cent. of the agricultural land in Queensland has been, if not settled, at any rate alienated. Figures show that about 24,000,000 acres of land in Queensland have either been alienated or are in the process of alienation. Hon. members opposite would often try to make us believe that the issue of a freehold deed to land makes all the difference between successful land settlement and otherwise; but I propose to quote figures to prove that there is nothing in that argument, because we find that, although nearly 18,000,000 acres have been alienated in fee-simple and over 6,000,000 acres are in process of alienation in fee-simple, making a total of 24,000,000, yet of that total less than 2,000,000 acres are under cultivation. There is certainly something wrong with that state of things, and those figures present a problem to those who say that the issue of freehold deeds are going to bring about land cultivation. What about the cultivation of the land for which deeds have already been issued? Of the total of 24,000,000 acres there are—

	Acres.
Under crop	1,066,612
Fallow	81,259
Broken up	11,597
Previously under crop	136,524
Under artificial grass	546,575
Total	1,842,567

Hon. members will see from that that barely 8 per cent. of the land which has been taken up already and for which deeds have been issued is being put to its best use—in quite a number of instances to any use at all. That is the agricultural land, the best in the State, and there must be something wrong with such a state of affairs as that.

It is a remarkable thing that those who have so much to say against leasehold tenure

Mr. Winstanley.]

think it is quite fair and proper to become freeholders themselves and to grant leases to other people. Only recently we had an instance where an individual who had taken up land attacked the late Government because they would not allow him to cut up 600 acres of banana land into 10-acre blocks for lease as banana farms. So there are individuals who consider that it is not pernicious to grant leases for small areas for banana farms, but that it is quite wrong for the Government to grant perpetual leaseholds. In the latter case everything is wrong, but in the case of an individual who wants to grant leases he expects to be regarded as a philanthropist. Evidently, from what has been said during the present debate, some hon. members opposite occupy that position.

Mr. FRY: That is a very unfair statement to make.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There is nothing unfair about it. The people specified said so themselves. The Economic Commission visited Queensland quite recently, and had something to say on this particular point, and the advice contained in its report is well worth reading. They point out that what is needed in Queensland and in Australia generally is not more extensive settlement but more intensive settlement. They pointed out that they travelled along our railway lines for hundreds of miles and saw exceptionally fine land, but not the slightest sign of that land being cultivated. This is what they say on page 19 of the report—

“The more intensive use of land already in occupation in Australia is a matter of the greatest importance. This should be promoted by scientific research, and will increase the country's wealth more surely, rapidly, and cheaply than further extensive development is likely to do.”

That is sound advice, and advice well worth heeding. I do not agree with anyone who asserts that it is a satisfactory state of affairs to keep land out of use as is being done in this State to-day. That is a wrong state of affairs—in fact, a rotten state of affairs. Those landholders are not land settlers, but really land monopolists. They are not using the land themselves, nor will they allow anyone else to use it. That is one reason why Queensland is in its present position. We have the high price of land, and hon. members opposite stand for the high price of land.

Mr. KENNY: We stand for cheap land.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is not so. I have heard the Premier say over and over again that you cannot borrow on cheap land. The whole idea seems to be to secure land, then mortgage it, and be burdened with the mortgage for the rest of your life, instead of securing it cheaply in the first place and utilising your capital in the development of that land.

Mr. KENNY: That is what we advocate.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I do not think the hon. gentleman knows what he advocates. Nobody can be satisfied with the present state of affairs, not merely in Queensland, but in Australia as a whole. The whole problem could not be solved even if a freehold title were granted without any delay and a security was created upon which the holder could borrow. The question would then arise as to what should be produced.

[Mr. Winstanley.

The landholder would no doubt find it necessary to produce something that was not at present being supplied to the local market. We are told at the present time that increased production means an increased possibility of meeting our liabilities overseas as well as providing wages, food, and clothing for those in this country. There is scarcely any industry that is not subsidised in some way or another to enable it to live. We cannot carry on on that basis for very much longer, and something will have to be done in this direction. My contention is that the land question is at the root of every other question, but the majority of people holding land to-day are faced with the problem of over-capitalisation. The land is so heavily capitalised that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to earn interest on the money involved and earn a living as well. Some change will have to take place in that direction.

Apropos of this matter I wish to read a paragraph which I recently took from the “Brisbane Courier”—

“A RICH COLONY.

“A series of articles revealing the enormous possibilities of the British colonial Empire was recently contributed to the ‘Times’ by Dr. Walter Elliot. Dealing with British Malaya, he states that in 1926 the overseas imports were valued at £117,000,000 and the overseas exports at £147,000,000. These remarkable totals exceed those of the total external trade of the whole of the rest of the colonial dependencies put together. The value of exports per head of the population of British Malaya for the last two years has exceeded that of any other country in the world, and is higher even than the figure for New Zealand, which leads the self-governing Dominions in this respect.”

Malaya has a population of 4,000,000, or 2,000,000 less than the Commonwealth of Australia. The Government of Malaya had the good sense to adopt a policy not to give their land away to private individuals. The bulk of their revenue comes from land. As a result, they are not burdened with a whole lot of taxes, but have been able to pay their ordinary administrative and developmental expenses, to make practically the whole improvements of the country out of revenue, and invest millions in the stocks of other countries. I turned up their “Year Book,” and found that last year the revenue exceeded the expenditure by nearly £2,000,000. That meant that instead of going on the loan market, they were able to take up scrip of other governments. That is a practical example showing how things can be done if people desire to do them in a proper, just, and equitable way.

Unemployment at the present time is a world-wide problem. It exists in countries ruled both by Labour Governments and Nationalist Governments. If Nationalist Governments could boast of no unemployed, things would be remarkably good, but, unfortunately, they cannot say anything of the kind. I could not help being struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Ipswich when he was dealing with the price of money. He pointed out the high prices being paid in New York for short-dated loans. In an article I read the other day contrasting America and Britain as lending

powers, it was stated that America did not have the money for loans overseas in the same way as Britain. The article went on to point out that American tourists touring Europe and other parts of the world spent £100,000,000; consequently goods to that amount had to be exported to other countries. That goes to show that America—that wonderful country which is often referred to in this Chamber—has not an equitable division of its production if a handful of people can spend £100,000,000 on touring while there are millions in the country who have no jobs and no wages at all. The Development and Migration Commission have had the question of unemployment under review for the last three years and have collected quite a useful lot of data.

It is frankly admitted that unemployment is a world-wide problem to-day. If unemployment were more widespread in Queensland than in other countries.

[7 p.m.] then some blame might be attachable to the late Government; but it cannot honestly be denied that unemployment is just as prevalent in countries where Labour has never assumed the control of the government. Therefore, it is not altogether a question of the particular Government being responsible, but rather is it evident that other factors enter into consideration. For example, as the Development and Migration Commission pointed out—and they can speak authoritatively from the data which they have collected—trade cycles and the transitional stage from coal to oil in many industries have contributed to the prevalent unemployment, particularly in the latter case to the thousands of coalminers who are now out of employment.

The hon. member for Ipswich has stated that the wages of the workers are no more effective to-day than they were fourteen years ago, so it is evident that somebody is getting more than a fair share of the benefit of the increased production which has taken place. But it is not over-production that is causing unemployment; it is under-consumption, which is caused by the fact that workers have not the wages with which to purchase all the things they require. It is well known that, when one set of workers is thrown out of employment, the effect is felt by other workers whose efforts have been directed to producing articles which are no longer capable of being purchased, resulting in more unemployment.

I know that the feeling exists that the Government in power should take the blame. When I sat on the other side of the Chamber and anything was said about previous Governments, the gentlemen in opposition did not hesitate to say, "We are not responsible for previous Governments; we have nothing to do with what they did or did not do, and we cannot accept any responsibility in that direction." I say the same thing to-day—that we are not responsible for Governments that have gone by. If hon. members opposite think that by railing against the late Government they will improve matters, then they are making a great mistake. As a matter of fact, they have the privileges of office, and must accept the responsibilities. The people outside are not asking about what the previous Government did; rather are they asking what the present Government intend to do. Prior to the election the Premier went through the

country conveying the idea to the people that he would find employment for those who were unemployed. Amongst other things, he said that he would provide £2,000,000 to create 10,000 jobs; and he pointed to that as a pledge of his sincerity. Amongst the many circulars which he issued was an autographed letter—evidently turned out by a duplicating machine—which set forth certain figures relating to the unemployment question. In that connection it is interesting to note that, when a man goes into a witness-box, he is required to swear that he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and, when we find a man who claims to be sincere—and, if I understand that word correctly, I take it to mean that the truth will be told—one naturally expects that when figures are quoted they will be used in their proper relationship, and not merely to suit the particular purpose in view.

Amongst other things he stated there had been a decrease of 26,358 in the population of country districts. Nobody disputes that; but does anybody pretend that the drift from the country to the cities has been greater in Queensland than it has been in any other State of the Commonwealth or greater than in any other country in the world? Most decidedly not. As a matter of fact, in the State that the Premier came from, and which is often held up as the paragon of perfection—that is Victoria—the drift from the country districts was 43,671 in the same time, which goes to show that this drift is not peculiar to Queensland. One of the reasons for the drift from the country to the cities is that owing to the improvement in modern machinery workers are not required in the country districts to the same extent as they were years ago. Then, as everybody knows, a drought has prevailed in Queensland during the last two years, and consequently men cannot find work in the country, and they have come into the city in the hope of getting work here.

The hon. gentleman also pointed out that during the past three years factories have reduced the number of their employees by 739 and that the value of their products has decreased by £7,000,000. That is nothing more or less than mere figure-faking, for the simple reason that the returns given in the Commonwealth "Year Book" are for the five-year period; and, had the five-year period been taken, the result would have been very different from that set out in that alleged autographed letter. Had the five-year period been taken it would have been seen that there was an increase in the number of employees of 4,720, and an increase in the value of production for that period of £3,504,666 instead of a decrease of £7,000,000.

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

Mr. GRIMSTONE (*Stanley*): In the first session of a new Government it is only natural that there should be many changes in the composition of the House.

I desire to associate myself with the congratulations of previous speakers. First, to you, Sir, upon your elevation to the high and honourable office of Speaker of this Assembly—a position for which you are eminently fitted, and I have every confidence that, in the carrying out of the duties appertaining to that position, you will always

Mr. Grimstone.]

maintain the very best traditions of the office. I also desire to congratulate the hon. member for Bulimba—the mover of the Address in Reply—upon her conquest of Bulimba—a brilliant victory in a notable Labour stronghold. I can imagine the consternation with which the news of her victory was received on that historic night of 11th May last. In fact, one may compare it to the consternation that reigned throughout Spain on that memorable morning in 1704 when England captured from Spain that previously considered impregnable fortress of Gibraltar. Gibraltar would be regarded by Spain in exactly the same way as Labour regarded Bulimba.

I further wish to extend congratulations to that same hon. member for being the first woman to enter this Chamber, or to use her own words, to enter the masculine fastnesses of this Chamber; also upon the very fine trend of her speech. I was particularly impressed with its very high tone, and it struck me at the time, "This is indeed a very worthy standard for succeeding speakers in this debate to aim at in their contributions."

Then I extend my congratulations to the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Cook. He made an excellent speech, and he so bombarded the Opposition that their leader, in his reply, devoted what one may call a paragraph in his speech to the hon. member for Cook and, though there was an implied sting in the hon. member's remarks, the fact that there was such a sting was ample evidence of the excellence of the speech of the hon. member for Cook. I might also add my meed of praise and congratulations to the various other new speakers in the Chamber who have made their debut this session; and, after listening to the speeches, one must readily agree that the debating strength of this Chamber has been considerably strengthened as the result of the decision of the electors on 11th May last.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GRIMSTONE: It is not very long since I also made my debut in this Chamber, and I have many happy recollections of my effort.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: It was a great physical effort. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. GRIMSTONE: I was under the impression that maiden speeches were always listened to with respect, as mine was last session. I regret that such evidently is not now the case. It may be a delusion or an illusion. In seeking a cause for this change and noting where the interruptions mainly came from, I was forced to the conclusion that the sting of defeat was rankling so much that hon. members opposite were forgetting their good manners. I sincerely hope that that is only temporary.

We have been assailed by hon. members opposite with regard to not keeping faith with the electors. We are a Government of what one might term five minutes duration, and we are being assailed for not having within the short space of time we have held office carried out our promises to the electors. I think that the real worry of hon. members opposite is not that we are not going to carry out those promises, but that we are going to carry them out.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: Perish the thought!

[Mr. Grimstone.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: In listening to the speeches of hon. members opposite and their attacks upon us, one would naturally assume that they and supporters of the previous Government had been most particular with regard to the keeping of the election promises that they themselves had made in previous election campaigns. Let us go back to the 1926 election. The Labour programme at that time included among other things childhood endowment, pensions for widows and orphans, no increase in the railway tariff, preference to Queensland manufactures, no undue burden of taxation, better conditions for the worker, and just on the eve of that election their leader, Mr. McCormack, said—

"Labour is going to remain in control of the State for the next three years, and, as leaders of that party, we say we shall deserve the trust. We can do and will do the things we have promised."

Such was the election programme of the Labour Party in 1926. We know that Labour did retain control of Queensland for those three years—and, I may add, to the detriment of the State—but we shall just see how they carried out the promises made in 1926, and which were emphasised by the late Premier just prior to the election.

The TREASURER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition holds down his head. (Laughter.)

Mr. GRIMSTONE: Take widows' and orphans' pensions and childhood endowment. Are they on the statute-book? No! Instead of that, we have an increase of £5 a week to members of Parliament.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: You took the increase.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: I was not in Parliament when that increase was passed, and I strongly denounced it amongst thousands and thousands of other Queenslanders at that time; and I shall prove my bona fides on the question when the Bill to reduce salaries is before the House in a short time.

Then they promised that there would be no increase in railway charges. Well, we have had increases in freights ranging from 10 per cent. to 50 per cent. They did not carry out what they called "retrenchment," they called it "deflation"; and from 2,000 to 3,000 of the employees in the Railway Department were "deflated," and, in addition to that, they introduced the system of pooling work.

Then they promised preference to Queensland manufactures. There is nobody who will not subscribe in some degree to the policy of preference to Queensland manufactures. But let us see what happened. We know that the Ipswich railway workshops are capable of turning out excellent locomotive engines, but instead of giving that work or some of that work to the Ipswich workshops, they went overseas for twenty-five locomotives. At the same time the men in the workshops at Ipswich were pooling work. In addition to those locomotives, they went overseas for a pilot steamer and a couple of hopper barges.

Then they promised that there would be no undue burden of taxation. What happened? They introduced what has been spoken of as one of the most iniquitous Acts that has ever been passed—the Gift Duty Act. They imposed an increase of 33 per

cent. in stamp duties. Then we had an increase in licensing fees and the registration fees of motor cars.

They also promised better conditions for the workers. In place of that, we got an increase in unemployment—in fact, record figures—whilst the workers' contributions to the Unemployment Insurance Fund were increased by 100 per cent.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is not true.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: Of course it is true. They were increased from 3d. to 6d. per week. Just glance back at how hon. members opposite, when they were in power for a term of three years, put into effect the promises they made in 1926. It ill becomes hon. members who have such a string of broken promises to their discredit to stand up in their places in this House and say, when this Administration have been in office for but a few moments, so to speak, that they have not kept their election pledges. As I said earlier, the real worry with them is not that we are not going to carry them out, but that we are going to carry them out. There is an old saying—perhaps hon. members opposite have not heard it—"that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones."

Mr. KIRWAN: That is an old chestnut with hair on it.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: It is, but it is so applicable to hon. members opposite that it is worth repeating. It is rather remarkable to note the change of front of hon. members opposite, particularly on the question of unemployment. We remember that, when the question was raised in the House during last session when hon. members opposite were then sitting on the Government benches, it was rare indeed that one could get any of them to make any admission about unemployment, or, if one of them did say something about it, it would be something like this, "Well, it is worse somewhere else." I remember saying that if hon. members who were then on this side of the House had been sitting in opposition and the same amount of unemployment existed then as exists now, I could imagine the thunderous denunciation of the members of the Administration in which those hon. members would have indulged. We hear that thunderous denunciation now—a denunciation, really, not of this Government, because we have only just come into office, but denunciation of the late Administration. It was the Labour Government who really created this unfortunate position.

Amongst the many other good things that the elections of May last did was to awaken members opposite to a fuller realisation of the position in Queensland to-day—a position that is not of our creation, but is a legacy of the Labour Government after fourteen years of more or less experimental legislation, or what has been termed by other speakers the result of a "financial jazz." This party have been called upon to endeavour to straighten out this tangle in Queensland and restore the State to that road to prosperity that she should never have left. I might use a simile in comparing Queensland with a ship—a ship that has for a considerable time been sailing through very tortuous and dangerous channels. It reaches such a stage that absolute disaster seems inevitable. At this stage the passengers on the ship—to wit, the electors of Queens-

land—take a definite and decided stand and throw their pilot overboard—their pilot then being Mr. McCormack—and instal a new pilot, Mr. Moore, to bring that ship once more through to safety. Just as the job of bringing that ship safely through is going to be a long and tedious process, so also will the job of bringing Queensland back to prosperity be a long and tedious job. Hon. members opposite do not like the truth, and it is fitting at this stage that we should examine the position just as we find it as the result of fourteen years of Labour rule. We have an accumulated deficit amounting to £1,750,000, and an accumulated loss on the railways of nearly £18,000,000.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We have heard that before.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: You will hear it again. It is essential that the position should be definitely stated here. Evidently hon. members opposite do not like to have the position restated because it places them in a very bad light.

During the regime of the Labour Government our loan indebtedness practically doubled. The hon. member for Herbert endeavoured to prove, or inferred, that, when Labour first took control of the government of this State, the loan indebtedness amounted to something like £65,000,000; and he proceeded to state that, if one added to that the amount of interest payable over the remaining years, one could easily account for the increased loan indebtedness to-day. I have yet to learn that the interest on our loan indebtedness has been capitalised. The annual interest bill has increased from £1,975,000 to £5,170,000, or an increase in the charge on revenue from 13 per cent. to 54 per cent. In face of that, we have record unemployment. Taxation has increased from £554,000 to £4,671,000.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Taxation has increased in all States.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: As the Treasurer pointed out, as soon as something unpalatable is brought before hon. members opposite, they immediately skip off to some other place.

From that increase in taxation, £2,750,000 is required to assist to meet the annual interest bill. The per capita production, which in 1915 was £14 0s. 5d. above the Australian average, was reduced in 1927 to £12 6s. 7d. below the Australian average. The hon. member for Herbert, when addressing this Chamber, made the statement that in 1915 the taxable income in Queensland amounted to £16,250,000, which figure in 1928 had advanced to nearly £23,000,000. His inference was that there had been no increase in taxation, and that the increased amount received under the heading of taxation was not increased taxation but a natural result of the swelling of the taxable income. Let us see how that tallies. In 1915 the percentage of taxable income that was collected by the Government was 5.3 per cent., and in 1928 this percentage had risen to 23.12 per cent. Take this example. In 1918, 411 firms engaged in secondary industries paid an amount of £10,596 as income tax, while, in 1927, 270 firms engaged in secondary industries paid £153,613. That is to say, although 141 fewer firms were engaged in this particular industry, they paid nearly fifteen times as much in income tax as in 1918. So much for the statement that the taxation

Mr. Grimstone.]

had not been increased. What is the result of this crushing burden of tax on the people? There can be only one answer to that—a decrease in the number of secondary industries which necessarily means a decrease in employment. Unfortunately, this is the case in Queensland. Queensland statistics show that for 1927 there were twenty fewer factories engaged in production, while 2,323 fewer workers were engaged in this line of production, whereas over the border in New South Wales during the same period 26 new factories had been established, employing an additional 9,902 workers.

Mr. KIRWAN: How can you explain the fact that New South Wales has a higher percentage of unemployment?

Mr. GRIMSTONE: In Victoria 122 additional factories were established in the same period, giving employment to no fewer than 8,650 employees. It must be readily conceded by all that one of the principal functions of the Government is to do their utmost to encourage new capital to come to this State. We all desire to see an extension of our secondary industries for, in addition to the additional employment such factories would create, they would also increase the home market for our primary and secondary products. Unquestionably the home market is the best market. There would also be an increase in the circulation of money by way of wages and this increased money would, as a natural corollary, mean that the people would have a higher consuming power. The country that is self-contained, having no exports or imports, but consuming the whole of its products locally, can set up any standard of wages or conditions of living, and without detriment, but where a State like ours, at present, mainly a primary producing State, has to export its surplus products and compete in the markets of the world, then Sir, must we face the all-important question of the costs of production.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: How do you propose to face it?

Mr. GRIMSTONE: If the hon. member will listen, he will hear what I have to propose.

[7.30 p.m.]

Mr. KIRWAN: You are the first who has tackled it.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: Possibly the hon. member has not been listening; but upon this question the very welfare of the State depends. Our opponents declare that, when we talk about reducing costs of production, we mean reducing wages. To that I say emphatically that that is not necessarily so. The surest and most effective method of reducing costs of production is by increasing efficiency. I mean this increased efficiency to apply not only to the worker but to every stage in an industry—to the management equally as well as to the lower ranks of the labour employed.

Labour politicians frequently assert that they have raised wages. They may have assisted in raising nominal wages; but, as a result of their administration, they have also materially assisted in reducing the effective wage. The effective value of £1 sterling is only 12s. to day, so that the effective basic wage is not £4 5s. but £2 11s. per week. The effective value should, therefore, be increased; and, if hon. members opposite were as sincere and honest

in their desire to bring about a better condition of affairs as they profess to be, they would work wholeheartedly with that object in view.

How can this be done? Firstly, we want the hearty co-operation of all concerned in our slogan of "Increased Efficiency." Every increase of 1s. in the effective value of the £1 means an effective increase in the wages of workers of 4s. 3d. per week. Surely that is a slogan worth adopting!

Mr. HANLON: But slogans won't feed the people.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: But it stands to reason that, if hon. members opposite—the so-called leaders of the people—keep preaching their gospel of strife, we cannot have increased efficiency, which cannot exist where discord and suspicion prevail between the two parties engaged in industry. Only the other day the hon. member for Paddington, the ex-Secretary for Mines, when speaking with reference to the Bowen State coalmine, said that costs of production depended upon output, and that the greater the output the lower the cost. In effect, he meant that the greater the efficiency the lower the cost, which is a confirmation of the point I am now making. Let us see where the starting-off point for this increased efficiency should be. First of all, complete confidence should exist between all parties. The opportunity should be available at all times for a free and frank discussion between the parties; there should be an opportunity for all to participate in profits; and also for the increase of the daily or weekly earnings. Lastly, but by no means least, there should be absolute freedom from political interference. If hon. members opposite and the union secretaries were the true friends of the workers that they claim to be, they would advocate this closer co-operation in industry instead of the class antagonism that, unfortunately, exists to-day.

Capital and labour are interdependent, just as the human body is dependent for its motive power upon the action of the heart. Peace in industry is an important factor in this question of unemployment. When we see in Queensland that during the past five years there have been 131 disputes, in which 69,150 workers were involved, with a total loss in wages of £612,875, how can we say that we have that true efficiency that is so vitally necessary for the satisfactory development, progress, and employment of its people?

It is freely recognised that this constant friction and constant suspicion, with its accompanying loss of efficiency, is an important factor in the creation of unemployment. I welcome the amending Arbitration Bill as forecast in His Excellency's Speech, because I believe that it is going to assist materially in bringing about that closer co-operation and that greater efficiency that is so necessary. It will provide greater opportunities for the worker, and it will enable him to get the full measure of his labour, and, as stated in the Government Policy Speech, opportunities for co-operative work, profit sharing, and payment by results, or the incentive wage will be provided.

No man should be denied the right to live or the right to work. This, unfortunately, is the case at the present time. I refer particularly to the question of closed union books; and I do hope that this Bill, when

[Mr. Grimstone.]

it comes before the House, will make provision for that particular aspect.

In this connection I would like to quote from an article by Cyrus McCormick, who is at present in Australia. This article was published in the Melbourne "Herald," and probably hon. members have read it. Mr. McCormick is vice-president of the International Harvester Company of the United States of America, a huge organisation employing something like 45,000 men. He is commenting upon the relations existing between employers and employees in America and the efforts adopted there to promote peace and harmony in industry. He says that they had instituted there a works council, which includes representatives of the employees. Among the functions of this works council is the discussion of all questions on matters arising between the workers and the management, particularly including the questions of wages, hours, and working conditions. His conclusions are that the results of the works council are eminently successful. He says there is not in America that sharp demarcation between the employer and employee which is to be found in older countries. Unfortunately, that sharp demarcation exists in this country, which is regrettable. Then he goes on to say that the young American wants to get ahead. He knows that the higher positions are obtained by energy, integrity, and intelligence. As he works he likes to believe that he is serving himself. What a fine gospel that is to preach to our people, instead of this everlasting strife and ferment! We can easily substitute the word "Australia" for the word "America," because there are similar opportunities for the Australian worker here just as there are for the American workers over there. The point that I am making is that there are opportunities for the worker here, if he is given a free hand. Unfortunately, at the present time he is not given a free hand owing to some unionistic decree. This is an opportunity for hon. members opposite to prove that they are the true friends of the worker by preaching this gospel of closer co-operation and greater efficiency. We are endeavouring to do this, and I feel quite confident that, as a result, the worker will still feel that he has more genuine friends on this side of the House than elsewhere. Mr. McCormick goes on to say—

"The American system is one that believes in the doctrine of high wages because high wages give high consuming power, but the high wages are earned wages, gained by efficiency. The piece-work system is very popular with the workmen because they know that as they become more efficient their earnings increase. The American employer does not cut piece-work rates. He knows that extra effort on the part of the worker pays dividends to him as well as to the worker. In American manufacture there is practically no such thing as what is called in England "ca canny." The American workman has come to the conclusion that the better he works the greater are his earnings, the greater his own consuming power, and there are therefore, more sales and more work for him at good wages. . . ."

That is one of the factors that would help very considerably in the solving of the unemployed question—by preaching the doctrine of greater efficiency—by allowing the workmen themselves a freer hand than they have

at the present time to increase the efficiency in industry, increase the consuming power of the people, and we shall not have, as the Leader of the Opposition said, over-production.

Further on, he deals with profit-sharing. There are 45,000 employees participating in the dividends of the company. That is one of the things which, as I mentioned earlier, we propose to make possible for the Australian workmen. Under such conditions and ideals it is not to be wondered at that they have a very much higher efficiency over there than we have here, unfortunately. It should be our aim to strive to bring the efficiency of our country to an equality with that of America.

Mr. HYNES: Are you decrying your country?

Mr. GRIMSTONE: I am not decrying my country. I take second place to no man in regard for his country. I am one of those who have such a pride in his country that he is not content unless he sees his own country taking the foremost place in whatever it may undertake. Mr. McCormick, in summarising, states the effect of the works council upon production in these words—

"(a) Makes for safer working conditions;

"(b) Improves the quality;

"(c) Increases the efficiency."

The workman there recognises that his interests and those of his employer are not separate, but are demonstrably one and the same. Here is an extract from a speech made by His Grace Archbishop Duhig, in February last—

"The working man of to-day could not do as he liked, but only as his union ordered him. It was a great pity to kill individuality and personality. One standard of work had been set up, and there was no incentive for the working man to make for improvement."

To-day we are endeavouring to provide the working man with the opportunity to free himself by throwing off his chains and regaining the individuality and personality that are to give him the incentive once again to climb higher and higher the ladder of life.

While on the matter of efficiency I wish to say that so far I have only dealt with efficiency as it applies to the manufacturing side of industry. I also mean my remarks to apply to other industries as well. Take the wool industry, for instance. Undoubtedly Australia leads the world both in the quality of wool and in production per sheep. But because we occupy that position are we to rest content and say we cannot go any further? What an immense benefit it would be to our country if we could increase the production of wool per sheep by, say, $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. or even 1 lb.! I do not think that is impossible. What an immense benefit that would be to our country! This is why I welcome the establishment of this Council of Scientific Research to give us a lead in a matter such as this.

Mr. BRUCE: It is increasing every day.

Mr. GRIMSTONE: That is so, but let us keep on.

I would also point out that Australia only occupies the twenty-sixth place in the world with regard to the wheat yield, the average in Australia being 13.24 bushels per acre,

Mr. Grimstone.]

whereas in Denmark the average is 40.51 bushels per acre. There is ample room for improvement there.

Take maize. We find that Canada leads the world in maize production per acre, the average being 42.3 bushels per acre, while Australia occupies fifth place with a yield of 27.16 bushels per acre. This certainly is a much better position; but can we not go right to the top?

Then take the dairying industry! It is certainly pleasing to note the efforts made to increase efficiency in this industry by herd improvement, herd-testing, and so on. But we have a long way to go yet before we can say that we have gone far enough, or that we have reached such a state of efficiency that we can afford to rest. In connection with this problem I raise the most important question of fodder conservation as one constituting a big factor in the progress of the industry.

I have just mentioned a few avenues for improvement. There are many other phases upon which I could touch, but my time is going, and I have said enough to show what an immense field there is for the activity of the Bureau of Research.

Now I come to the question of land settlement. If this question is tackled in the way in which I am sure the present Government will tackle it, I am sure it will assist materially in the reduction of the numbers of our unemployed. It is depressing to know that during the past thirteen years the land not occupied has increased by 20,000,000 acres—from 69,070,920 acres in 1915 to 89,248,752 acres in 1928. That is very unsatisfactory in a country like this, and I heartily welcome the Land Act Amendment Bill which is forecast, whereby we shall have the restoration of the freehold tenure and the removal of the dictatorial and irksome restrictions on our land settlement. I anticipate a very rapid increase in land settlement in the very near future, and I think that, as a result, we are going to have a check on this alarming drift from the country into the cities. This drift citywards is the natural result of decreased land settlement, as will be seen from the following figures:—

LAND SETTLEMENT.	
1909-14, increase	27,000,000 acres
1922-28, decrease	500,000 acres
POPULATION.	
1909-14.	
	Increase.
Cities and towns	43,406
Shires	77,474
1920-26.	
Cities and towns	153,050
Shires	26,358

With an increase in land settlement we are naturally going to check the drift from the country into the cities, and this also has a very important bearing on the question of unemployment.

With only a minute to go, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the electors of Queensland upon their decision of 11th May, as a result of which we now have on the Government benches an Administration whose dominant principles are honesty of purpose, integrity, and common sense.

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

[Mr. Grimstone.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. E. A. Atherton, *Chillagoe*), who was received with Government cheers, said: I would, first of all, like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the high position you have attained in this House. I am especially pleased, as one of the Northern members, to have the honour of having you as Speaker upon my introduction to this Assembly.

I also congratulate the electors of Bulimba upon having had the honour of electing the first lady member of the Queensland Parliament. To the hon. member herself I offer my sincere congratulations upon the convincing manner in which she won the Bulimba seat. The wonderful victory that she achieved in doing so has thrilled Queensland and showed that on this occasion "Wright was wrong." (Laughter.) I also congratulate the hon. member on the splendid speech she made, and I congratulate my next-door colleague, the hon. member for Cook, on the splendid speech with which he seconded the Address in Reply. It is clearly evident that the hon. member who represents the Cook constituency will not prove as silent as was the late member.

Mr. BRUCE: Don't be dirty.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That statement is quite clean; I always play fair. I take my place in this Assembly as Secretary for Mines, and at this juncture I should like to assure you, Sir, and hon. members that Queensland possesses absolutely the richest mine in the Commonwealth.

Mr BRUCE: Who told you that?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have gained that experience during the short time that I have been Secretary for Mines. But, unfortunately, that mine has been so unsympathetically, carelessly, and badly managed that its timber structure has almost decayed, the mine has become flooded with water, and quite a considerable quantity of the ground work has caved in. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, when a mine reaches such a stage of disuse, it requires a period of perhaps years and tremendous expense to dewater the mine and restore it to the state of high efficiency which existed perhaps ten or twelve years before. The mine to which I refer is this wonderful State of Queensland. The administration to which we have been subjected over the past fourteen years has brought Queensland practically to the brink of bankruptcy, and, although it is no easy task to restore Queensland to its original sound, prosperous condition, given a little time, the present Government will restore the State to the happy position that it enjoyed fourteen or fifteen years ago. An ex-Minister of the Crown, when speaking the other day from the Opposition benches, doubted the wisdom of the Premier in appointing two political novices to his Cabinet. My only reply is that, if the whole of the Cabinet were composed of novices, they could not be guilty of a more lamentable display of inefficiency and disaster than we suffered at the hands of the past Labour Cabinet.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DASH: The Premier selected the best material available.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I accept that compliment from the hon. member. It is my intention to do my very

best in the interests of the State as a whole; but, even if I did my very worst, I could not exceed the ruination of the past Administration.

I have the honour to represent an electorate of which you have all no doubt heard mention in this Assembly. I refer to the electorate of Chillagoe. I regard it as a high compliment to have the honour of representing the electorate of Chillagoe. In view of the present financial position in Queensland, and in view of conditions generally, it is necessary that those who control the destinies of the State should be possessed of broad vision in order to improve the present condition. I say without fear of contradiction that no other electorate in Queensland has a greater possibility of being able to do that than the Chillagoe electorate which I have the honour of representing. A greater quantity of wolfram and bismuth has been won from the Chillagoe electorate than from any other country of the same area in any part of the world. There is no reason why Chillagoe should not produce as much in the future as in the past. Chillagoe also holds the proud position of having the second largest silver mine in Queensland. There also happens to be in my electorate a district of which possibly a few hon. members may have heard, and that district is Mungana.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: We have heard about that before.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have the honour of representing Mungana, which is part of the Chillagoe electorate; and I do hope that during the next few years Mungana will not be looked upon in such an unsavoury light as in the past, but that it will once again become a wealth-producing district, and be looked upon not only by the public, but by Queensland and the Commonwealth, and even by people right across the seas, in a more favourable manner than it has been during the last five or six years.

Mr. COLLINS: You are indulging in innuendoes.

Mr. KELSO: There is a lot of smelly business about Mungana, anyway.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It may not be out of place for me to mention right here what was done in regard to the Mungana mine. I do not intend to get down to tin tacks; the whole details will shortly be available for the information of the people; but suffice it to say, in order to let hon. members know the position, that the Mungana mine at one time was lying idle and was not considered worth while for the Government to take up. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Cairns, when addressing the Townsville Labour Convention, was asked why he had not opened up some of the silver-lead mines in North Queensland, and he replied that no one would think of taking up such a mine with lead at £20 per ton, with any hope of making it pay. What do we actually find was the case? They waited for a considerable period, and, when lead rose to £40 per ton, a company took up Mungana and worked it for a considerable period. Lead dropped again to £22 16s. per ton, and the Queensland Government then turned round and purchased Mungana for £40,000. I am speaking of a matter that I know something about.

Mr. BRUCE interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I can assure my hon. friend that I know more about Mungana and Chillagoe than he imagines I do. I was born in the district, and I have lived in the district all my life. (Opposition interjections.) I claim to know something about my electorate—possibly more than some hon. members sitting on the Opposition benches know of their electorates. That reminds me of the story of a man coming from overseas to Queensland. He was asked, "What are you going to do in Queensland?" "I am going in for politics," he said. He was asked further, "On what side?" The overseas man said, "I won't know until I get there." (Laughter.) I am not one of those men; I always know the colour of my politics.

Mr. COLLINS: Innuendoes again.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No hon. member in this House, or any man out of this House, has the slightest chance of altering my political convictions.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

After that they closed Chillagoe down, and automatically with that closure in July, 1927, the Mungana mine ceased to function. What I take exception to is the manner [8 p.m.] in which Mungana was closed down. I do not think many

people are aware of what happened, but I can tell them that, when the manager was given instructions at 4 o'clock one afternoon to close the mine up in the morning, he appealed most strongly for two or three days' grace in order that he could remove the valuable machinery. He was told that the adjectival machinery could stop there, that the mine must be closed in the morning. The manager again appealed in vain for the opportunity of taking that valuable machinery out of the mine. The result is that to-day the mine is full of water, and there is at least £4,000 worth of machinery lying anywhere beneath 600 and 700 feet of water. The same remarks apply to its sister mine, the Lady Jane, in which over £4,700 worth of machinery is now lying in many hundreds of feet of water. Later on, when the Government did not consider it wise to reopen Chillagoe or work that mine, what did we find? They simply allowed the lease to lapse, and handed Mungana once more to Ahern and party. I do not blame the latter party one iota for accepting the mine, but I do not think that 2 per cent. of the people of Queensland are aware that the Government do not own the Girofla mine, which is owned by a party of five or six individuals, to whom it was given in 1923.

That is the true position with regard to Mungana, from which it will be seen that not only has Mungana been crucified by leaving valuable machinery under water, but also has been sacrificed by the lease being allowed to lapse and to be taken up by Ahern and company.

The day will come in Queensland when we must realise that more scientific and up-to-date methods must be employed in mining activities. The day is long since past when the individual miner can go out with his pick and shovel, make a temporary windlass, and scratch a living out of the wealth left near the surface of the ground. The most scientific methods must be adopted to exploit the mineral wealth of the State. As I said a minute ago, we all agree that

Hon. E. A. Atherton.]

the day is past when these mines can be worked on the old haphazard system.

Mr. BRUCE: You have got to put the copper there that you have taken out.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The copper and the lead are still there, but we have to adopt modern scientific methods to enable us to treat ores profitably that we are now dumping. In the past the eyes were picked out of the mines. I am not referring so much to gold mines, but in connection with other mining we only picked out the eyes. Out of every 100 tons of ore produced possibly 10 tons were treated and the other 90 tons were dumped.

Mr. BRUCE: Did they not treat low-grade ore at Chillagoe?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They treated a lot of low-grade ore. They also treated ore that was not worth a snap of the fingers, but they purchased it from some individual. It was not out of their own mine. The day has come when we must treat this low-grade ore as a payable proposition, because in nearly every other country in the world they are treating ores of a lower grade than ores we are dumping to-day. If we adopt scientific methods, with the most up-to-date machinery, there is no reason why similar low-grade ores cannot be treated in Queensland.

Mr. BRUCE: Are you going to put up-to-date machinery in Chillagoe?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member wants to know if we are going to put that machinery in Chillagoe. I think the machinery at Chillagoe and Mungana already cannot be surpassed in any part of the world, especially the human machinery that handled the financial side of it.

The present Government have lost no time in commencing to clean up the mess that was left by the late party in power in connection with State enterprises and other non-paying propositions. I was highly amused the other day when the Leader of the Opposition, by way of interjection, asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry what value he put on the goodwill of the State cannery. I have been in business all my life, and I never realised previously that a business that was continually losing money had any goodwill whatsoever. The State cannery has shown a huge deficit, in spite of the huge amount that has been written off.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have been able to run a business all my life, and I have never worked for a day's wages in my life, and that is more than can be said by some hon. members sitting on the Opposition benches. They may have tried to run a business, but the success that they anticipated was not met with, and they were forced back upon the wages market. I must apologise. I said a moment ago that I had never worked for a day's wages in my life. I presume wages would include salary, and, in case that is so, I wish to state that for three months I have been a Cabinet Minister and have been drawing a salary. But this is the first time in my life that I have drawn a salary.

Queensland was struck nothing less than a deathblow when the right of freehold tenure was taken from the people.

[Hon. E. A. Atherton.

I think it was in 1911 that the people were given the right of perpetual lease if they wished it. Prior to that, when it was optional for a selector to take either a freehold or a leasehold, to show how popular the leasehold tenure was, whereas over 112,000 acres were taken up in one year under freehold tenure, only 2,000 acres were taken up under the perpetual leasehold tenure. Even when the Labour Government put an Act through and saddled the perpetual leasehold system on the people, when they discovered that it was detrimental to the State they should certainly have removed it. I am not blaming anyone, because the party that never made a mistake also never did much good; but they should be broadminded enough, when they see that anything is seriously affecting the welfare of the State, to remove the obstacle. The only way to remove the obstacle is to allow the people to revert to freehold.

I have been convinced since I have been in the House for the last few days that hon. members opposite are what I might term more narrow-minded than I had ever any idea of before. As the old saying is, there are some people who are as narrow in the forehead as a sardine, and I honestly believe that some of these business people exist in Brisbane. I would refer to the freehold tenure in my own electorate. I represent possibly the most cosmopolitan electorate in Queensland, an electorate that produces nearly every mineral known, the finest timber in the world, and is one of the greatest maize-producing centres of Queensland, and also contains the finest dairying country in Queensland. When going through my electorate, I noticed the difference in the selections that were taken up under the freehold tenure and those which were taken up under the perpetual leasehold tenure. You had not the slightest necessity to ask people whether any place was freehold or perpetual leasehold, because you could see by the improvements on the farms which they were. The man with a freehold property had very substantial yards and bails for his dairy concreted right through. In the case of the man who had a perpetual leasehold, his dairy yards were knee-deep with mud. Those people do not feel inclined to spend money to put up concrete buildings on their farms, because, first of all, they cannot raise the capital to do it on perpetual leasehold tenure; and, secondly, the more they improve their farms the more they are taxed for improving them. I think that Queensland is the only country in the world where a man is taxed for improving the property of the State.

Mr. HYNES: You do not know much about it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I happen to know a great deal about it. I have done more farming than the hon. member has ever seen, and I know exactly what I am talking about. That was one of the deathblows that was dealt to Queensland. I am glad to say that it will only be a very short time before the people of Queensland will again be able to say that they can take up a selection under the old freehold tenure.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: To anyone with any ambition, to anyone who likes to own a piece of property, and, later on,

pass it down as a heritage to his next-of-kin, the freehold tenure certainly offers more attractions than does leasehold, under which a man knows that the property he is improving to such a high degree will never be his and he will never be able to hand it down to a later generation.

I have been convinced for years that the past Government never governed Queensland. There was never any secret about who governed the State. It was the Australian Workers' Union. A striking instance of that occurred at the time of the big trouble in North Queensland, when a very high authority in the Government service said to the men, "I will see that we pass legislation to do so and so." What was he told by the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union? I cannot tell you here exactly what he said, but it was to this effect: "Our troubles about the Government; they are not running Queensland. We are. The Government will do as we tell them." That is what happened in Cairns. I, as chairman of the Cairns Harbour Board, was at the time discussing the matter with these other two or three individuals. So I cannot understand how anybody can deny here that the Australian Workers' Union did control Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS: The Employers' Federation run you.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Bowen interjects that the Employers' Federation run me. All I can tell the hon. member is that I have never belonged to the Employers' Federation in my life; and, if he can find my name in their books, I will forfeit my seat.

Mr. COLLINS: That does not make any difference.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Now the hon. member, like a carpet snake, is trying to wriggle out of it.

Mr. COLLINS: Why are you talking about carpet snakes? Why do you not play the game?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is not accustomed to carpet snakes. He is accustomed to tiger and diamond snakes—they are more venomous.

I would like to deal with the Government's purchase of the State stations and the lack of knowledge they displayed when they bought them, when the prices of cattle were right at their top. They never went any higher, and they started to fall almost immediately. I find also that their method of buying—in my area they bought six stations—was such that they did not buy until somebody else had actually come along and bought the stations. Then in a few weeks these persons passed them over to the Government—at what profit I am not able to tell at this juncture.

I have occupied a good deal more time than I expected, and now I want to refer at some detail to the truly extraordinary agreement that the late Government made with Mr. H. C. Sleigh, of Melbourne, in 1927, for the sale of coal from the State coalmine at Collinsville. Notice has been given of a lot of questions on this point, and possibly many of them will be answered now.

In his speech delivered on 23rd August in this House the hon. member for Paddington, who was Minister for Mines at the time the agreement was made, said that he

had paid detailed attention to this matter. Later in his speech he said that the Sleigh agreement was only for coal for overseas trade and overseas bunkering, yet the agreement to which the late Minister paid detailed attention definitely states that Sleigh is appointed the sole and exclusive agent for the Queensland Government for Bowen coal for bunkering overseas vessels and for export outside the State. It is quite clear that the hon. member for Paddington, as Secretary for Mines, had only a very vague idea of the contents of the document to which he appended his signature. Contrary to his idea of its contents Sleigh was given coal at a cost of about 2s 6d per ton under the cost of production, and from 5s. to 6s. per ton below the cost of coal to other purchasers, including interstate vessels. This agreement, which made him the sole and exclusive agent, included sales to other States. I will deal further with this phase of the question later on.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Next week.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You will get it to-night, if I have time. The point I wish to make now is that, although the hon. member for Paddington said on Wednesday last that he paid detailed attention to this matter, and that he signed the agreement with the very best intentions, in reality he knew very little at all about the agreement that he signed on behalf of the Government. My opinion is that there was a master mind behind this agreement, just as there was a master mind behind the peculiar transactions of the late Government in connection with the Mungana mines.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I do not for a moment think that the hon. member for Paddington had any real grasp of the essential features of the Sleigh transaction at all. I believe that this transaction was conceived by the type of business mind that carried through the Mungana transaction to such a successful conclusion, and, to a lesser extent, the type of mind that could contrive to extract from the public purse a sum of not less than £13 a day for travelling expenses. These were the minds, Mr. Speaker, that were behind that agreement, and not the mind of the hon. member for Paddington. Under this peculiar agreement Mr. Harold Crofton Sleigh was empowered to demand from the Queensland Government 500 tons of the usual merchantable quality of Bowen coal every twenty-four hours at the following prices, delivered on trucks at the mine:—

	Per ton.
	<i>s. d.</i>
Best screened coal	... 14 0
Run-of-mine coal	... 12 0
Screened small coal	... 11 0

The agent on his part was under no obligation whatever, except to use his best endeavours to execute the sale of the said coal. Two months prior to the signing of this extraordinary agreement the matter was referred to the supervisor of State coalmines, who reported adversely upon it. He pointed out that the average cost of production of coal at that time was 14s. 6d. a ton, and stated that it was impossible to reduce the existing prices of 20s. a ton for screened coal and 16s. a ton for unscreened coal. He also pointed out that the greater the sales of screened coal—the kind of coal that

Hon. E. A. Atherton.]

Mr. Sleigh would require—the greater would be the cost of production because of the increase in the quantity of slack or duff, which is practically unsaleable. In spite of all this, the then Minister, the hon. member for Paddington, signed the agreement two months later, when conditions had not changed in the slightest degree, and he apparently did not know that it included interstate sales. On two or three occasions on Wednesday last he stated that Sleigh had to sell the coal overseas, and that the Sleigh agreement was only for coal for overseas trade and overseas bunkering. There is another peculiarity about this agreement—it was made for a period of three years, yet Mr. Sleigh was under no obligation whatever to take the coal; he could decide whether he took it or not, just as it suited his interests. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that some of my friends on the Opposition benches have become quite dumb. There was no clause in the agreement providing for an increased purchasing price in the event of increased costs of production in the Bowen State coalmine. The value of the Bowen coal could rise to £2 per ton at the pit head, and the cost of production could rise to 20s. per ton, yet Mr. Sleigh could still demand 500 tons every twenty-four hours at the price of 11s. 5d. per ton. I ask you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, if the hon. member for Paddington, as the Secretary for Mines, had really given detailed attention to this agreement; for, if he did so, as the responsible head of his department and the responsible agent of the Queensland Government, acting as trustee of public money, would he have appended his signature to such a document? Certainly he would not. Having studied the terms of this wonderful agreement, perhaps it will now be interesting to find out how it has actually worked out in its operation. As hon. members will remember, the agreement was signed in May, 1927, and was for a period of three years. In the following financial year—that is, 1927-28—Mr. Sleigh disposed of 5,082 tons 15 cwt. of coal. Although—I stand corrected—the hon. member for Paddington said Mr. Sleigh never sold an ounce in the first twelve months, I say he sold 5,082 tons 15 cwt. at an average cost to himself of 11s. 10½d. per ton, though the cost of production was 16s. 10d. per ton. In the financial year 1928-29 he purchased 27,402 tons of coal from the Bowen State coalmine, for which he paid at an average rate of approximately 11s. 4d. per ton—the cost of production being 14s. per ton. (Opposition interjections.) I can word my own speech without the assistance of hon. members opposite, as they will be quite satisfied to admit when I am finished.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Over the whole of the period up to 30th June last, the average price Mr. Sleigh paid for coal purchased from the Bowen State coalmine worked out at 11s. 5d. per ton. I want hon. members to keep that figure in mind, because the hon. member for Paddington has questioned the accuracy of my statement as to the profits made by Mr. Sleigh under this agreement. That is what I am now coming to.

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

[Hon. E. A. Atherton.

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

“That the Secretary for Mines be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech.”

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of hon. members that the Secretary for Mines be granted an extension of time?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I particularly desire to thank hon. members for their courtesy in granting me an extension of time, for I can assure them that this is a most important question.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It has already caused a great deal of discussion in this House, and it will not be my fault if it does not create a lot more discussion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Cook, on 27th August last, I stated that Mr. Sleigh had received a concession worth 5s. per ton of coal, equal in value for his purchases for last year to a sum of £6,884, or a selling commission equal to 30.6 per cent. Those are figures I gave to this House the other day, and I am prepared to stand by them, irrespective of the statement made by the hon. member for Paddington that they were not correct. I definitely state that they are correct.

Mr. BRUCE: They are the gross figures.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The late Secretary for Mines took exception to my calculations.

Mr. COLLINS interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I can prove that the hon. member for Bowen has not the faintest idea of what he is talking about. The hon. member for Paddington stated last Wednesday that the sales profit could not be calculated until we knew the price at which Mr. Sleigh sold the coal. That is perfectly true, and it is an important matter for consideration.

Mr. POLLOCK: Plus his costs.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is, quite true also that I am not in possession of the facts of Mr. Sleigh's transactions—

Mr. PEASE: You will be.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Although I do know of one sale of Bowen coal to New Zealand at 23s. per ton f.o.b.

Mr. BRAND: By Sleigh?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is no demand for coal for New Zealand bar through Mr. Sleigh, and he got 23s. per ton f.o.b., which is equal to 19s. per ton at the pithead. Therefore, on that lot of coal alone we know he made a profit in the vicinity of 8s. a ton. I considered that I made a very conservative estimate of Mr. Sleigh's profits under this agreement, and I see no reason in the world why I should alter that opinion. Hon. members opposite cannot refute the statements I have made.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why did you leave some of that man's report out?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am making this speech. As I have admitted, I

have not any exact knowledge of Mr. Sleigh's transactions. He has never given any information to the department; he is not that type apparently, but probably for very good reasons of his own. It is quite evident that the overseas trade he has developed is of very little value, and it certainly does not justify the sale of nearly 40,000 tons of coal, mostly for other States—not overseas—at a loss of approximately 2s. 6d. per ton or the selling of Bowen coal at 11s. 5d. per ton when the present value at the pithead is in the vicinity of 19s. per ton.

Mr. COLLINS interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Apparently the hon. member for Bowen has no idea of what a voice I have got. (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will grease the machinery directly, and they will be wound up by the time I am finished. (Renewed laughter.)

I have given the House sufficient information, I think, to prove that the Sleigh agreement which the late Minister sought to excuse on Wednesday last is one of the most disastrous of a large number of similar transactions during the regime of the late Government. No one with any gumption would enter into an agreement to sell coal at a fixed price for a period of three years without any proviso to cover increases in value or increases in cost of production. It is only natural that anyone entering into an agreement of that nature would make provision for a sliding scale to cover increases or decreases in cost of production; yet the Sleigh agreement had no such proviso.

Mr. BRAND: It is not a usual practice in the coal industry, either.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No one would agree to sell 500 tons of coal without any obligation on the part of the other person to take any specified quantity; nor would any sane person agree to sell at a loss of 2s. 6d. per ton for interstate trade when any number of equally competent agents would be willing to perform the selling service at a small commission of 1 or 2 per cent.

Before concluding I wish again to refer to the statement made by the late Minister that he paid particular attention to that agreement, which he says he made with the very best intentions. I do not think so. My opinion is that the late Minister had a very vague knowledge of the document which he was signing.

Again I say it must have been a master mind that conceived this particular transaction, and the late Minister was merely a fool in the hands of some other person. I honestly believe that the late Minister was not a party to that transaction. He signed with his eyes blindfolded, and, after signing it with his eyes blindfolded, he comes here and says he knows exactly what is in it. In that connection I desire to offer the House some evidence which I feel sure will be accepted by hon. members as it can be substantiated right up to the hilt. I have in my hand a statement on this subject signed by Mr. Frederick Hart of the Aberdare Collieries, Ipswich. I propose to read this

statement for the information of hon. members—

"Prior to 1927, my father, John Henry Hart, bought certain coal lands and secured options over adjoining lands in Ipswich which contained the well-known Aberdare coal seam. To prove that this land contained this seam he went to considerable expense in putting down a diamond drill bore, which proved that this seam continued to at least 1,300 feet.

"He then secured a report from John McGeachie, who is recognised as a leading mining engineer, and as this report was very favourable, he drew up a prospectus for a company with a capital of £250,000.

"When this was completed, he sent a representative to Melbourne to interview H. C. Sleigh, whom he heard might be favourable to joining the company.

"Mr. Sleigh became interested to the extent of sending a 10-ton sample to, I believe, Manila. He then came to Brisbane, and to all concerned appeared to be most favourably impressed, and agreed to join the board of directors.

"The question of exporting coal then arose, and Mr. Sleigh said he could arrange the matter, the only question being the rebate of port dues of 9d. per ton on export coal. This rebate was at that time gazetted every six months, and Mr. Sleigh pointed out that if he signed a contract at a set price with any overseas clients and that he then lost the 9d. per ton rebate, this would affect the business considerably. We then suggested that he should see the Minister for Mines and see what could be done in the matter.

"Mr. Sleigh, Mr. Frederick Lionel Dawson, and myself interviewed the Minister for Mines on or about 3rd February, 1927. Mr. Jones quite realised the position we were in and said he would do all in his power to help us, but this matter was outside his department.

"Mr. Jones rang the Premier, Mr. McCormack, and arranged an appointment for us for the next day. Mr. Dawson, Mr. Sleigh, and myself then went to interview the Premier, and explained the position fully to him. He stated that he realised our position but for certain reasons he did not think it advisable to pass an Act of Parliament making the rebate of 9d. per ton permanent, but he gave us his assurance that so long as he remained Premier of Queensland the 9d. per ton rebate would be made. This arrangement was quite satisfactory to Mr. Sleigh, and after talking for a few minutes we rose to leave the room. Mr. McCormack walked to the door with us and shook hands with all of us, but as we were going out of the door he said, 'Mr. Sleigh, I would like to see you for a few minutes.' Mr. Dawson and myself left the room, and it was fully half an hour before Mr. Sleigh came out of the room. Our suspicions were aroused by this, and we asked Mr. Sleigh if Mr. McCormack had been trying to sell him Bowen coal. He said, 'Well, no, not exactly.'

"After this interview, Mr. Sleigh went suddenly cold on our proposition, and returned to Melbourne without giving us

Hon. E. A. Atherton.]

anything definite as to his intentions. We made further inquiries, and from information received we understood he was making arrangements to buy Bowen coal.

"A little later, Mr. Dawson went to Sydney and called at Mr. Sleigh's Sydney office. After considerable trouble he found out that Mr. Sleigh had left for Brisbane the following afternoon. Thinking that it was on our business, Mr. Dawson immediately wired me, and I met the Sydney mail that evening, and Mr. Sleigh seemed most surprised to see me there. However, he did not say even then that he had turned our proposition down, but told me he was going to Bowen to inspect some cattle. I naturally knew that Bowen coal was really his mission to Bowen.

"In my opinion, it was entirely Mr. McCormack's fault that Mr. Sleigh turned this proposition down, as prior to seeing him he appeared most enthusiastic, and I must say that the Minister for Mines was most courteous and did not mention Bowen coal to Mr. Sleigh, and also assured us that he would give us any help he possibly could."

That is Mr. Hart's statement, and, if anyone studies it, they can see its truth for themselves.

I do not wish to labour this matter very much longer, but I think I have shown quite conclusively the facts with regard to this contract with Mr. Sleigh, which originated with the late Premier, Mr. McCormack, and the late Secretary for Mines, Mr. Jones, and I repeat that, although the latter signed it, he had a very imperfect knowledge of its contents. The public of Queensland have sustained a huge loss through giving to Mr. Sleigh the right to demand 500 tons of Bowen coal per day at a cost from 4s. to 6s. lower than the price charged to all other purchasers. Mr. Sleigh was not required to take any coal; he could take it or leave it, to serve his own interests. There was no provision whatever in the contract to cover increased production costs or increases in the value of coal. The result has been that for several months Mr. Sleigh increased his demands for coal, and the Government were forced to supply him under his contract. In consequence a profit of £226 for the four weeks ended 9th February, 1929, was turned into a loss of £360 for the four weeks ended 9th March, 1929. The following four weeks, ended 6th April, 1929, showed a loss of £480.

Mr. HANLON: From what are you quoting?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am quoting my supervisor's report, which is sent in monthly.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I honestly thought that, with the intelligence the hon. member is blessed with, he would know that without asking the question. The cause of these losses was Mr. Sleigh and his contract.

The supervisor of State coalmines, in his report dated 28th June, 1929, as well as in previous reports, leaves no room for argument. In that report he stated—

"Sleigh's contract was again responsible for Bowen's loss, and while he con-

[Hon. E. A. Atherton.

tinues to take the major portion of the output losses were to be expected, as his price is much below the cost of production, and an average of 4s. below general prices. The sooner the contract terminated the better. In my opinion, it serves no useful purpose."

In conclusion, I can only say that Mr. Sleigh's gain is Queensland's loss, and those responsible for this sorry piece of business will find it very difficult to make excuses or satisfactory explanations for their action in this matter.

I might say also at this juncture that I had not been in my office a week before Mr. Sleigh wanted a renewal of the agreement. Naturally he would want a renewal.

Mr. KENNY: Did you give it to him?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Did I give it to him! Does the sun rise in the west? (Laughter.) Within the last three weeks he has offered me an additional 5s. per ton for any extra coal that I can supply. If this man is now prepared to offer 5s. per ton more for any extra coal that I can supply, it shows conclusively that he is making a profit of at the very least 5s. per ton, because I do not think Mr. Sleigh is so patriotic that he is going to purchase coal just for the sake of being helpful to Queensland.

I think I have shown that the Bowen State coalmine, where Mr. Sleigh exercised his option shows a loss. Any month when he does not exercise that option and buys very little coal, the Bowen mine is capable of showing quite a reasonable profit, which substantiates my statement that the more coal we sell to Sleigh the more money we lose. A certain amount of this coal is sold in Australia and a certain amount overseas. I had the figures in my hand, but I have mislaid them, and I shall not keep hon. members any longer on this question.

The present Government have fulfilled their promises right up to the hilt. Hon. members opposite apparently cannot reason. One moment they find fault with the Government for keeping our promises, and the next they find fault because they say we do not. That has been going on ever since I have been sitting in my seat in this Chamber. I am content to leave the matter in the hands of the public of Queensland. I am quite sure, as I said before, that people who are not as narrow in the forehead as a sardine will look at the matter in a broad-minded manner—and no ordinary business man can look at it in any other way—and will admit that what I have said here to-night fully substantiates my argument.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 293, I ask that the documents from which the Secretary for Mines was quoting be laid on the table of the House. I do this because we have reason to distrust him. He left out another very important statement from another document. That man would say anything.

The HOME SECRETARY: It will be necessary to send a detective to watch them.

Mr. POLLOCK: You must put them in—the whole of them.

Question—That the papers quoted by the Secretary for Mines be laid upon the table of the House—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 20.

Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hanson
„ Bow	„ Hynes
„ Brassington	„ Kirwan
„ Bruce	„ Pease
„ Collins	„ Pollock
„ Conroy	„ Riordan
„ Dash	„ Smith
„ Dunlop	„ Stopford
„ Foley	„ Wellington
„ Hanlon	„ Winstanley

Tellers : Mr. Foley and Mr. Hanson.

NOES, 37.

Mr. Atherton	Mr. Kerr
„ Barnes, G. P.	Dr. Kerwin
„ Barnes, W. H.	Mr. King
„ Bell	Mrs. Longman
„ Boyd	Mr. Macgroarty
„ Brand	„ Maxwell
„ Butler	„ Morgan
„ Clayton	„ Nimmo
„ Costello	„ Peterson
„ Daniel	„ Plunkett
„ Deacon	„ Roberts
„ Duffy	„ Russell, H. M.
„ Edwards	„ Russell, W. A.
„ Fry	„ Sizer
„ Grimstone	„ Tedman
„ Hill	„ Tozer
„ Jamieson	„ Walker, H. F.
„ Kelso	„ Warren
„ Kenny	

Tellers : Mr. Hill and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): Mr. Speaker, speaking on a question of privilege, I ask that the papers in connection with this matter referred to by the Secretary for Mines be placed in your charge and kept in your custody until this House has had an opportunity of seeing them. We are afraid that they will be “cooked.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): If the hon. gentleman would only show a little patience for a few moments, I would be able to tell him at the adjournment of the House that the desire of hon. members opposite will be given effect to, and that the papers will be laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That announcement will be made at the proper time—that is, on the adjournment of the House.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): In the interval between now and the adjournment of the House there is an opportunity for the removal of papers. (Government interjections.) I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to take possession of the papers, in order that they may be safeguarded. I ask you to do so in order that our rights may be safeguarded. An important extract was left out of one of the papers quoted from previously by the Secretary for Mines. Two of our members inspected those papers, and they found that extract, which was not quoted by the Minister, but was deliberately left out. We fear that some of those papers will be removed, therefore, we ask that they be placed in your charge now.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You are used to your own tactics.

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*): Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, during the time that the division was being taken a lot of cross-firing was going on, and the Leader of the Opposition directed to the Secretary for Mines, who had just spoken, this statement—“that he paid 20s. in the £1,” insinuating that the Secretary for Mines had not paid 20s. in the £1. I ask the hon. member did he say that? If he admits that he did say so, then he should withdraw.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*MacLay*): A number of recriminations and interjections were being flung to and fro across the Chamber during the time the division was being taken. Quite a number of them I cannot now remember. Quite a number of references were made to myself, and, in reply, I said, “There is one thing I always do; and that is I always pay 20s. in the £1.” That is a very honourable course to pursue, and I do not think there is anything in that remark to take exception to or to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Gregory has asked that certain papers from which the Secretary for Mines quoted in the course of his speech should be placed in my custody. I shall leave that matter entirely in the hands of the Minister. If the hon. gentleman wishes to place the papers in my custody, they will be taken care of. The House has the assurance of the Deputy Leader of the Government, who told me before the hon. member for Gregory made the request, that the papers in question would be placed on the table of the House to-morrow. I am not going to ask the Minister to place them in my custody unless he wishes to do so.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are not going to take his orders, either.

The SPEAKER: If the Minister wishes to place the papers in my custody, I will accept them and take very great care of them.

Mr. POLLOCK: Where are the papers now? Why don't you put them on the table of the House if you have got them?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We are the Government—not you.

Mr. KENNY: We have the whip hand now.

Mr. DANIEL (*Keppel*): In the first place, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your high and honourable office. I trust that you, Sir, will be blessed with health and wisdom to enable you to carry out the duties appertaining to your high position with credit to yourself and with satisfaction to the House.

I desire also to congratulate the hon. member for Bulimba on being the first lady elected as member of this deliberative assembly. May that good lady prove a tower of strength in the midst of the members of this Assembly.

I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on the able and efficient manner in which they acquitted themselves.

It is with pleasure that I welcome the amending legislation which is foreshadowed in the Speech of His Excellency. The Attorney-General very appropriately [9 p.m.] stated to-day that it was necessary to be destructive in order to be constructive, and I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the urgent necessity for the

Mr. Daniel.]

projected amending legislation. Speaking of destructive forces, what more destructive agency to the farming community than the rural workers' award? The operation of that award meant that hundreds of men were thrown out of employment, because farmers could not afford to engage labour at the rates of pay prescribed in that award. The effect of the suspension of that award has been the employment of scores of men in my own district.

The Government's intention with regard to the conversion of land from leasehold tenure to freehold tenure will be welcomed, because under the leasehold system, with its reappraisal provisions, no inducement was given to the man on the land to effect improvements that would have tended to increase the wealth production of the State. In many cases leasehold land was valued at £2 10s. per acre when it was worth only 5s. per acre; in fact, it would have been cheaper for the farmer to have purchased the land straight out. The unfortunate part of the whole business is that legislation was passed by the Labour Government without any appreciation of the effect such measures would have on the farming community of the State. Labour's policy was to legislate for one class alone.

The hon. member for Balonne made an appeal the other day in which he spoke in sorrowful terms of the serious plight of the wool industry, which, he stated, would have to be assisted in its present trials and tribulations if disaster were to be averted.

The hon. member for Balonne has suddenly wakened up, and it has fallen to his lot to advise the present Government to design some means by which to bring a ray of hope to the sufferers, to lighten their load and cause the star of hope to hover jerkily on the horizon. The hon. member for Balonne, being far-sighted as well as being imbued with the true spirit of philanthropy, sternly withholds from the right hand a knowledge of what pranks the left hand is up to. His Government first collected an average of £550,820 more land revenue per annum during the ten years between 1917-18 and 1926-27 than was collected for the ten years immediately preceding that golden period. This gave them £5,508,208 of their victims' money with which to be generous when the time came to satisfy their friends, the electors. The quality of the generosity of the hon. member's Government may be gauged from the fact that £320,000 of the ill-gotten plunder has been returned in the form of rent rebates that were necessary, principally because the gangsters repudiated rental agreements, and held, in effect, that no agreement, undertaking, or contract held water if a Labour Government decreed otherwise. Their generosity amounts to 5½d. in the £1 of extra land revenue collected. There is no record of brigands treating their victims more generously. All the same, it demonstrates that the Government supported by the hon. member for Balonne had two hands of widely differing capacities—one which over the last ten years collected an average per year of £1,376,264 of land revenue against an average over the preceding ten years of £825,444, while, on the other hand, they gave back to the rack-rented and drought-stricken people the magnificent sum of 5½d. for every extra £1 taken. Needless to state, the hon. member for Balonne affects a bland innocence of what I have said concerning the existence of the clutching hand of the late

Government which made such a glorious sacrifice of so many microscopic drops of mercy that drip from the other blood-stained paw.

The claims made by the hon. member for Port Curtis on behalf of Gladstone savour indeed of insincerity to the State. At this juncture I do not intend to argue as to the merits or demerits of any port; but it may be as well to ask whether Rockhampton, which is the port for Central Queensland, with an unimproved ratable valuation of £1,500,000 and a population of 30,000, is to be sacrificed in order to bolster up Gladstone, with a ratable value of but a few hundred thousand pounds and a population of a few thousand people. The present liabilities of the Rockhampton Harbour Board—thanks to the blunders of the past, and for which the board is not altogether liable—can be met, and met only, by removing from the optic lenses that portray Brisbane as Queensland and focusing the eye upon the State as a whole. Let us give to Central Queensland, of which Rockhampton is the heart-pulse, that which is her just due as a terminal port by complying with the board's request for a loan to ensure that shipping shall trade to Rockhampton wharves with the inward and outward cargoes that are now commandeered by Brisbane and despatched over steel rails by the Railway Department at a loss, thereby piling deficit upon deficit on this department's balance-sheets. This is due principally to the stranglehold mismanagement—that destroying octopus called Socialism, exercised in the name and cause of humanity.

I also urge and appeal to the Secretary for Railways to cut out the tapering rates beyond terminal ports. Subject to these embargoes and obstacles being removed, the drift from the country to the capital will be stopped and the whole State will benefit thereby. It should not be overlooked that the prosperity of Brisbane is dependent, and dependent only, upon the prosperity of Rockhampton and the great Central district, and which, if met four-square, would prove a more prosperous and valuable part of Queensland.

If the Treasurer intends to keep the local bodies up to the collar in the matter of loan payments, and if the loans are to be reviewed, we would almost seem to see some semblance of the beginning of sound finance, but the Government should go about the matter very cautiously, as it must do nothing to impair its debtors' chances to make good. In other words, the creditor should not compete in the same market as his debtor. The real difference between economy and being niggardly with loan money must be kept in sight, and Queensland, as a whole, must be kept in mind in its fullest economic aspect. If the Government, as a matter of settled policy, set out deliberately to attract the trade of Rockhampton and other ports to Brisbane by special railway rates in competition with sea carriage, it would not be long before the debts of the harbour boards concerned followed the creditor who had fished their legitimate trade. The debts of all harbour boards are secured only by the legitimate trade of the respective ports and districts, and the moral duty of the creditor is to assist and not to destroy that trade. It is also common sense, and the practice of holding debtors to payment and at the same time destroying their ability to pay is no longer fashionable. Any honourable

[Mr. Daniel.

institution which loans money will at all times assist the borrower rather than retard him in paying his debts. The late Government however, did everything to destroy and hinder the debtor from being able to pay its just dues. Given her legitimate trade, Rockhampton will stand up to her debt, but shifting the trade centre of Central Queensland to Brisbane means that the only security for the debt of a dead port will be in its dead plant. Queensland's transport problems have attained a status which places them far above a departmental inquiry, and Rockhampton's port troubles are unquestionably caused largely by uneconomic use of the railways in competition with developed ports. There is no time like the present for stating that the condition of the Rockhampton Harbour Board is the direct outcome of Government policy. Nobody seems to know who accepted responsibility for the strict adherence of the late Labour Government to that policy, and nobody knows yet how far or how long our present Government are going to tolerate such false economy. Either the Government must state clearly that they favour crippling the whole of the provincial towns on the seaboard in order to build up a mighty metropolis with buildings costing millions of money, or it will be necessary to make a clean-cut issue on the question of reviewing the whole position of Queensland transportation by sea, rail, and road.

Labour terminated its political reign with fewer factories and factory employes in Rockhampton than at the commencement of their term. Although the population had increased by 10,000 in the past ten years, there were 350 less employes in factories alone. It is to be hoped that the present Government are not going to try to emulate the example of our late Government. Thirty-eight years ago there came into Rockhampton by sea 30,588 more tons of cargo than came in last year. These figures show the inward traffic to Rockhampton—

—	By Sea.	By Rail.	Total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1891 ..	126,702	70,579	197,281
1928 ..	96,114	768,685	864,799

Those figures show a decrease in sea traffic of 30,588 tons, and in rail traffic an increase of 698,106 tons. It is freely mentioned in the daily papers that the Commissioner for Railways has suggested that, if there were sufficient traffic from Northern ports direct to the railways to fill up the empty trucks returning to Brisbane, he could make an additional profit of £160,000. Fancy a business man like the Commissioner for Railways talking about making an additional £160,000 by filching it from someone else! The Commissioner for Railways actually forgets everything but the railways! It matters very little to him what sinks so long as the railways swim. A responsible Government has to deal with the situation from a national point of view, and not from a parochial point of view. In his annual reports for 1924, 1925, and 1926, the Commissioner complained emphatically but unavailingly of the disadvantage under which the Queensland railways were placed because of the tapering rates and fares for the extremely long haulage of goods and passengers; but the late Government turned a deaf ear to him, took no notice,

and carried out their disastrous job. How can the Commissioner reconcile one statement with the other? He tells you that, if he is given carte blanche to carry on the administration of the railways, he will be able to secure an additional £160,000. Yet in 1924, 1925, and 1926 he condemned that system. To-day he wants to filch the trade from the various ports in the North. It has been argued and proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the extreme long-haulage and tapering rates have caused a loss to the ports of many millions of pounds. On this matter I desire to quote the following extract from the Brisbane "Daily Mail" of yesterday:—

"It is satisfactory to learn from Mr. W. H. Barnes that the improvement of the navigation of the Brisbane River—in other words, the preservation and advancement of Brisbane's reputation as a port for deep-sea shipping—is receiving the attention of the new Government.

"Economy cannot justify the continuance of dangers or difficulties in the navigation of the river, which could be removed by a larger outlay for dredging operations. It would be defeating its own object by discouraging the use of the port, and so diminishing the port revenues as well as doing damage to the trade of the city and the State."

Does this apply to Rockhampton, Gladstone, and elsewhere, or does it apply only to Brisbane? Is Brisbane Queensland? That is what I want to know. Have we in Rockhampton not a right to keep the Fitzroy River open to traffic? So long as the Government do not allow the Commissioner to interfere with the natural trade of a port, we will make the port pay. The article continues—

"Care of Brisbane port facilities is a responsibility offering an opportunity to the new Administration to apply that greater business ability and more practical sense of commercial requirements which the public hopes have been brought to bear upon the government of the State."

Rockhampton and the provincial towns of Queensland ask the State Government for an opportunity to show what they can do for the provincial towns, and, unless they get a fair deal from the present Government, we shall have to simply agitate for separation. That is the only thing left to us—the management of our own affairs.

I take exception to a remark made by a member of the Opposition the other day. He stated, by way of interjection, that the new and younger members of the Government Party would do as they were told by the leader of their party. I wish to say definitely that I intend to be loyal to my leader and the party so long as the Government carry out the policy which the Premier has enunciated. I am sure that my leader does not expect loyalty from me beyond that point. I also desire to say that, if the Leader of the Opposition brings any measure forward that will be for the good of the country, I will support him.

[9.30 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on the 22nd August, the House now stands adjourned. On adjourning I will

Mr. Daniel.]

give the Deputy Leader of the Government an opportunity to state the business for to-morrow.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have adjourned the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): A few minutes ago the hon. member for Gregory—

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I rise to a point of order. If you, Mr. Speaker, have adjourned the House, what right has the Deputy Leader of the Government to speak?

The SPEAKER: Under the Standing Orders I adjourned the House, but gave the Deputy Leader of the Government the opportunity to state the business for to-morrow.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): In announcing the business for to-morrow, I desire to state that, in connection with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Gregory, when he pressed his contention to a division and was defeated, the Government desire to place on the table of the House the documents that have been quoted by the Secretary for Mines. I therefore have much pleasure in laying these documents on the table. The business of the House to-morrow is the resumption of the debate on the Address in Reply.

The House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.
