

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 1929**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER, 1929.**

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

FRIVOLOUS QUESTIONS.

The SPEAKER: For the information of hon. members, I should like to state that question No. 8, which appears in the "proof" business-sheet for to-day has been deleted by me from the business-sheet. I considered the question one of a frivolous nature, and one that should not be asked. I refer the hon. member for Queenton to the remarks that I made with regard to questions on 22nd August last, from which he will see that I stated that questions of a frivolous nature would not be permitted to be asked. That is the reason why I have deleted the question from the business-sheet for to-day.

QUESTIONS.

SALES OF SMALL COAL UNDER SLEIGH CONTRACT.

Mr. JONES (*Paddington*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. The quantity of small coal dumped at the mine at the time Sleigh's contract was entered into?

"2. At what price was this small coal being sold before Sleigh's contract was entered into?

"3. Is it not a fact that the quantity of small coal sold by Mr. Sleigh up to 30th June, 1929, is 59 per cent. of the total coal purchased by him?

"4. Is it not a fact that of the coal on order by Mr. Sleigh on the 28th August 67 per cent. of same is small coal?

"5. Was he aware of the sales of this small coal when he quoted Mr. Stafford's report, in which Mr. Stafford stated 'that the greater the sales of screen coal, which was the kind of coal Mr. Sleigh would require, the greater the cost of production, because of the increase in the quantity of slack or duff, which was practically unsaleable'?

"6. Is he aware that the mine has been unable to supply Mr. Sleigh's requirements for small coal?"

"7. Is he aware that Mr. Sleigh has not sold any coal to New Zealand, as stated, and will he state by whom the sale of Bowen coal to New Zealand at 22s. f.o.b. Bowen was made, and to whom and from what mine?"

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

"1. 1,551 tons small coal and 11,638 tons of duff or slack.

"2. Screened smalls, 16s. per ton; unscreened smalls, 14s. per ton. The contract prices to Mr. Sleigh are 11s. and 9s. 6d.

"3. Yes.

"4. 59.4 per cent.

"5. Yes.

"6. It has not been possible to supply Mr. Sleigh's orders for screened small coal. To have done so would have greatly increased cost of production, as stated in the extract from the report of the Supervisor of State Coalmines quoted in the previous question.

"7. If the hon. member would adjourn the question for a week, I will then furnish the information, as the officer supplying the information is not available this week."

LETTER FROM MR. H. C. SLEIGH TO PREMIER IN RE COLLINSVILLE COAL CONTRACT.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*) asked the Premier—

"1. On what date did he receive the letter from Mr. H. C. Sleigh relative to the unwarranted reflections cast upon that gentleman's business integrity by the Minister for Mines in connection with the agreement for the disposal of coal from the State coalmine, Collinsville?"

"2. Will he lay upon the table of the House a copy of the reply which he has forwarded to Mr. Sleigh in acknowledgment of the letter above referred to?"

"3. Does he propose to make any investigation along the lines suggested in Mr. Sleigh's letter?"

The PREMIER (Hon. A. E. Moore, *Aubigny*) replied—

"1. I am not aware of 'the unwarranted reflections' to which the hon. member refers. I have not questioned Mr. Sleigh's undoubted right as a business man to make the best deal possible for himself. I am concerned solely with the loss the State is sustaining as a result of the contract entered into in 1927 by the late Government, under which Mr. Sleigh was given the right to demand 500 tons of Bowen coal every twenty-four hours for a period of three years, without any obligation whatever on his part to take a single ounce of coal unless it suited his interests to purchase, the price agreed upon being approximately 2s. 6d. per ton under cost of production, and averaging 5s. per ton under the prices to all other purchasers.

"2 and 3. See answer to No. 1."

CLAIM OF THARGOMINDAH HOSPITAL COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRICK TREACEY.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrigo*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Respecting the complaint of Mr. Walter Williams, Government representative, on the Thargomindah Hospital Committee, will the Home Secretary cause a public inquiry into the truth of certain entries in the books of the Thargomindah Hospital with regard to one Patrick Treacey, and the claim of the hospital committee for £10 18s. for services rendered to Patrick Treacey?"

"2. Is he aware that certain dates, as I am informed, having been disproved in the inquiry by local justices into the plaint against Treacey, the court permitted the alteration of dates from October to November and December and entered a verdict against Treacey?"

"3. Will he make available the correspondence between the committee and the Department, which correspondence the Government representative, Mr. Walter Williams, has not been permitted to read?"

"4. Is it intended, because of Mr. Walter Williams's action in the matter, to remove him as Government representative on the committee?"

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

"1. Mr. Williams's complaint has been referred to the hospital committee for their representations.

"2. This statement has been made by Mr. Williams in his letter to the department.

"3. No.

"4. Mr. Williams was removed from the position of Government representative on the committee before the department had any knowledge of his complaint."

APPLICATION OF ALSATIAN SHEPHERD DOG ASSOCIATION FOR PERMIT FOR STREET COLLECTION.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*) asked the Premier—

"1. Did the Alsatian Shepherd Dog Association recently make application for a permit to take up street collections in order to raise funds to prosecute a campaign against the proposed sterilisation of the Alsatian dog?"

"2. Was the application refused?"

"3. If it was refused, upon what grounds was such refusal based?"

The PREMIER (Hon. A. E. Moore, *Aubigny*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes.

"3. At a recent conference of Ministers for Agriculture of all States the question of the Alsatian dog was considered, and it was unanimously agreed to recommend the prohibition of the importation of Alsatian dogs to Australia, and also the sterilisation of those already here. As this was an Australian decision, no good purpose would be served by allowing street collections for the furtherance of the proposed campaign."

## SUGGESTED LEGISLATION FOR STERILISATION OF ALSATIAN DOGS.

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

“1. Did all States subscribe to the decision to sterilise all Alsatian dogs at present in Australia?”

“2. Is it a fact that certain States, although originally agreeing to introduce legislation providing for sterilisation, have now renounced the agreement?”

“3. For what period has the Commonwealth Government prohibited the importation of Alsatian dogs?”

“4. When does he intend to introduce the necessary legislation to provide for the sterilisation of these dogs?”

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

“1. The Ministers for Agriculture assembled in conference in June last unanimously supported a resolution to the effect that all Alsatian dogs be sterilised.

“2. Intimation recently received by me from the States does not indicate any changed attitude towards this breed of dog.

“3. Five years.

“4. The intentions of the Government will be made known in due course. Much will depend upon the progress of business by the House.”

## REMOVAL OF MR. M. KELLY FROM ROCKHAMPTON HOSPITAL BOARD.

Mr. DUNLOP (*Rockhampton*) asked the Home Secretary—

“1. Will he please give a full explanation why Mr. Maurice Kelly was removed from the Rockhampton Hospital Board?”

“2. Is it his intention to also substitute another person for Mr. William Goss, senr., who was one of those members of the board whom it was intended to remove along with Mr. Maurice Kelly?”

“3. Will he be pleased to table all correspondence in connection with the removal of Mr. Maurice Kelly and proposed removal of Mr. William Goss, senr., from the Rockhampton Hospital Board?”

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

“1. See answer to Question 4, standing in the name of the hon. member for Herbert in Votes and Proceedings of the 22nd ultimo.

“2. This matter is not under consideration.

“3. No.”

## DEFICIT ON VICTORIAN RAILWAYS AND VICTORIAN EXPERTS ON RAILWAY BOARD OF INQUIRY.

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

“1. Is he aware that the annual report of the Victorian railways for year ended 30th June, 1929, discloses a general deficiency of a very considerable amount?”

“2. In view of this loss in a State so closely settled as Victoria, does he not consider that the two officials he has

imported from the Victorian railway service would be better occupied putting the affairs of their own railways in order?”

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

“1. The information is being prepared.

“2. See No. 1.”

## ALLEGED SLOWING DOWN OF RAILWAY DEVIATION BETWEEN EMERALD AND BOGANTUNGAN.

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

“1. Did he authorise the slowing down of the deviation between Emerald and Bogantungan by reducing the working days of the men engaged from five and a-half days a week to four days a week?”

“2. Is he aware of the state of the line between these two stations, and is he aware that some engine-drivers have refused to take trains over this section on account of its dangerous condition?”

“3. Will he hold himself criminally liable for any disaster which may occur as a result of this disgraceful delay?”

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

“1. Yes. In order to avoid dispensing with their services altogether in consequence of the limited loan funds available. In similar circumstances in 1920 the late Government closed the work altogether, and, regardless of their welfare, dispensed with the services of 130 men.

“2. The line from Emerald to Bogantungan is in a safe condition for traffic. There has been no refusal of drivers to take trains over the section. However, if the line is in a dangerous condition, as stated by the hon. member, only the late Government is to blame.

“3. See No. 2.”

## DISMISSALS AND ENGAGEMENTS BY RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Railways if he has an answer to the following questions which I addressed to him on 27th August:—

“1. How many men were dismissed by the Railway Department between 20th May, 1929, and 31st July, 1929—(a) from construction works; (b) from other loan funds work; (c) from Consolidated Revenue Fund employment?”

“2. How many employees were engaged by the Railway Department for the period stated under the respective headings mentioned?”

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

“1. (a) 352; (b) 819; (c) 432.

“2. (a) 67; (b) 500; (c) 251.

“1. (a) 145 men left of their own accord; the remainder were discharged, principally in consequence of the work on South Brisbane-Kyogle line, Mount Isa Railway, and Many Peaks-Monto extension nearing completion and completion of Longreach-Winton line.

“1. (b) Accounted for by the partial completion of Roma Street-Mayne rearrangement work, completion of special works authorised in the Central

and Northern Divisions prior to the elections, and various other loan works. Forty-three men left on their own account.

"1. (c) Principally accounted for by ballasting, resleepering, and other special revenue works being completed and by temporary men specially engaged to relieve fettlers, &c., during annual, extended, and sick leave being paid off when the permanent men resumed duty.

"NOTE.—The average number of employees during the ten (10) weeks after the elections to 31st July on construction works, regrading, &c., was 2,163, as compared with 2,027 during the same period prior to the elections. Therefore the present Government actually employed more men after the recent elections than the Labour Government employed before the elections."

#### RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. GRIMSTONE (*Stanley*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Railways if he has an answer to the following questions which I addressed to him on 27th August:—

"1. What was the number of revenue employees of the Railway Department on 30th June of the election year 1926?"

"2. What was the number on 30th June, 1927?"

"3. How many were retrenched following the general elections of 1926?"

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

"1. 22,036.

"2. 19,670.

"3. During the financial year subsequent to the 1926 general elections, whilst the Labour Government was in power, the staff was reduced by 2,366 employees."

#### HOSPITAL DISTRICTS AND HOSPITAL RATES.

##### 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 28th August last, on the motion of Mr. Winstanley, showing—

1. The number of hospital districts that have been formed in Queensland.
2. The number of hospitals in each district respectively.
3. The number of hospitals that are still outside the said districts.
4. The rate which the local authorities have struck in each district.
5. The total amount collected.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*): I desire to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the Speakership of this House. After your long experience in Parliament, I think you are well fitted for that position, and it must have been pleasing to you, as well as to hon. members on this side of the House, that you were elected to your high position without opposi-

tion. I am sure that you will carry out your duties with credit to yourself, and, as you said when thanking members for your election, with common sense.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion under discussion at the present time. They both made very able speeches, and I am sure they will be a great acquisition to the debating strength on this side of the House.

I am also pleased to have the opportunity of speaking in this Assembly from the Government side of the House. I had nine years in opposition, and when you are addressing the Chamber it is pleasing to feel that you have some power behind you, as is the case at the present time with the large increase in the number of members supporting the Premier, Mr. Moore. When we were in opposition, the Labour Government were great advocates of perpetual leasehold. Perpetual leasehold was their policy, and I can assure them that they are going to have a perpetual leasehold so far as the Opposition benches are concerned. (Government laughter.) I am also inclined to think that the Leader of the Opposition, from what I know of him, will make a better Leader of the Opposition than he did a Minister of the Crown. There is not the slightest doubt that Labour in Queensland has "shot its bolt." We have had to be content with Labour rule since 1915, but at last the people have given a verdict showing that the Labour Party in Queensland are utterly incompetent to govern this State. In taking over the control of affairs in this State we have taken on very great responsibility, and we shall have to face the position. After fourteen years of Labour in power with the incompetents that were then on the Government side, it will take some time for members on this side to straighten things out, although they are well endowed with business ability; but I venture to say that after we have been here for three years and ask the people for a renewal of their confidence, the position will not be altered, and we shall remain in possession of these benches. The question is: Why did we come back to this House with such a large majority? The respective policies that were enunciated by the leaders of the two parties answer that question absolutely. It was surprising to find that not one member on the opposite side of the House mentioned the objective of the Labour Party during the election campaign. They know to-day that their objective is unpopular; but they are forced to adhere to that objective, because their rulers at the various Labour conventions have reaffirmed it; therefore they must abide by the will of their masters who attend those conventions. I think the Opposition will find that we are going to mete out fairer treatment to them than we experienced from them when we were in opposition. We had to contend with the stifling of discussion and other disabilities that were not in the interests of the people.

Mr. COLLINS: We never moved "That the question be now put" on the discussion on the Address in Reply.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CLAYTON: The question arises as to how Labour held office for the lengthened term that it did. I think I shall be able to show the reason why, if I review the position of affairs with regard to this Parliament during the last fourteen years. Let us take our minds back to 1920, when the Country

[*Mr. Clayton.*]

Party came into being. After we had been in the House a very short time we had a Government in power with a majority of one. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that the first session we met here, in order to carry on with a majority of one, Mr. Theodore used the "gag" 121 times, and thus stifled discussion on matters of importance. Mr. Theodore complained bitterly yesterday when Mr. Bruce used the "gag" in the Federal Parliament; but we were fortunate in having there Mr. Corser, the Federal member for Wide Bay, who had had experience of Mr. Theodore in this Chamber, and he exposed Mr. Theodore's tactics. In 1921, when the Government were faced with the prospect of having to go to the country, we, as an Opposition, had to contend with the introduction of what was known as the proxy voting system, and we had Mr. Theodore, the Premier at that time, giving his vote on the floor of the House, and pulling proxy votes out of his pockets and recording them in addition to his own. Then fearing that at the forthcoming election in 1923 they would be defeated on that appeal to the country, what did they do? They abolished four Country Party seats, and placed men in employment in various parts of the State so as to secure the return of their party at that election. They were successful; but it was not British justice. When they saw the 1926 election looming in the distance, and realised that the people of Queensland were getting tired of them, and that their position was becoming worse, in the financial year 1925-26 they increased the expenditure from loan, trust, and revenue funds to the extent of £3,020,000.

Mr. BRUCE interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BRUCE again interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member for Kennedy persists in his interjections, I shall certainly have to take some other course of action.

Mr. CLAYTON: They increased their expenditure from loan, trust, and revenue funds by £3,020,000. Then, fearing defeat owing to the expenditure of so much loan money, although the number of employes in all departments on 30th June, 1925, was 35,011, on 30th June, 1926, for electioneering purposes, they increased the number of employes in all departments to 42,616.

So far as the railways in particular are concerned, the figures show that in 1925 the number of employes was 18,372; in 1926 the Government increased the number to 22,056; and in 1927, after the election, the number was reduced to 19,670. In other words, before the election they put on 3,664 extra men, and dismissed 2,366 after it. We hear a lot nowadays about unemployment; but history proves that the late Government, unfortunately, used the workers of the State for political purposes in order to secure their return to office. On this occasion the position has altered, and, although hon. members opposite tried to put their house in order, the verdict of the people was such that they are now on the Opposition benches. I consider that it is unjust and unfair for any party to adopt bushranging tactics in order to secure its return to power.

Mr. HYNES (*Townsville*): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. mem-

ber in order in making the statement that this party used bushranging tactics?

The SPEAKER: The expression is unparliamentary, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. CLAYTON: I might say that I did not say that any party in particular had adopted such tactics.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. CLAYTON: I withdraw. The people showed their utter disapproval of the methods adopted by the party opposite, and in 1929 this party was returned with a very fine majority.

However, let us trace the history of the Labour Party. In 1915 their battle cry was that finance was the test of good government. That was what Mr. Theodore and Mr. McCormack said was the test when they went before the people in that year. How do they stand judged by that test? From 1915 to 30th June, 1928, they actually doubled their public debt, and increased the interest bill from £1,970,581 to £5,079,570. Those figures show whether, judged by that test, they were a good Government or not. Another battle cry at the 1915 election was "Borrow, boom, and burst!" Well, I have shown, by quoting the increase in our national debt, that the party opposite borrowed more money than any other Government in Queensland had ever done, and they out-boomed and out-burst any previous Administration. The result is that to-day we find those hon. members on the Opposition side of the Chamber—these so-called Labour men—and it is pleasing to note that those benches are not over-crowded.

Mr. COLLINS: What do you intend to do about borrowing? The investors won't trust you.

Mr. CLAYTON: The investors would not trust the hon. member's Government, so I throw that back in his teeth. If we cannot borrow, it is because of the conditions brought about by Labour legislation and administration. The Labour Party's policy originally was to borrow only for reproductive works; but, as I proceed, I shall show what they did with the money they borrowed.

[3 p.m.]

This statement appears in the policy speech delivered by Mr. Theodore in 1920—

"Without venturing an opinion as to the wisdom or unwisdom of borrowing as applied to those States and countries whose resources are more fully developed than our own, I have no hesitation in affirming the belief that in Queensland a prudent expenditure of public loan money is not only advantageous but unavoidable if we are to make the progress that we should make in the development of our country."

I should like the hon. member for Bowen to note the following remarks.

Mr. COLLINS: I am listening to you very attentively.

Mr. CLAYTON: I ask the hon. member to pay particular attention to these remarks—

"Further, the nature of the outlook and the character of our investments are such as to enable us to engage in this policy with perfect safety to our financial prospects and without passing on undue burdens to posterity."

*Mr. Clayton.]*

The ex-Premier, now the hon. member for Cairns, after being associated with Mr. Theodore from 1915 until a few years back, most of the time as a Cabinet Minister, stayed in Rockhampton in 1927—

“He knew it was inevitable that, if Queensland went on spending large sums of money on non-productive works, the people of this State would suffer in a few years’ time. He allowed the whole responsibility to fall upon himself, but the position had to be faced sooner or later.”

There you have the statement of the ex-Premier, the hon. member for Cairns, in direct contrast to the forecast of Mr. Theodore in 1920. Mr. Theodore eventually saw the inevitable result in this State, and turned his back on it in order to enter the Federal arena. Now we have the hon. member for Cairns with his back turned on Queensland—at least, for the time being. Both those prominent members of the political Labour Party have found it necessary hurriedly to turn their backs on the desolation wrought by their legislation. The present Government must now face the unenviable task of cleaning up the mess that has been created by the Labour Party as the result of fourteen years of administration in Queensland. I know that the problem before this Government is a difficult one.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. Theodore will find it necessary to clean up the destruction of the Bruce-Page Government.

Mr. MAXWELL: He will not have the chance.

Mr. CLAYTON: The experience of hon. members on this side will stand us in good stead in our gigantic task of placing the State on the high road to prosperity. Much criticism has been levelled by hon. members opposite against the Governor’s Speech; but, without indulging in detail, I should point out that it was not a window-dressing speech, but one framed by men conscious of the important responsibilities imposed upon them in the conduct of affairs in this State. Hon. members opposite have scornfully referred to the fact that twenty-two amending Bills are outlined in the sessional programme. That is quite true; but I would remind them that in 1927, when they were in power, the Governor’s Speech contained eleven amending Bills, and in 1928 the number had jumped to twenty-two out of a total of twenty-three mentioned in the Governor’s Speech. The Labour Government found it necessary to amend their own legislation, because of their own stupidity in preventing hon. members who were then in opposition from making sound suggestions based upon actual experience. It has been found necessary to include twenty-two amending Bills in the sessional programme to fulfil our promise to the people when we went to the country and informed them that, if this party were returned to power, we would repeal all the legislation that was having a harassing effect on production and upon Queensland generally. We are keeping faith with the people by amending irksome legislation in the directions desired, and by removing from the statute-book those enactments that have been found to be impracticable.

For instance, we are going to deal with the Water Act, the Hospitals Act—this is simply a class tax on the man on the land—

[Mr. Clayton.

and the Elections Act. If we bring about uniformity in the Federal and State rolls, we shall save a considerable amount of money.

Hon. members know that the Federal Treasurer, Dr. Earle Page, set to work in the direction of having one collecting authority for land and income tax; and we all know what a great amount of money has been saved by the adoption of that policy in Queensland. If we can provide one electoral authority for the Federal and State rolls, we shall save an additional sum of money. Then there is the Main Roads Act, which requires amending, and also the Land Act, as well as the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act. This party is fully conversant with the conditions to be faced. Those conditions are difficult, but, notwithstanding the difficulty we find the State in as a result of Labour rule, our experience gives every confidence that the position of Queensland will improve.

Mr. COLLINS: You have had no experience at all.

Mr. CLAYTON: I admit we have not had much experience on the Government benches; but the people of Queensland had a great deal of experience as a result of the Labour Party controlling the Government benches—so much so that they showed their disapproval in no uncertain voice on 11th May last.

A lot has been said about unemployment; but much of the unemployment existing in Queensland to-day is a direct result of the socialistic experimental legislation of the late Government. That experimental legislation has also been the cause of reckless expenditure of loan money. Loan money was expended by men who, through lack of experience and ability, were not competent to expend it wisely. Unemployment has also been caused by the interference of the late Government with private enterprise. By harassing restrictions the late Government prevented capital from being invested in the State. We all regret that for some time past capital has not been invested in Queensland to the extent that we would like. We believe that the removal of those harassing restrictions on the private individual will see a fresh investment of capital in enterprises and industries which will assist to a great extent in alleviating the unfortunate position now existing with respect to unemployment. As our Leader stated during the elections, the Government will make money available for the relief of unemployment. We shall stand up to the pledges we gave at that time.

Mr. FOLEY: In the meantime what are the unemployed going to do?

Mr. CLAYTON: The Government would not require to do very much if they did not do more than the hon. member and his party did while they were in office, or than he is doing now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CLAYTON: Labour assured the electors that, when it came into power in this State, every man would be found work. We all remember the statement made by the hon. member for Paddington, then Secretary for Mines, to the effect that not one man would be out of work in Queensland within a month of the elections. We also remember the statement of the hon. member for

Flinders, the then Attorney-General, that one unemployed man in a community was a disgrace, but two was a disaster. In the face of such statements, it is a very strange commentary that for the twelve months ended 31st August, 1929, the sum of £411,169 should have been spent in Queensland from the Unemployment Insurance Fund. We should all be sorry that the expenditure of that money was necessary, but the expenditure by the late Government of loan money on non-reproductive works, and their actions in stifling enterprise, could produce no other result. One result of that policy has been that men have been leaving the land and drifting into the cities. If we can restore confidence by the introduction of liberal land laws, we shall go a long way towards relieving the present position of the labour market by creating further land settlement and increasing production.

The Labour Government also favoured the making of a rural workers' award; but I am pleased to say that the suspension of that award by the Government has been the means of relieving unemployment to a very great extent. To my own knowledge, many men have received employment and are much happier at work in the country than they were when doing casual work in the town and having to seek unemployment relief.

Speaking with reference to unemployment, the ex-Premier had this to say at Cairns during the last election campaign—

"It was no use their blaming or charging Governments for such things unless they were prepared to get at the cause of their troubles. If they bought and used articles made by their own people in their own country, they would do more to solve the problems of unemployment and dislocated trade balances than all the newspaper articles or criticisms ever written."

But the hon. gentleman did not tell the people of Queensland that his Government were responsible for letting a contract to an English firm for the construction of twenty-five locomotives, costing £200,000.

Mr. JONES: You know the reason for that.

Mr. CLAYTON: The reason was the incompetence and lack of foresight displayed by the hon. member's Government.

Mr. JONES: They were British engines, anyhow.

Mr. CLAYTON: Undoubtedly; but as we had a Queensland firm, Walkers Limited, employing good Queenslanders, I think we might very well have given them the work, particularly as in that year there were 251 families in Maryborough in receipt of Government relief.

Mr. JONES: You know the reason for that contract.

Mr. CLAYTON: I know that, when tenders were invited, the price submitted by Walkers Ltd. was equal to that quoted by Messrs. Whitworth, Armstrong, and Co., Ltd.; but the trouble, it was stated, was that Walkers Ltd. wanted seventy-two weeks in which to construct the locomotives, whereas the English firm contracted to land them in Brisbane in thirty-six weeks. We know, however, that not one locomotive arrived from England until fifty-two weeks after the contract had been let, which goes to show

that Walkers Ltd. might have been given at least portion of the contract. That would have relieved the unemployment then prevailing, and decreased the expenditure on rations which necessarily was involved.

At the commencement of my remarks I stated that money had been squandered in ventures that were not of a reproductive character. I refer particularly to the State enterprises created by the Labour Government, about which they had much to say in their pamphlet, "Socialism at Work"—a pamphlet which I would suggest new hon. members to this House might obtain from the Chief Secretary's Department and read with interest. Let me point out, however, that the State enterprises were responsible for a loss of £2,041,000 for the year 1928; the uncharged interest amounted to £577,000; and the total indebtedness to the Treasury was £4,073,737.

A great deal of that expenditure of loan money will never be recovered, because a lot of it has been put into industries that have been abandoned. This is the sort of thing that brought Queensland to the unfortunate position she was in when Labour went out of office.

I would like to read a list of some of the abandoned industries in which the Labour Government spent loan money, and on which, unfortunately, we are called upon to pay interest to-day. Take coalmines: The loss on Baralaba was £57,170.

Mr. JONES: Who supplied you with those figures?

Mr. CLAYTON: If the hon. member wants the exact figures, I will turn them up for him in the Auditor-General's report. The loss on Styx No. 2 was £71,492; and the loss on the Warra coalmine was £38,659. These losses in connection with coalmines are absolutely unrecoverable. Now, take the Jibbenbar arsenic mine. This was the mine that was going to do away with the importation of arsenic. The late Secretary for Mines, in his optimistic way, said that we would be able to supply arsenic for the destruction of prickly-pear.

Mr. JONES: So we did.

Mr. CLAYTON: He did, but he is not doing it now. Arsenic was to be supplied for the destruction of prickly-pear, and cattlemen also were going to get a supply of cheap arsenic. That mine is abandoned to-day, and the loss on the enterprise was £62,786. That is absolutely gone. Another project that they brought forward was iron and steel works. The hon. member for Bowen was going to have these works established at Bowen, and they were going to put Bowen on the map, as the hon. member said on more than one occasion. The loss on the iron and steel project was £16,108. Then they were going to see that we had cheap fish for breakfast. They purchased a trawler, and they employed men to catch fish. I do not know where the trawler is to-day, but I know that the fish are in the sea, and the loss in that connection was £35,000.

Then there was a further loss on the "Douglas Mawson." The experience we have had in regard to State enterprises has been such that the Government now in power should not further engage in Government trading. They should confine themselves to the work of governing the State, and allow

*Mr. Clayton.]*

the trading to be done by private enterprise or by co-operative enterprise.

Mr. PEASE: What are you doing for the unemployed?

Mr. CLAYTON: I have told hon. members what we are going to do for the unemployed. To a great extent, Queensland is a primary producing State, and it is necessary that we should devote more attention to agriculture. It is very pleasing to know that we have in charge of the Department of Agriculture a man who has had a long practical experience in agriculture, and a man who has a long parliamentary experience. In the present Minister we have a man who will be sympathetic to the primary producer.

Mr. COLLINS: He should have been in charge of the Mines Department instead of the Department of Agriculture, and then you would not have got into the present mess.

Mr. CLAYTON: The hon. member for Bowen led a Government for two minutes on one occasion, and now he wants to dictate to this party; but I for one am not going to stand it. (Laughter.) It will be our endeavour to introduce the most liberal laws in regard to land settlement in order to assist agriculture as far as we possibly can.

We are restricted now with regard to the expenditure of loan money, but for every £1,000,000 we can get the people of Queensland to produce from the soil, one-third will go to the producers and the other two-thirds will be distributed amongst the community. This wealth will be produced from the soil and will be distributed, and it is wealth we shall not have to pay interest upon, and it will indirectly bring much revenue to Queensland.

It is necessary that we should apply science to agriculture. Where we have adopted scientific methods in regard to agriculture we have progressed. Scientific methods have been introduced in the dairying and sugar industries with the utmost success, and I am sure that the Secretary for Agriculture will give every assistance in that direction. It is all very well to advocate production, but, after we have produced, it is also necessary to turn our attention to the marketing of our products. Organised marketing will be in the interests of land settlement in Queensland. We have had legislation introduced by the late Government in connection with marketing, and that legislation has been beneficial to Queensland. I might say further from a full knowledge of land settlement and production that, when we were in opposition, we were able very materially to improve the Bills which came before the House. The late Mr. Gillies introduced some years ago the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill. We were successful in getting nineteen amendments inserted to make the measure more workable than it would have been in its original form. We intend to go on with the organisation of marketing, but with this difference: The previous Government introduced marketing legislation, and no doubt the farmer got a little more in his pocket from it, but what went into one pocket was taken out of the other pocket by increased taxation and harassing restrictions.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. CLAYTON: It is right; and I think the people agree with my contention in view

[Mr. Clayton.

of the defeated members of the Labour Party who contested agricultural electorates at the last election. We have sixteen farmers in our party, and on any matter concerning agriculture we shall be able to speak with some voice. I do not think that there is a farmer on the other side, unless it is the man that farms the worker.

We are going to introduce legislation with regard to land settlement which will be of material assistance to the man who is going upon the land. We shall remove many of the harassing restrictions which have been placed on land settlers. For instance, the late Government introduced the Palmerston Land Settlement Bill, under which the Minister took power to call upon a man to cultivate a certain area, and he could define the position of the land that had to be placed under cultivation. Restrictions of that character, I contend, are harassing restrictions. We are going to allow the man on the land to convert his leasehold into a freehold tenure.

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

Mr. KIRWAN (Brisbane): Before I proceed to address myself to the subject-matter of the motion, I desire to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, upon having attained such a high and honourable position—the highest within the gift of this House. It will be generally admitted that, while you occupied a seat on the floor, you fought fairly. Let us hope and trust that the same qualities will characterise your rulings and general control of this House.

It was not my good fortune or privilege to hear either the mover or the seconder of the Address in Reply, and I also missed several of the other speeches. However, I have read the speech of the hon. member for Bulimba, and I congratulate her upon it. I do not know that in saying that hers was a more excellent address than many which have been delivered from the Government benches I should be paying that lady a very high compliment; but there is no question that she outshone a large number of her colleagues.

Now I want to make reference to the change that has come over this House. We find ourselves occupying the Opposition benches. I find myself practically in the same position that I occupied when I arrived here in 1912.

Mr. JONES: Only for three years.

Mr. KIRWAN: Somebody says it is only for three years. I am not going to indulge in prophecy, because I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. (Laughter.)

I think at this point I might be permitted to make some reference to the passing of the late member for Albert, the late Hon. J. G. Appel. He occupied a seat in this House for a number of years. He was likewise a member of several Governments, and, as one who had something to do with the strenuous days from 1912 to 1914, I think I can say that, although that gentleman fought very determinedly and strongly on the floor of the House, it could never be said against him that he carried any feeling outside that bar regarding any member who criticised his actions as member or Minister.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: I think it will be admitted by all who were privileged to know him that

he was most kindly disposed, and in his administration of the Home Department the late Hon. J. G. Appel did many a kindly act that brought sunshine and happiness into many a home. I conclude my reference to that gentleman in the words of the poet—

“But O! for the touch of a vanish'd hand,

And the sound of a voice that is still!”

I want to make reference to another gentleman who also has passed away—one who was a member of this House at one time, and who occupied a seat in the Legislative Council for a number of years. I refer to the late Frank McDonnell. I speak of him because, as one who has been associated with the Labour movement for a lifetime, I can well recall his agitation in the early days for a Factories and Shops Act.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: And I want to say here that, whilst I do not want to detract from the credit that is due to other men in connection with the passage of that piece of legislation, invaluable assistance was rendered to him by the late J. J. Knight, who at that time was a struggling journalist on the “Evening Observer.” Although a young man at that time, I read, with many other Labourites, Mr. Knight's splendid notes on “Labour” which appeared in the Saturday edition of that journal. Mr. Knight, to his credit be it said, was a strong advocate of the principles that Mr. McDonnell enunciated. Mr. McDonnell had something of the missionary's zeal about him. He had a definite purpose and object in life, and the shop assistants of Queensland owe a deep debt of gratitude to him for the work he did. Those of them who know the early struggles of the Labour movement know that to a very large extent the high standards of living and the conditions which they are privileged to-day to enjoy were due to the tireless energy and agitation of the late Frank McDonnell.

The speeches from the Government side to which I have listened, and those which I have read—if I possibly except that of the hon. member for Bulimba—would make it appear that the Labour Government were still in power.

[3.30 p.m.]

Every speech delivered by hon. members opposite, whether by the learned Attorney-General, by the Secretary for Mines, or by any member of the rank and file, has been nothing more than a rehash of the speeches delivered by them during the election campaign. I can visualise the hon. member for Wide Bay delivering at Tinana during the election campaign the speech that he has just delivered in this Chamber.

Mr. BRAND: Do you remember the speech you delivered in Maryborough?

Mr. KIRWAN: The same remarks apply to the speeches delivered by the other hon. members in the different electorates. Evidently hon. members opposite do not realise that they are the Government in this State. They should realise that the Labour Party, whether for good or for evil, is now on the Opposition benches. When the Labour Party controlled the affairs of this State, and I as Minister or any other Minister of the late Administration sought advice or suggestions from the then Opposition, our invitations were dismissed with a wave of the hand and the remark, “Wait until we

are called in; we shall then prescribe.” Those same hon. members now constitute the Government of the State, and it is their duty to formulate their own policy. The people have passed judgment on the utterances of hon. members opposite, the remarks by the hon. member for Wide Bay being a fair sample. They are now in charge of the Government, and we are in the cold shades of opposition. When reading “Hansard,” I noticed that the hon. member for Enoggera referred to hon. members on this side as “soapbox orators.” That is the old, old story. I can well remember that epithet being hurled at us when I was a mere youth, and speakers took up their positions at street corners and preached the gospel of Labour. I did a bit of that myself. I can recall learning the art of public speaking at the “Courier” corner on Friday nights, in Market Square on Saturday nights, and from Smellie's corner, addressing the people who were going to the Botanical Gardens on Sunday afternoons. I am not ashamed of being referred to as a “soapbox orator.” I quite realise the educational advantages and facilities that were enjoyed by hon. members opposite in the days of my youth in comparison with the circumstances confronting myself and others. I well recollect the conditions that governed the boys and girls in my time. At any rate, I have done my best; and I am conscious of my limitations. “Soapbox orator” as I may be, I was always prepared frankly to state my views to any gathering that I addressed, and to permit them to pass judgment upon me in comparison with gentlemen who occupy the front Treasury bench to-day.

During the course of her speech, the hon. member for Bulimba asserted that Labour could not lay claim to many of the social reforms introduced into this State. Generally speaking, whether in Australia or in any other part of the British Empire, social reforms have been placed upon the Statute-book in a large measure following upon the advocacy of Labour. I desire to quote the remarks of one of the greatest men of his time—one of the most distinguished statesmen of the last century—a man of great intellectual gifts and attainments. I refer to the late Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. After having devoted a lifetime to the service of his country and of his party, he said—

“I painfully reflect that in almost every political controversy of the last fifty years the leisured classes, the educated classes, the titled classes, have been in the wrong. The common people—the toilers, the men of uncommon sense—these have been responsible for nearly all of the social reform measures which the world accepts to-day.”

Mr. KEES: Did your party bring in their promised widows and orphans' pensions and childhood endowment?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KIRWAN: The speeches of hon. members opposite have been merely a rehash of their speeches during the late election. They are incapable of constructive speech, and are merely acting now like a nest of magpies, reiterating their electioneering utterances. (Government interjections.) I heard the Attorney-General interject. Speaking on the floor of this Assembly the other night, and in reply to an allegation that on one occasion he had made an attempt to link

*Mr. Kirwan.]*

up with the Labour Party, he was emphatic in his denial, which we accept; and he then went on by way of justifying the truth of his statement, and stated that prior to the last election, when he was waited on by a representative gathering of electors of South Brisbane, who asked him to allow his name to go to a plebiscite, he had not worried very much about politics, nor had he taken much interest in them. That statement was certainly borne out by his speech. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to throw some discredit on the late Administration because of the manner in which they had dealt with the electoral boundaries which, as hon. members are aware, were fixed during our term of office by a commission. Speaking in reference to my own electorate, the hon. gentleman is reported on page 179 of "Hansard" to have said—

"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 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 admit that the last redistribution of seats was not in accordance with equity."

Strange to say, in the redistribution to which the Attorney-General referred my electorate was one of the very few electorates which were not affected by an alteration of the boundaries, so that the alleged anomaly he spoke of and attempted to ridicule was the result of an action of the Denham-Barnes Administration. However, I would inform the hon. gentleman that his statement in regard to the boundaries of the Paddington and Brisbane electorates is not correct, because a section of Wickham terrace is included in the Brisbane electorate.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I was talking about that part of Wickham terrace which ought to be in the Brisbane electorate.

Mr. KIRWAN: That was an act of an Administration holding similar political views to the hon. gentleman—namely, the Denham Government.

The Secretary for Mines made a remarkable speech. I listened very attentively to it. In fact, he did not make a speech—he read one. On that occasion I was reminded of a well-known character in Dickens.

Mr. KELSO: What character is that?

Mr. KIRWAN: I was not aware that the hon. member was so dense that he was unable to place the character. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: I want to see if you know.

The SPEAKER: Order!

[Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. KIRWAN: The present Administration seem to be extremely happy. They seem to be imbued with the idea that there is no danger for the next eight or ten years in regard to their occupancy of the Treasury benches, and, therefore, they are prepared to treat the Opposition generally with contempt.

When I became a member of this House in 1912, the occupants of the front Government bench were men of some intellectual attainment, and possessed a considerable amount of administrative ability—men of the type of Mr. Denham, the present Treasurer, the present Chief Justice, Mr. Paget, the late Hon. J. G. Appel, and other hon. gentlemen. Those gentlemen were flushed with victory after the 1912 election, when they inflicted what they regarded as a crushing defeat on the Labour Party, and when several Labour members were defeated. But before the close of that Parliament I saw a "round robin" being publicly hawked round this building having for its object the deposition of the then Leader of the Government. So we are not in such a hopeless position after all!

The TREASURER: Courage, brother! (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: What are you crying about?

Mr. KIRWAN: To suggest that I am crying is to indicate that the hon. gentleman who has interjected has no appreciation of my genial temperament. We shall see where the Government will be before three years have elapsed.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: What about the Bruce-Page Government?

Mr. KIRWAN: Yes, that great Government, led by statesmen, and returned to power in November last, is now smashed!

Mr. HYNES: That will be the fate of the present Government if they tamper with the Board of Trade and Arbitration here.

Mr. KIRWAN: Let me proceed with my remarks. We have heard hon. members on the other side defame this State. I say that definitely and directly, because they have declared not only in this House but on every platform from which they have spoken that, as the result of Labour administration, Queensland has reached the worst position in its history. Everyone knows that statement to be inaccurate and untrue. If Queensland had recently experienced a financial crisis similar to that of 1893, or was faced with conditions that existed from 1901 until 1905, then hon. gentlemen opposite might be able to point with some degree of truth to the awful condition to which they say the State has been reduced by Labour administration and legislation. But, as you, Mr. Speaker, are well aware from your intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Royal National Agricultural Association, during the Labour regime the association has been able to make more extensive improvements to the Exhibition ground than at any time in its previous history. You know, too, that the recent Show was a huge success, the attendances constituting a record, and falling short of the attendance at the last Sydney Show by only 20,000. Hon. members opposite who have been privileged to open country shows are unanimous in their opinions that records have recently been created, yet they persist in defaming the State and saying that it has been absolutely

ruined as the result of Labour legislation. May I quote from the "Patriot" of 18th August last—and I do not suppose a more pronounced anti-Labour journal is published in Queensland—

"IT WAS A GREAT WLEK.

"Records were broken everywhere during the week, particularly in the Show attendances, which only fell short of Sydney's great crowds by 20,000. The dance halls registered a record also. The two all-night balls were crowded, and the amount of drink consumed was easily a record. We haven't the figures of the amounts spent in dinners and wines at the hotels—if we had we'd be giving up the newspaper business."

Now, with regard to the question of unemployment. During the election campaign hon. members on the Government side stated that they had two proposals. The first proposal was to raise a sum of £1,800,000, and the second proposal was the well-known advertisement in regard to the raising of £2,000,000. In dealing with the question of unemployed, I may be permitted to quote what one of the leading Sydney journals had to say on the question. The "Daily Telegraph Pictorial" said—

"Unemployment was a dominant issue of the Queensland poll, just as it overshadows every other question before the British electors. Mr. Moore made a bold tactical move when he outbid his opponents by offering to spend £2,000,000 of borrowed money in providing work for the unemployed. The economic soundness of such a policy may be open to doubt, but it brought thousands of voters into the Nationalist camp."

Now let us look at the first proposal—to raise £1,800,000. The first suggestion in connection with this project was from the hon. member for Kurilpa, who, speaking at the School of Arts in his own electorate, as reported in the "Daily Mail" of 24th April last, had this to say—

"The National Party, on the other hand, had a scheme which would relieve unemployment by the creation of a special work fund of £1,800,000, to which members of Parliament would also contribute by the reduction of their salaries. The fund, capitalised, would give immediate employment for one year to 10,000 persons, for six months to 20,000, and for three months to 40,000."

Then the Attorney-General, speaking at Highgate Hill, as reported in the "Telegraph" of 1st May, 1929, said—

"For the unemployed the Government had not done things in the right way. The Country and Progressive National Party had propounded a scheme whereby on being returned to power it would find work for 10,000 men in the space of a few months. Its policy, too, would ensure the revival of secondary industries."

The Secretary for Public Instruction, who was then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, speaking at the corner of Juliette street and Emperor street, Thompson Estate, as reported in the "Telegraph" of 2nd May, 1929, said—

"As a further step towards relieving unemployment, the party proposed to reduce the members' salaries by £250 a

year, and the surplus thus obtained would pay the interest on a loan of £300,000, which would be added to a similar amount procured from the Unemployment Insurance Fund. Local authorities would then be approached to allocate certain work within their particular areas which could be carried out, but which would not have been done under ordinary circumstances. They would be asked to pay two-thirds of the cost of the work, while the Government would provide the additional third. By this means work to the extent of £1,800,000 could immediately be carried out, which would provide employment for 10,000 men for at least twelve months."

The "Daily Mail" evidently thought that the position had not been put sufficiently clearly by gentlemen who spoke on the opposition platforms, and they thought it necessary to write a leading article on the question, which was entitled "Doles or Work." This article, which appeared on 7th April last, had this to say—

"Mr. Moore proposes to use £300,000 of the Unemployment Insurance Fund as an employment assurance fund. There will still be a balance for sustenance payments, but the objective will be to give work wherever possible instead of a dole. It is also one of the planks of the Country and Progressive National Party's platform to reduce the salaries of members of Parliament to what they were in 1925. This will mean a saving of £18,000 a year in the cost of Parliament, enabling the State to make available another capital sum of £300,000 for providing employment without making any addition to the present Governmental expenditure. By further administrative economies Mr. Moore is confident that he could make available a Government subsidy of £100,000 for increasing employment. Thus he would have an employment assurance fund of £700,000 with which it is intended to help local authorities to advance public works whereby local unemployed may be absorbed. Subsidising approved schemes at the rate of £1 for every £2 paid in wages by local authorities, the Government would have means to assist an expenditure up to £2,000,000 on public works widely distributed throughout the State and under local control."

That was the first proposal, but evidently it did not "catch on" well enough, and we found a very fine advertisement appearing in the daily papers "Is it a job?" etc.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Put it in "Hansard."

Mr. KIRWAN: I was going to ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to have it photographed by Mr. Mobsby of the Department of Agriculture, and reduced to a plate which could be put in "Hansard," because a photograph of that kind will become historic in years to come. I understand that at one period in this House there was a sheep's head over the Speaker's chair, but I think a photograph of this advertisement would be much better. I make the suggestion to you, Mr. Speaker, that it might be suitably framed and hung up in the Chamber, if you are agreeable. There we have the present Government

Mr. Kirwan.]

exploiting the privations, the sufferings, the miseries, and the worries of the unemployed.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What is wrong with it?

Mr. KIRWAN: Everything is wrong with it, because hon. members opposite now say that they cannot get the £2,000,000. In fact, I think the Premier made a speech at Goombeunge Show the other day in which he said that he was not going to carry out certain promises because he had nothing to do with them. It is freely rumoured, as the Treasurer would say, in that characteristic manner of his. It is reported in certain quarters that the Premier knew nothing about the £2,000,000 until he saw it in the press. What is the first reference made to that? I find that the hon. member for Maree was the first to refer to it. Speaking in support of Mr. Shaw at Ithaca Hall, Red Hill, as reported in the "Telegraph," on 3rd May, 1929, he said—

"It was the intention of the Country and Progressive National Party to borrow £2,000,000 for the immediate relief—"

the word "immediate" occurs in all those statements—

"of unemployment in Queensland. This was not a statement 'off his own bat,' but would be made by Mr. Moore before polling day."

The Premier, in a statement reported in the "Daily Mail" of 9th May, 1929, two days before the poll, said—

"I have been criticised in some quarters for pledging myself to make available £2,000,000 at the earliest possible moment for the relief of the unemployed workers and their families. I have explained my plan in full in the public press, and it certainly does not involve the borrowing of this amount or any intention of continuing the financial 'jazz' of the present administration. At any rate, I make no apology. I regard it as the sacred duty of any Government in times of emergency to resort even to expediency to lessen widespread distress. I am well aware that my proposal is merely a palliative, and that many vital changes must be made before the root causes of our present troubles will be removed. I believe they can be removed."

The Government cannot get away from the fact that thousands of workers throughout the length and breadth of Queensland and their wives and families voted for the party opposite because they believed that the cause of unemployment was political and not economic. Hon. members opposite said, "Remove the McCormack Administration from the Treasury benches and place us in charge, and within three months we will find £2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs." (Government interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KIRWAN: I shall take hon. members opposite to another question. They know as well as I do that, like all National Parties which get in on false pretences, they are repudiating their election pledges. Take the question of the reduction of wages. Hon. members opposite said that they would not reduce wages. I saw a paragraph in last Monday's "Daily Mail," in which the Secretary for Railways stated that 1,000 men in

the Railway Department would be reduced to four days a week instead of six. Is not that reduction of wages? The Attorney-General, speaking at South Brisbane, as reported in the "Daily Mail" of 1st May, 1929, said—

"The wages of the workers are low enough already, and I for one would never, from the humane standpoint alone, be a party to having them reduced—"

What a prophet he was!

"Mr. McCormack has been saying that, if Mr. Moore is returned, wages will be reduced. I say that Mr. Moore is an honourable man, and one who has given his solemn undertaking that he will not cut down wages."

And the very first Cabinet meeting they had was held to reduce the wages of men employed in the rural industries! (Government dissent.)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You accused the Secretary for Mines of reading his speech. You are now reading other people's speeches. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: Since I have been a member of this House, when I have made a statement I have always proved it, and I am putting witnesses in the box and giving their testimony against the Attorney-General and his friends. The Secretary for Labour and Industry practically made the same remarks, and, in a speech delivered at Geebung, he forecast a very happy state of affairs for the unfortunate unemployed, particularly boys and girls, if the present Administration were returned to power. They have been returned to power, and I think it is quite safe to say that no additional employment has been made available. As a matter of fact, we know that they are combing the railway service, and men are being dismissed in half-dozens and dozens. (Government dissent.) Well, perhaps some of them are not being dismissed directly. Positions are being offered to them which it is well known they cannot accept because of family reasons or because they have young boys and girls apprenticed to trades here or following occupations here, so that to go out to the far west of Queensland would be nothing short of the act of a madman.

Nor can hon. members opposite say that, when they were returned to power, they did not get some assistance. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, knowing your interest in the State of Queensland, that you read with pleasure the appeal of the Employers' Federation asking every employer to provide an additional job by way of a thanksgiving for the return of the present Administration to power. No doubt you also read of the meeting of the graziers at Longreach, who decided that, by way of celebrating this great political event in the history of Queensland, they also would employ additional men. It is a well-known fact that these gestures made immediately after the election have brought no additional employment to any particular person, and I am quite confident that next March and April we shall have a state of affairs without parallel in the history of Queensland so far as unemployment is concerned.

Mr. KELSO: You are crying "stinking fish."

Mr. KIRWAN: I am not crying "stinking fish." I have never yet been guilty of defaming my State, let alone the Commonwealth, and I certainly did not give my blessing

[Mr. Kirwan.

or benediction to the delegation that went from this State to "queer the pitch" for the then Premier in order that he might not be able to raise money in London, so that, by the creation of a considerable amount of unemployment, hon. members opposite would be able to win the 1920 election. (Government dissent.) We can all recall the hostile criticism of hon. members opposite when the Government of that day were compelled to go to New York for loan money, but it was not very long afterwards that their own Federal Treasurer went there. There was no condemnation of his attitude. The hon. member for Wide Bay, who preceded me this afternoon, made the startling statement that the reason why Queensland could not borrow money to-day was to be found in the condition brought about by Labour administration and Labour laws. The hon. member knows perfectly well, if he knows anything at all, that the Commonwealth Government of which this great statesman, Mr. Bruce, is the leader was recently compelled to approach the London market for a loan. They had to offer that loan for twelve months! That is the longest term they could get. It was one of the shortest-dated loans ever floated in the history of Australia. The loan [4 p.m.] was floated by the great Federal National Party, with their wonderful financial advisers, buttressed by the great genius who controls the Federal Treasury, but all they could secure in London was twelve months' credit on the strength of the name of the Commonwealth.

Mr. COLLINS: The investors did not trust them.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is useless for the hon. member for Wide Bay to make wild statements when he knows perfectly well that, following upon the altered conditions of borrowing by the creation of the Loan Council, all loans are now raised by the Commonwealth, and that no money is raised by the individual States. He knows full well that all loans are now raised on the credit of the Commonwealth, and not on the credit of the individual States. When the Labour Party were in power, they did not approach the London market for a loan of £2,000,000 and receive only £600,000, which was the pathetic experience of a previous Government when there was no Labour Party in existence that could be held responsible for the awful, terrible, and disastrous legislation which it has been alleged was introduced by the late Government to the extreme detriment of Queensland in the eyes of shrewd investors.

I listened very attentively to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Ipswich—a speech that certainly stands out amongst those delivered by hon. members opposite. The hon. gentleman made a remarkable statement when he said in effect—I hope that I am not misquoting him—that the people of this State were very little better off to-day with the wages and conditions that they enjoy than they were in years gone by. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman, who, I presume, has keen powers of observation and analysis, making a statement of that kind. Everybody knows that the standard of comfort has been considerably raised in this State. Everybody knows that the conditions which are enjoyed by the great masses of the workers to-day and the opportunities that are available to the children of the working class are far in excess

of those which obtained in years gone by. Visit any of the technical colleges, the State high schools, the various secondary denominational schools, grammar schools, or colleges, and it will be seen that 95 per cent. of the boys and girls attending those schools are the sons and daughters of the workers. I make that statement without any fear whatever of being contradicted. To say that conditions have not improved, and that privileges and opportunities have not improved, is to say that one has been practically asleep for the past fifteen to twenty years.

Mr. KELSO: He referred to the wages.

Mr. KIRWAN: Consider the homes enjoyed by the working class to-day. No doubt the Secretary for Public Works can inform the hon. member for Nundah that he has received or anticipates the receipt of quite a number of applications for loans for the erection of workers' dwellings in the very near future. Just imagine a working man fifteen to twenty years ago being in a position to secure an advance of £650 for the erection of a home!

Mr. NIMMO: He was able to secure the same home at a lesser cost.

Mr. KIRWAN: Nothing of the kind. Visit any of the new suburbs upon which workers' homes have been recently constructed for the workers by the Department of Public Works and by the various building societies, and one will see houses of an ornate type absolutely unknown in our youth.

I hope the Government will endeavour to fulfil the promises they made on the hustings to the people. They exercised considerable zeal in passing through this Chamber a Bill having for its object the reduction of the salaries of members of Parliament. Possibly that Bill will become law early next week, and the Government will then have £18,000 to enable them to borrow the £300,000 to which they have referred. They will then be in a position to distribute that sum to the various local authorities. I am sure that the Treasurer, in that most winning way of his when dealing with this class of people, will be able to induce them to embark upon schemes involving the expenditure of large sums of public money. The Nationalist City Council in this city has contributed more to the problem of unemployment in Brisbane than has any State Labour Government by virtue of the fact that during the past fifteen months it has dispensed with the services of 1,200 men.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I am rather glad that the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat referred to the passing of a very estimable member of this House. I was waiting for some of the older members to mention the matter, but this is the first occasion on which it has been so mentioned. I refer to the passing of our dear old friend, George Appel. One cannot sit in this House without looking towards the corner seat now occupied by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley and missing the genial appearance of that good-natured gentleman, who has "gone west." It seems to me a pitiable feature of our public life that men should give their lives in the public interests, and, when they have passed away, no recognition of their services is made except it be by hon. members rising in their places in this Chamber and drawing attention to the passing of men such as George Appel. The State and the Commonwealth were much the better for

Mr. Maxwell.]

his participation in public life. Since he has gone the State and Commonwealth are much the poorer.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on attaining the high and responsible office of Speaker. It is unnecessary for me to say more at this juncture than I did when moving the resolution that you be elected Speaker of this House.

At 4.7 p.m.,

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

Mr. MAXWELL: To the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply I offer my congratulations. I certainly cannot offer my congratulations on the tactics which hon. members opposite have adopted. I remember the period during which they occupied the Government benches, and I was then forced to the conclusion that their numbers represented quantity but not quality; but I am to-day forced to the further conclusion that they represent neither quality nor quantity. The Government Party, on the other hand, represent both quality and quantity as a result of the electors, in their wisdom, approving of the policy that was enunciated by the Leader of the Government.

During the period that the Premier was delivering his policy speech and addressing the electors in various parts of the State, he stated that he fully realised that the members of his party would have to submit to vilification and abuse on every occasion that they appeared on the hustings to enunciate the policy of the party. I had no idea that that attitude would be continued when we came within the walls of this Chamber. I was under the impression that, as soon as the election was concluded, hon. members opposite would conduct themselves in a different manner, especially on the floor of this House. They have asked of every speaker who has risen on this side of the House, "What was in the Governor's Speech?" they said. "It is only a drab production. The Governor's Speech is composed of nothing else but amendments to be introduced of legislation enacted by the previous Government." The proposed amending legislation is perfectly justified for this reason: Did you ever know a Nationalist Government to build a house on foundations of sand and water—shifting Socialism? If you are about to build a house, it is necessary to build it on a rock so that its foundations will be firm. That being the case, it is quite necessary to remove the sandy foundation of Socialism, which was laid by the late Government when they introduced legislation in this Chamber, and to enact legislation which will stand the elements for all time.

The Leader of the Opposition said that, while they never gloat over a victory, they never in any way whine over a reverse; but it is apparent that since Parliament assembled they have been yelping all the time.

During the few minutes at my disposal let me expose the inconsistency of hon. members opposite, who are continually making imputations about members of the Government which are both incorrect and untrue. They say it is all in the game, which hon. members do not, apparently, understand! Criticism has been levelled by them at the action of the Government in

[*Mr. Maxwell.*

obtaining the services of certain gentlemen to conduct an inquiry into the working of the railways in Queensland, their chief complaint being that there are men in Queensland more competent to do the job.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: So there are!

Mr. MAXWELL: I don't say there are not, but let me pause here to drive home the point I am making. Were not competent men also available for the position of Director of Agriculture, and for the management of the Mungana mine? Yet the Labour Government went to Western Australia for Mr. L. R. Macgregor, and appointed him to the post of Director of Agriculture, and in the same way they brought a man from Victoria to take charge at Mungana!

Let it be distinctly understood—and it may be necessary that I should emphasise this point—that I am saying nothing to the detriment of these gentlemen, who are decent, honest men. My desire is to emphasise the inconsistency of Opposition members in criticising the Government for bringing two Southern men to conduct certain inquiries for them in Queensland. Those who know, of course, class all that talk as pure political piffle, intended as political propaganda outside this House. They say, in effect, "We understand mob psychology. We know how we can catch these people"; but, thank God, they cannot dope the intelligent people of this community with such stuff as that.

Mr. PEASE: If we do wrong, why should you also do wrong?

Mr. MAXWELL: Let me refer to a statement that has been frequently made by hon. members opposite that the party now in power represent the moneyed class and are being subsidised.

Mr. PEASE: We believe it!

Mr. MAXWELL: Then I shall quote from a cartoon, referring to the Country-Nationalist Party, to contradict that statement. The motto in that cartoon reads—

"The stable punters are 'fed-up' with the horse. They refuse to put another poultice on him."

We could get no money, so where does the argument come in that we were feeding members of this Government? This cartoon said—

"Got a little more dope to make him go the distance?"

"No! I'm fed up with that crock."

Who issued that? The big man! The man who said, "Vote for the McCormack Government." Not "Vote for the Labour Government!" These are the gentlemen who talked about giving work to Queensland workers and encouragement to those who want work.

Mr. HYNES interjected,

Mr. MAXWELL: When the party opposite wanted someone to do this work, they imported Harry Julius from Sydney.

Mr. HYNES again interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: The Nationalist Party did not do that. They gave Queensland men the preference.

Mr. HYNES: We believe in Australian-born Governors.

The DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I have called on the hon. member for Townsville

three times to obey my call to order. I shall not call again.

Mr. HYNES: I did not hear you the previous times. Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. MAXWELL: Cartoons and other matters have been referred to in the House, and it is just as well that we should allow you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have a look at some of them. This has been authorised by Lewis McDonald, 238 Elizabeth street, Brisbane, so I presume it is quite all right.

Mr. COLLINS: What is wrong with it?

Mr. MAXWELL: I am showing the inconsistency of the party to which the hon. member belongs. Hon. members opposite have attributed statements to this party which they know are not true. They have accused us of receiving money to carry on our political work in this House and elsewhere. They published cartoons showing that the people with money will not trust us, and will not give us any. That is what I am showing hon. members. There is something else that I want to bring forward—

“The Three Useless Monkeys.”

(Opposition laughter.)

“Country—I see no good!

“Progressive—I do no good!”

“National—I am no good!”

It is a most peculiar thing how coming events cast their shadows before. “Hallelujah, they are bum.” (Opposition laughter.) And they are! I just want to refer to another little inconsistency, but to me it is serious, and I want to say that I believe in the recognition of those who have been doing public work if the people think they ought to be recognised. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and other hon. members in this House remember the great amount of fuss and noise that was made when the Right Honourable William Hughes, then Prime Minister of Australia, was recognised for the work that he did.

Mr. PEASE: He did his work well.

Mr. MAXWELL: When the purse of money containing £25,000 was presented to him, what did the Labour Party of Australia say? What did the Labour papers of Australia say? “One of the most contemptible things ever done by a public man!” For a man like that to accept a purse of money was disgraceful.” But, of course, this was presented by the great insurance companies, by the capitalist class. They were the men who gave this. What for? Because, as they said at the time, he did his job according to their wishes. Now let us see the other side of the picture. It was reported in the “Telegraph” newspaper of 12th July, 1929—I read a similar statement in the “Daily Standard,” so I suppose it is accurate—that the present Leader of the Opposition was thanked by the primary producers. This was what the “Telegraph” had to say—

“Appreciation of the work done by Mr. W. Forgan Smith, M.L.A., as Minister for Agriculture and Stock in the late Labour Government on behalf of Queensland primary producers was expressed by representatives of primary producers at a gathering in the Legislative Council Chamber, Parliament House, yesterday afternoon. Mr. Smith was presented with a purse of £100.”

If it was wrong for “Billy” Hughes to take money, it was wrong for the Leader of the Opposition to take that money.

Mr. POLLOCK interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Gregory may interject as much as he likes, but there is the truth, and he cannot get past it. It ill becomes hon. members opposite to attempt to vilify hon. members on this side. Hon. members opposite have harped on the subject of £2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs. I am associated with an honest Government, who will keep their promises. I venture to say that there is not a man behind the Government who would stand for broken promises. First of all, what is the cause of the unemployment which exists to-day?

Mr. COLLINS interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: Imagine hon. members opposite talking as they do after occupying the Treasury benches for fourteen years, and saying to us, “Why have you not solved the problem of unemployment?” Unemployment is rampant throughout the length and breadth of the State—that is the pity of it—but what is the cause of it? It is caused by the extravagance, waste, and high taxation imposed by hon. members opposite when they were in power—not all of it—I would not be foolish enough to say all of it—but the greater portion of it was caused by the action of hon. members opposite. Is it any wonder that they were thrown out of office? They were not merely put out—they were thrown out of office, because the people realised that in Arthur Moore, as the Leader of the Government, they had a man who would keep his word. I have no qualms of conscience at all about what Arthur Moore, the Premier of this State, is going to do in connection with the question of unemployment.

Mr. PEASE: “Immediately,” he said.

Mr. MAXWELL: I was referred to the Townsville “Herald,” which one hon. member opposite says uses the word “immediately.” I find it is not there. The hon. member knows how impossible it is to do everything at once. As the hon. member for Nanango pointed out, immediately the rural workers’ award was suspended, fully 5,000 men found work.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We don’t believe it.

Mr. MAXWELL: I know hon. members opposite do not believe it; but such is the case.

Mr. HYNES: What was the rate fixed in the rural workers’ award?

Mr. MAXWELL: What I have stated is the case. All one has to do is to look at the payments for out-door relief and unemployment insurance for last month, which indicate a considerable falling-off in the amount, which proves the statement of the hon. member for Nanango that there have been a good many more men employed in rural areas. It is only necessary to draw attention to the method of handling State enterprises to show the waste and extravagance on the part of the late Government.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: The Government are practically giving the State enterprises away.

Mr. MAXWELL: I have a recollection of addressing a question to the Leader of the Opposition when he was a Minister in the

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

late Government, drawing attention to a statement which had been made by the then Premier, Mr. Theodore, who had been criticising the amount of waste that had taken place in connection with State enterprises. I was led to believe by Mr. Theodore's utterance that it was the intention of the then Government to review the whole position, and to remove what was a financial sink and which was bringing the State down financially.

It was stated by the Leader of the Opposition that the whole policy of the Government in dealing with State enterprises was going to be reviewed. Well, that has been going on for a very great number of years. As I have said that the unemployment has been caused by waste of money, I would refer hon. members opposite to the statement of their late leader, Mr. McCormack, as recorded in last night's "Daily Standard." This is what Mr. McCormack is supposed to have said in England—

"What brought about the collapse of the Labour Government in Queensland after fourteen years in office?"

"Many members of the parliamentary Labour Party who attended a meeting addressed at Westminster by Mr. William McCormack, must have experienced a rude shock as he unfolded his reply to the query that was in all our minds (says the Glasgow 'Forward.') There were many factors, of which Mr. McCormack has agreed himself to write in 'Forward,' but perhaps the most striking declaration was: 'Our own people did not give us a fair go.'

"They had had fourteen years in which to try out their plans, said Mr. McCormack. They had removed the House of Lords so that they could not blame a second Chamber.

"That is one of the great tragedies of Queensland. It was not Socialism or nationalisation that was wrong. We failed because our own people considered we, as a Labour Government, were fair game—that they could go slow. We gave them good wages and good conditions and we expected good service, and we did not get it. And in one after another of our industries we were compelled to close down.

"There was nothing wrong with Socialism, but there was something wrong with our propaganda, and our people had not that civic spirit which is necessary if we are to succeed. . . .

"We felt that in the past they had perhaps stressed too much the question of higher wages, and laid too little emphasis on the Socialist ideal, so that in the minds of a great many wages and conditions obscured the larger vision."

That is not my statement. That is the statement of the ex-Premier.

Now let me deal with State enterprises. Hon. members opposite have said that the Government were going to get rid only of the enterprises that were not paying.

Mr. PEASE: Not get rid of them—give them away.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member should not talk like that. He should remember the answer to a question asked by one of his colleagues, the hon. member for Warrego, the other day, dealing with a butcher shop

at Chillagoe, in which the Minister proved that the butcher shop was practically given away.

Mr. POLLOCK: It was said.

Mr. MAXWELL: He is a responsible Minister, and one of the hon. member's own party asked the question and the answer showed that it had cost over £1,000, yet it was sold for £50.

Mr. COLLINS: It did not come under the State enterprises at all. It was under the Department of Mines. You know that.

Mr. MAXWELL: You heard what the Minister in charge of the State enterprises said.

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes, but we did not believe it.

Mr. MAXWELL: The worst part of it is that hon. members know that what they are saying is wrong, that they are trying to mislead, and are taking advantage of mob psychology to practise on the people outside; but the people are awake from their lethargy, and are now fully alive to the chicanery of hon. members opposite.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is a good one.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is a good one. I intend to quote from the policy speech of the Leader of the Government, and it is just as well that I should read all that he said about State enterprises lest hon. members opposite should say that I am reading only the part that suits myself:—

"We believe that it is no function of a Government to enter into trading ventures. We propose to dispose of the various State enterprises at the best prices obtainable as opportunity offers, with the exception of the State insurance business and the railway refreshment-rooms, which will be an adjunct to the railways, and any profits will be credited to that department."

[4.30 p.m.]

"The State enterprises are creating no additional employment, and their sale to private enterprise will create no additional unemployment. We consider the public has everything to gain and nothing to lose through their disposal. The various State enterprises have absorbed over £5,000,000 of borrowed money which could have been much more usefully employed in other directions, and have been responsible for losses amounting to £3,700,000, which has had to be made good by extra taxation upon private enterprise. It is undoubtedly true that the State enterprises have thus been a large contributing cause of unemployment, and, in addition, have caused a lack of confidence in the Government, which has been extremely detrimental to the investment of capital in our industries."

The late Leader of the Labour Government said other things on the floor of this House, but his sincerity had to be doubted. Hon. members opposite know what he said in connection with the various State enterprises. We had a spasm from the hon. member for Ithaca about the State cannery.

Mr. PEASE: The Government gave it away!

Mr. MAXWELL: The State cannery was disposed of in a legitimate and honest way—not behind closed doors. Public tenders were

[Mr. Maxwell.]

called, and the property passed to the highest tenderer. It was far better to cut the loss at this stage rather than pile up the loss, as was done by hon. members opposite. These figures show the losses on the various State enterprises:—

	£
State cannery ... ..	89,380
State Produce Agency ... ..	19,880
State fish supply ... ..	42,401
State stations ... ..	1,375,029

The total loss on all State enterprises amounted to £3,647,812. Those figures clearly indicate that huge sums were taken out of industry—money that should rightly have been retained by industry for national development was wasted. The Government grubbed and scratched in every direction for money—by over-the-counter loans and by other means. The money was extracted from the pockets of the people and sunk in these enterprises, which the late Leader of the Labour Party intimated should be reviewed with a view to placing them on a firmer and sounder basis.

Mr. POLLOCK: Do you propose now to review the position by selling the most successful enterprises?

Mr. MAXWELL: The Premier has emphatically stated that all State enterprises except two must be sold. It is no use hon. members opposite endeavouring to distort the utterances of the Premier, or to put words into my mouth, or to suggest that the Premier said something that he did not say.

Mr. COLLINS: Do the Government propose to sell the Bowen State coalmine?

Mr. MAXWELL: I have not referred to the Bowen State coalmine, and I advise the hon. member for Bowen not to refer to the Lukerman irrigation area. (Laughter.)

It is just as well that I should deal with the statements of hon. members opposite that the Government have acted unwisely in disposing of the State butcher shops, which hon. members claim are a valuable adjunct of government in this State.

Mr. POLLOCK: They were sold after the Government depreciated their value.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Government were quite justified in adopting the attitude that it was the function of the Government to govern and not to trade. We did not depreciate the value of any State enterprise; but, when we were in opposition, we definitely pointed out that our party did not stand for State enterprises, and that they would be abolished. Now we are asked by hon. members opposite to continue the State enterprises—really to set up an edifice of State upon socialistic sands. When Parliament was opened in the Legislative Council Chamber, the vast majority of the people of this State exclaimed with an air of confidence, "Thank God that this day has arrived!" It was worth living for to know that at last, notwithstanding what had been done, notwithstanding the boasts that had been made at various places in Brisbane and throughout Queensland, the late Government had been turned out of office. Before the result of the elections was announced, we heard on all sides "Don't worry. We are there for all time." "They won't put us out. Have you seen the proposed redistribution of seats? It will be good, all right." Notwithstanding those boasts, it took my friend the hon. member for Brisbane all his

time to be returned at the head of the poll. If it had not been for the votes of the inmates of Dunwich, he would not have been here now. He had the fight of his life. It is really a wonder to me that there are so many members of the late Government now sitting in opposition, for the electors were so disgusted with their mismanagement, extravagance, and waste.

Let me deal with the so-called profitable butcher shops. In 1926 Mr. Corser, the then hon. member for Burnett, on behalf of the present Premier, asked the Minister in charge of State enterprises—

"How many State butcher shops were operating as at 30th June in each of the years 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926?"

"Hon. D. A. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) replied—

"1923, 72 shops; 1924, 57 shops; 1925, 50 shops; 1926, 48 shops."

Hon. members will see how the number of butcher shops was falling off, notwithstanding the statements of hon. members opposite about the wonderful benefit the shops were to the people. It was evident at the time from that statement that the people were not availing themselves of the State butcher shops as hon. members opposite represented. The Minister in his reply further stated—

"In addition to these there are at the present time eight cash delivery carts operating in lieu of shops."

Why, three shops in Toowoomba were closed down—not by this Government but by the late Government—showing conclusively that they could not compete on the same footing with private enterprise. The only way they could compete with the legitimate business man was by taxing him out of industry, not with a view to the nationalisation of industry but to the socialisation of industry.

References have been made to the promises made at the recent general election by this party. I am going to answer those questions in the same manner as the hon. member for Bowen answered questions in connection with unemployment. If, after three years of office by this Government, there remains one promise that has not been carried out, then, and then only, is it time for hon. members opposite to find fault with what has been done by the Government. We do not expect to carry out all our promises in a minute. Hon. members opposite are to-day sowing the seeds of discord and class-consciousness amongst the people. We know that some Labour men are going around saying to the workers, "Watch your jobs! There are 600 or 700 men going to be dismissed from the Railway Department." Such statements are untrue, and no one knows that better than they do.

Mr. PEASE: Forty were dismissed in Townsville.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not accept the hon. member's knowledge of affairs, because, as he well knows, he was very seldom in this House last session. He said that he was successful in having Mr. Martens elected for the Herbert seat in the Federal Parliament; but he should reflect on the number of Northern constituencies which are now represented by members sitting on the Government side of this Chamber.

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

Let us review some of the promises made by hon. members opposite to the farmers at the 1926 elections. They said to the farmers—

“Beware of the Tory plot to increase railway freights.”

“Don't let the Tories reduce the taxation of the wealthy city merchants and private corporations and make up the revenue by increasing railway freights. That is what they will do if they get into office. Keep the Tories out! Vote Labour!”

Then in the “Daily Standard” of 5th May, 1926, this was stated—

“There are only two ways in which the railways can be made to pay—(1) by increasing fares and freights; or (2) by reducing the wages or increasing the hours of employees. . . . the Labour Government is opposed to increasing charges. We have adopted the policy of making the wealthy income tax payers—most of them living in the city in luxury—bear the burden of the railway deficit.”

The railway charges were increased by 10 to 50 per cent. What did Mr. McCormack then tell them? He said, “This unemployment is something I cannot grapple with; it is an economic problem. When I came into this House I was permeated with wonderful ideas; I thought I could do great things; but, when I began to realise, I found I was beaten by sound economic facts.”

I desire also to refer to a matter that was dealt with by the hon. member for Cook, who is deserving of every praise for his courage—he is a young man, a “digger”—in standing up to the shots that were fired at him by the Opposition. Of course, they were mostly blank cartridge, although there was some gas about! (Laughter.) He referred to the fitting up of a bedroom at the Department of Agriculture and Stock. Fault was found with members sleeping in this building; but the Labour Government did not find fault with one of their number for spending £117 for bedroom furniture for a room at the Department of Agriculture and Stock when a bedroom was available for him at Parliament House. It was not the present Leader of the Opposition who was responsible for that; I say no more than that.

Then there was the extravagance of Ministers in regard to travelling expenses. In that connection it was time the pruning knife was applied. Ministers on this side are now setting an example; they are only receiving the actual expenses incurred by them.

Mr. POLLOCK: They charge more than we did, and cover it up.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not so. You will be able to verify all expenditure under the heading of “Contingencies.”

Mr. MAXWELL: I remember the Sydney “Bulletin”—at one time it was looked upon as the Labour man's Bible—saying that it was a good idea to go travelling about when ministerial expenses were allowed at £2 2s. per day. Why, that was a good salary in itself!

In dealing with the question of unemployment, it is well to repeat what the ex-Premier said when we drew his attention to the result that would inevitably follow

[Mr. Maxwell.

from the increased taxation that was being imposed. It was on that occasion that the hon. member for Maryborough inquired as to what was the limit of taxation, to which the ex-Premier replied “10s. in the £1; and that is what they are paying.” Of course, all the blame is not attributable to Mr. McCormack; other hon. members opposite must bear their share. At the same time, no previous Treasurer ever increased taxation to the extent that the ex-Premier did during his regime.

Mr. POLLOCK: Have you a Bill to reduce expenditure?

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman should direct his question to the Premier. He knows full well that the ex-Premier said on that occasion that the position did not render it possible to increase the burden of taxation.

The following table shows the increase in taxation during the reign of the Labour Government:—

THEODORE GOVERNMENT—	£
1922-23 (Increase) . . . . .	89,411
1923-24 (Decrease) . . . . .	286,316
GILLIES GOVERNMENT—	
1924-25 (Increase) . . . . .	296,960
MCCORMACK GOVERNMENT—	
1925-26 (Increase) . . . . .	189,961
1926-27 (Increase) . . . . .	393,218
1927-28 (Increase) . . . . .	475,742

The total increase in taxation during the six years amounted to £1,063,976, and of this increase the late Premier, Mr. McCormack, was responsible for £1,063,921, or 91 per cent.

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

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): Congratulations during the course of this debate have been very pronounced on the other side, and I desire now to congratulate the Premier and the Government on having survived the shock of success on 11th May. They never had it in their minds that it was possible to win, which accounts for the number of absolutely irredeemable promises that they have made. The only promise that they are likely to carry out is that which means the easy way—the destruction of State enterprises at any price—and another one—that of reducing salaries—which has been done, or is to be done. Now, post-mortems are not nice things at any time, and the fact that this party was defeated on 11th May can be allowed to stand without any further comment beyond this—that the only reason that I can see for the Government winning was because they had more than sufficient votes to beat us.

I join with the hon. member for Toowoong in regretting the death of a gentleman who was highly respected in this House—Mr. Appel—a man whose cheerful soul could carry him through politics without making any particularly violent enemies in a business which naturally makes enemies, owing to the bitter partisanship of party politics. We are very much in the habit—at least hon. members on the other side are—of seeing no good in the individual opposed to them—but it cannot be that a man coming into politics suddenly becomes either an angel or a devil. Mr. Appel, however, steered clear of most of these personalities, with the result that I do not think he had an enemy in this House.

One of the reasons why the voting on 11th May was wrong is contained in the Governor's Speech. It is a paragraph apparently inserted by the Governor himself, and one that might be expected from a highly conscientious medical man although he no longer is actively engaged in his profession. Although that is so, he says—because this is a paragraph originating from no one but the Governor—

“The vital statistics for last year show that both the death rate and infant mortality rate in Queensland stand at very satisfactory figures.”

The continuation shows that the Governor has a great admiration for the Government which ceased to be his advisers on 11th May—

“These facts bear striking testimony to the Queensland climate and to Queensland parenthood, and also furnish happy evidence of the wisdom and foresight of those who, realising that the young people are the greatest asset of a young country, have devoted their attention to safeguarding the health and furthering the welfare of the children of this State.”

That can be shown in the attention paid to child welfare and the cost—most of which was thrown up against us as extravagance—of increased facilities for education. These facts bear eloquent testimony to the work done by the late Government in increasing the education vote by nearly £1,000,000 per annum, although charged with extravagance.

The Address in Reply also carries a good certificate of character to us in many of the paragraphs. For instance, it is stated—

“While pastoral lessees will not be granted extensions of leases of any land suitable for closer settlement, they will be given concessions in respect of country more remote from the railways.”

Immediately the late Government went out of power the Gowrie question became prominent. I do not believe it was settled at the time of the elections, because, when the glad news came through to our opponents in Charleville, not ten minutes later interested people were saying, “Now Gowrie will get all it wants.” Gowrie has got all it wanted—practically half the resumption—and, probably, at a lower rental than that which will be charged to the selectors who have a chance of taking up the area.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Gowrie did not get what they wanted.

At 4.51 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. BEDFORD: They got 70,000 acres. Furthermore, in charging us with general extravagance and general waste, they at the same time discover that we have not been the worst, or anything like the worst, in that tremendous sink for money—repatriation and settlement of soldiers. Mr. Justice Pike, of the Land Valuation Board of New South Wales, was commissioned to examine and report in each State. He found that the total loss in the Commonwealth was £25,000,000, and of that loss this State had the least proportion.

Similarly the Government remarked—

“The quantity of raw sugar manufactured in Queensland last season, namely, 506,000 tons, was the largest output which has yet been attained in this State.”

They neglected to say that in the ordinary course of business, such as happens all over the world where dumped products are sold at immeasurably lower prices than are ordinarily obtained. They do not say that that is not right in the matter of sugar; but the Secretary for Mines the other day made a most dastardly attack on the contract made with Mr. Sleigh for precisely the same reasons and with the same intentions. There is no attempt to show that the sugar sold overseas represents a profit to somebody of the difference between the local price and the world's parity; but there is an attempt made to show—it is slyly stated—that a master mind was at work in order to give Mr. Sleigh a tremendous profit—the difference between what is practically a dumping price, and a local price. The statement was also made—

“The recent announcement that the tariff preference on foodstuffs imported into Great Britain may be discontinued by the Imperial Government is having the attention of my Government.”

Everybody knows that the State Government had nothing to do with the matter, and can have no more effect on it than the smallest boy in the State schools in Queensland. Similarly they congratulate the country on this—

“Commodity marketing boards are now exercising considerable influence upon the agricultural wellbeing of the State.”

Everybody knows that they were established by the Labour Party in the teeth of the opposition of hon. members opposite.

Mr. POLLOCK: Hear, hear! The hon. member for Warwick said it was rank Socialism.

Mr. BEDFORD: It also says—

“The decision of the Government to reopen the Chillagoe smelters for customs ore only has already led to a mining revival in North Queensland.”

Chillagoe was finished in 1899, when I lost the last bit of money I ever put into it, and I had to work live or six years very hard to make up the loss. Chillagoe is a political mine in Queensland; but you cannot keep a smelter running on politics. As a matter of fact, we would probably have won that seat if the late Government had decided to reopen Chillagoe; but, after having given it all the trials it was worth—and probably more than it was worth—it was decided that it would be a dead loss to open it again.

While on the question of Chillagoe, a statement has been made here to the effect that I asked a “loaded” question the other day. That was in response to a letter from the North telling me that the State butcher shops had been recently sold, and asking me to inquire into the condition of sale.

Now, if that butcher shop was sold for £50 by the late Government when it was the intention not to reopen the smelters, it was probably sold for about what it was worth. My question was directed to ascertaining whether any appreciation of that price had been made in view of the present Government's intention to reopen the smelters. It can be said that there are no true fissure lodes at Chillagoe. The ore occurrences there are carbon cave deposits in limestone, and the ore supplies could never be depended on. The whole history of Chillagoe from the beginning until now has been

Mr. Bedford.<sup>1</sup>

that. It is too great a price to pay for the return of the present Secretary for Mines to Parliament that the country should again begin to waste money on what is a "dud," and will ever remain so.

The hon. member for Gympie, in the course of his speech, said that labour conditions caused the closing down of Gympie. Now, that is utterly untrue. It is apparent to anybody that gold and other ores—base metal ores included—do not grow every season. What is extracted cannot be put back, and Gympie failed because it did not have any more ore.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: How do you know?

Mr. BEDFORD: We know that is so. We have the dicta of geologists. We have the fact that, when prices of material—dynamite, and so on—were lower than they are now, and when the price of gold was still at the same standardised price, mining was dropped because the chutes had become too short and too narrow and the country too hard, and there was too little metal in the stone to pay.

Mr. JONES: So it is all over Australia.

Mr. BEDFORD: It has occurred all over Australia. It is well known to all mining men that, if you take a ruler and rule a line across the continent above the latitude of Charters Towers, you will find that north of that line, in the Northern Territory and Western Australia as well as in Queensland, the chutes are short. In the Northern Territory gold goes out at 500 feet, and returns deeper in impoverished quality. But if any Government were responsible for the closing down of one of the rich fields of Queensland, it was the Denham Government, and the field was Charters Towers. When the Denham Government were in power, the late Hon. E. D. Miles and other representatives of mining in that centre came to the Government and asked for assistance, pound for pound, for the purpose of sinking a deep shaft to test the lower ground, and they were refused, with the result that Charters Towers closed down, although there is still gold there.

Mr. WELLINGTON: They did not give it a chance.

Mr. BEDFORD: They did not give it a chance. His Excellency the Governor is also made to say—

"My advisers take a most serious view of the present condition of Queensland industries and are of opinion that conciliation methods in industry afford the most hopeful outlook for the future."

That is, round-table conferences, where the big fellow kicks the little fellow on the shins:—

"A Conciliation and Arbitration Bill will be introduced which will be designed to give the widest possible scope for the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes, with recourse to the Arbitration Court only as a last resort."

We know what sort of a thing that will be—something like what hon. members opposite passed when they were in power before, because, if they are guilty of attempting to kill the arbitration tree—the Attorney-General said the other night that it was intended to ringbark it—it will be the end of a method which has brought more peace to industry than any other method which has been devised in the world.

[Mr. Bedford.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Your people have "white-anted" it.

Mr. BEDFORD: I am sure that, if this attempt that is being made to destroy arbitration in the Federal sphere cuts the arbitration tree down, it will cut the Bruce Government down, and will also consign that Government to the fires which it so richly deserves.

The Attorney-General the other night, in a speech which reeked of the hustings, without giving us anything new—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Like your own.

Mr. BEDFORD: I did not talk like this before the election. The Attorney-General, in a speech which gave us nothing of that deliberation which should belong to this House, made the wild statement that he knew that no member of Parliament, on this side or that, believed in his heart in Socialism or its possibility.

[5 p.m.]

That does not sound like a lawyer mind, because a lawyer requires evidence. It is more the statement of an advocate with ethics modified or extended by the brief. W. S. Gilbert, himself a barrister, satirised this cheap advocate habit of mind in "Iolanthe":—

"When I went to the bar as a very young man,

Said I to myself, said I,

I'll work on a new and original plan,

Said I to myself, said I.

I'll never assume that a rogue or a thief

Is a gentleman worthy implicit belief. Because his attorney has sent me a brief,

Said I to myself, said I.

"In all the professions in which men engage,

Said I to myself, said I,

The army, the church, the press, and the stage,

Said I to myself said I.

Professional license, if carried too far, Your chance of promotion will certainly mar:

And I think this rule might apply to the bar,

Said I to myself, said I."

In the business of politics, this denying of sincerity to individuals, these statements that any man can know what are the secret thoughts of another, are so cheap that it is unworthy of anybody who sits in a deliberative assembly. Everybody knows, that even as the heart knows its own bitterness, that every man knows his own thoughts, and only he knows his secret thoughts. It might as well be said, that, because Christianity has more professors than practisers, there is no such thing as Christianity in the minds of men, and Socialism is, after all, an ideal in practice of the profession of Christianity. Speaking to an ex-banker the other day—a man with a very fine mind in a material sense—he said that he believed Socialism to be impossible by reason of the general selfishness of human nature. To that I said, "Christianity has not yet failed, because nobody has ever tried it. A few bright, shining spirits have tried it, and made the world better for their presence; and it is just as logical to express the ideal of Christianity as

impossible as to say that Socialism is impossible in itself." Naturally, being a banker, material things were put into him, sunk into him, and impressed upon him for the reason that I have never known a banker to lend money for God's sake; he lends it on excellent security or not at all. Having said that Socialism was impossible, I asked if he thought the realisation of the Christian ideal was impossible, and he said, "Yes." I then asked if it would not be more honest to scrap all the churches, to which he agreed, but added that it would not do to say so publicly. Every man knows that, although the world still has a lot of cruel, perverted, and violent people in it, still it tends to grow increasingly better and better. It would be utterly impossible for any community to remain decent if it did not have some ideal, and the Christian ideal we figure is represented in government by the socialistic ideal.

The Attorney-General interjected just now "Owning property." Supposing there was such a thing as a return to that age when everybody went naked because man, according to Holy Writ, was made perfect, and he went outside without clothes, he would get twelve months in prison for being perfect. Supposing, then, that the ideal of the age was nakedness, he would advise me to take off my clothes in order to reach that ideal immediately, although I would display a much worse figure than when dressed. I have been a member of this Labour Party for thirty-five years by absolute belief in its tenets, and, although I have made and lost three or four fortunes in that time, I did not alter my belief like a chameleon just because my environment had changed. Supposing we take this to its logical conclusion. The worst man, the most selfish man, would then be the man with the most money. He is not always either; the best man would be the fellow with one sock; and the best democrat would be the fellow who only had a "Prince Albert." The thing is ridiculous. Any man who believes that a mere change of circumstances affects a man's fundamental beliefs proves himself thereby to be a very small man indeed. When they say that Socialism is impossible in practice they have forgotten that the Commonwealth Bank was established in 1912 without a penny; that it showed £16,000 of a loss in the first year after its establishment, and that in 1927 it possessed assets of £145,000,000. That bank raised £524,000,000 of loans—unfortunately, for war and not for development—during the war time, and since the war time has redeemed £61,000,000 of that amount. Is this failure? If they thoroughly believed in wiping out all forms of Socialism, why did they not dare to wipe out the State Insurance Office? Because they want the money—that is why. In the case of many State enterprises both in the Commonwealth and here, immediate bookkeeping profits were not shown. I have only to point to the raising of freights, cunningly held back until after the last Federal elections, to the fact that, as soon as the Commonwealth line of steamers was sold overseas freights were raised; and that here in Brisbane, as soon as the State butcher shops were sold, the price of meat was raised. The price of meat has increased in Brisbane. The position, then, is this: Nobody supposes that Socialism would wipe out the competitive spirit in man. Man is a competitive animal, and will always compete; but, whereas the thinkers of the

community do not trouble the community because they govern themselves and are above law, even if they never break it, the real job of Socialism is to take over all the misfits and wrecks of the old system—the invalids, the idiots, the lunatics, the violent, and the criminally-minded people. Nobody supposes that any ideal State would naturally consider them as much as it did its better class—its better-minded people. It would mean that they should be strengthened by as much social science as could be brought to bear on the question, or that they should be eliminated as soon as possible.

The greatest administrative act of the Government since its geographical Ministry was formed is the discovery by the Secretary for Public Instruction that a necessary part of the education of children should be politics, because, no matter how we say it or what we think about it, monarchical systems and Imperialism are political forces and nothing else—political entities which will disappear just as soon as the majority of the people make up their minds that they shall. We do object, and rightly so, to the Communists running Sunday schools and teaching children the gospel of "Nark"—a gospel of envy and hatred of other people. We strongly object to that. Similarly we object to the minds of the children being cluttered up with these other things which matter not at all, because by the time these children have grown up, ready to take their place in the world, probably the whole political face of the earth will be altered. In point of fact, if the Secretary for Public Instruction would use all the resources of his department to educate himself on his duty to the country as a Minister, we should be getting somewhere. For instance, if you want to teach these children politics at all, you must teach them Australian politics; that, whereas we give ill-advised preferential duties to Britain, amounting to £9,000,000 per annum, which succeed in sending German goods out here with a coat of paint put on and packed in Britain, masquerading as British goods, they give us £800,000 a year, and are now about to withdraw it. There is no objection to the British Government doing what it pleases with its own money. If it decides that that little island—which, owing to bad land laws, has never attempted to produce sufficient for its own requirements—is going to have free trade for the breakfast table, then that is their business; but it is our business to see that they get nothing from us for which they do not pay. As a matter of fact, the only time that such a thing as Imperial equality exists is when there is a war on and we are asked to find the best soldiers in the world. Similarly, too, a lot of this imperialistic propaganda has the worst possible result in Australia, because it includes anti-American propaganda. Why? Simply out of an inferiority complex, which says, "These people are better than we are; therefore, we hate them." The United States of America—with 6 per cent. of the world's population and 7 per cent. of the world's cultivable land—produces 27 per cent. of the world's wheat, 40 per cent. of the world's meat, 85 per cent. of the world's automobiles, and 90 per cent. of the world's moving pictures; and it has not done that by propaganda which has permitted them to put over inferior goods. The goods go over because they are better. I am not here as a protagonist for America. I would like to

*Mr. Bedford.]*

see the Federal Government—as will be done when the Labour Government is in power very soon in the Federal arena—(Government laughter). That is a dead certainty.

Mr. CLAYTON: The certainty is “dead” all right!

Mr. BEDFORD: I was only using slang which the hon. member might understand. The position, then, in regard to the Federal arena is that, whenever a Labour Government gets into power, it will decide that this £36,000,000 of a trade balance now in favour of America shall be wiped out by reciprocal treaties with other countries that produce such products of America as we want and must have.

Mr. DUFFY: What countries are those?

Mr. BEDFORD: Well, Italy produces motor cars. Any country with cheap power can produce motor cars cheaply. Any country that can give us £1 for £1 is the country that we should deal with. The British, in wiping out the little existing preference to Australian products, are perfectly right in doing what they like in their own house; but, owing to a lot of these loud-mouthed Imperialists or anti-Australians, we are not permitted to do what we like in our own house. That is the objection.

It was believed—I believe it to be true, too—that, if Mr. Bernard Corser had still been a member of this House, he would have been in the Government. He was noisy enough to entitle him to be. The Deputy Leader was included, apparently because he is fond of flag-flapping.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is a pity you do not do a little more flag-flapping.

Mr. BEDFORD: I am too busy. A man who is idle and can spend his time flag-flapping should keep on flag-flapping. Dealing with the general personnel of the Ministry, we were treated to an exhibition the other day by a Minister new to the House and new to politics, who decided that “Rafferty rules” should prevail here—that he could quote just as much of a State document as suited him. When he has been here a little longer, he will probably learn that there is nothing worse than consciously misleading the House; and probably his party will learn that, had he been over here, his resignation would have been asked for within twenty-four hours. (Government laughter.)

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Do you want his job?

Mr. BEDFORD: As a matter of fact, I do not want any job.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did the hon. member say that the Secretary for Mines consciously misled the House?

Mr. BEDFORD: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, Logan): I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in saying that the Secretary for Mines had consciously misled the House?

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member made use of the expression which the Deputy Leader of the Government says he did, then the hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. BEDFORD: Certainly I withdraw.

Now with respect to the promise with regard to the unemployed. It is remarkable that on 12th or 13th May the newspapers suddenly discovered that there was no unem-

ployment, or not sufficient unemployment to get into the newspapers, at any rate. It will be remembered that in the bad old days sectarianism played its full part, and that either unemployment or sectarianism was used. Sir Henry Parkes was a great believer in sectarianism until it hit the other way. When Premier of New South Wales, he invented a thing called the Kiama Ghost. It was a conspiracy at Kiama to cut all the Orangemen's throats, and the rank and file of the traducers even went so far as to go to the man who was sweeping the streets and tell him that, if he did not vote for the Parkes's party, the Pope would come out from Rome and get the job, and a few cardinals would probably get killed in the crush. I am in a position to say, having met His Holiness Pius X. on friendly terms, that I do not believe he was after any other job than the one he had, but immediately the election was over, the Kiama rabble miraculously disappeared, and all the clerics concerned went back to Rome broken-hearted because they could not get the sweeper's job in Sydney.

Similarly, at the last Federal election the party opposite used Communism. That, of course, is reserved for Federal purposes. But, if there is any force which is not only unconnected with Communism and any force which is the only possible force to keep in order these wild gospellers of “Nark”—those envious people who can do nothing, but only want to make confusion and so profit by it—it is the Labour Party. I recently had a libel action with a newspaper at Charleville—an alleged newspaper. The other day, through having improperly joined the “Western Sun” Newspaper Company, which was then not qualified to be a defendant owing to some technicality, I had to pay the costs separable from the other two of the failure of that prosecution. In that bill of costs this illuminating item occurred from the other party's solicitor, “To attending on Mr. G. W. Rymer, writer of the article, and obtaining from him certain particulars.” If the statements made in the article were as true as the jury thought, then I think the money was wasted and, as I had to pay it, I felt it very keenly. (Laughter.) The idea of paying the defendant's solicitor to have an interview with the writer is about the last thing I want to pay for in the world.

Here is this Communist continually attacking this party, and trying to “white-ant” it by writing in an anti-Labour newspaper in Charleville in an attempt to defeat the Labour Party. Does not this dispose of any attempted connection by the other side of the Communists with us? As a matter of fact, who paid the three Communists who went about through the Townsville campaign—the Communists who lost their deposits?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: You have not much to growl at in regard to your law suit. You got costs.

Mr. BEDFORD: Of course I did! The jury said I deserved them.

The hon. member for Bulimba spoke in a very excellent debating society speech, full of all the wildernesses, mirages, and morasses—a good speech, topographical and meteorological, but scarcely political. (Laughter.) She spoke of these morasses and crags and mountains, and other features of the scenery, and incidentally mentioned the fact that she was the first lady member of this

[Mr. Bedford.]

Chamber, but had not entered here in any spirit of sex war. In general terms it is only right to remind the lady, with all respect, that all the emancipation that women have, they are not quite emancipated yet, and what emancipation they enjoy has been given them by mere man. There are plenty of homes where they are over-worked, and plenty of homes where they over-work the old man, too. (Laughter.) I am speaking of the fact that plenty of lazy ladies do nothing but take the money from the bread-winner, and have not very much of an opinion of him either. But there is also the fact to be remembered that the very party which passed women's suffrage, which made it possible for her to come here, is on this side of the Chamber; and it is ungrateful, to say the least of it, for her to be supporting the party opposite, who in the past did their best to prevent her coming here.

The TREASURER: I say that is not correct.

Mr. BEDFORD: The hon. gentleman says, "I say that; and I say this;" and then he says it again, and nobody believes a word of it. (Laughter.) There is no way to approach the problem which confronts us by deciding that the state of society, the immediate condition of the people who most want assistance, can be affected by pious aspiration. There is much in the belief that most of us hold, I think, on reflection, that the world does not want the change of heart that the sob "sister" of the Government cried for the other day. It wants a better way and a more solid way of thinking. For instance, the Minister for Labour and Industry said that Australia "needs a change of heart in many directions." Well, if it gets a change of heart in many directions it might get mitral regurgitation, cardiac asthma, angina pectoris, aneurism, and hypertrophy, all at once. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders. I should like to point out to hon. members that, although the hon. member for Brisbane was quite in order in using this placard (referring to an election cartoon which had been displayed on the front Opposition bench) during his speech, I do not intend to allow it to remain in the place in which he put it during the remainder of the debate. I therefore direct the messengers to remove it.

Mr. DUFFY (*Eacham*): Before I join in the debate on the Address in Reply, which has now continued for a number of days, I would like to join many other members in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to your responsible position. I am sure you will fill the position worthily, not only by reason of your ability and fairness, but also because you were the only man at whom the Leader of the Opposition threw a bouquet. I also congratulate the hon. member for Bulimba and the hon. member for Cook upon the maiden speeches which they made under the trying conditions which confront new members. I think it will be admitted that it is an ordeal to make one's first speech in this Assembly. I am feeling excited myself, and I feel sure that they must have felt anything but comfortable also.

I do not intend to trespass on the patience or forbearance of hon. members by traversing all the opinions that have been expressed, but I would like to touch upon a few of the vital matters which affect

Queensland at the present time, and I feel sure that in doing so I shall have the sympathy of all hon. members who have the interests of the State at heart. I am not one of those members who claim that no good can come out of Egypt. I do not say for one minute that all the legislation the Opposition have given us during the past fourteen years has been harmful to Queensland. We admit that some of it has been useful, and worthy of them or any other Government, but the view I take of the position is that the bad legislation and the still worse administration they gave us have far outweighed their good legislation. In fact, I claimed before the election that, during the last few years, at any rate, their position reminded one of a drunken sailor on horseback—that is as near a description as I could suggest.

Hon. members on this side have been criticised very much for having suspended the rural workers' award. That is a matter which affects the whole of Queensland, but it must be remembered that we declared before the election that, if returned to power, we would suspend it. Surely, therefore, we were entitled to do so! It has been claimed by hon. members opposite that the wages under that award were low, and that any farmer could afford to pay them. Speaking of the Atherton Tableland, which is a maize-growing district and was affected by the award, I can say that a large number of men were carrying their swags through that district looking for work; but immediately the award was suspended I think they all found it. I understand that figures will shortly be available to sub- [5.30 p.m.] stantiate my remarks. The farmers were not so much concerned with the question of wages as they were with the interference and pin-pricking conditions imposed by union organisers.

Mr. HYNES: You have done pretty well under those conditions since you went to North Queensland.

Mr. DUFFY: I heard the hon. member for Townsville in this Chamber make the silliest suggestion that I have ever heard in my life—that the workers should produce less. Can you imagine anyone producing less than the hon. member?

Mr. HYNES: Your statement is a lie.

Mr. DUFFY: I heard the hon. member make the statement. There was to be the greatest gathering ever held on the Atherton Tableland in connection with the rural workers' award on the day following its suspension. Ever since the establishment of the maize-growing industry in that area, the picking conditions always provided for the placing of the maize in bags delivered in the barn; but, because the Board of Trade omitted to provide for delivery to the barns, the union organisers and their extreme supporters immediately attempted to create trouble, and arranged for a conference on the Tableland to dispute the contention of the farmers. They anticipated that they would reap a huge harvest, but their action was nipped in the bud by the suspension of the award.

Mr. DASH: Is there not an agreement in operation in that district?

Mr. DUFFY: It was sanctioned by the Board of Trade. The farmers did not object to the rate of wages; but they did strenuously

*Mr. Duffy.]*

object to union interference. There was another difficulty, in that the farmers were compelled to supply any deficiency in wages that could not be earned by temporary employees. The farmers had no idea as to the efficiency or otherwise of the workers. They were quite willing to pay the piece-work rate, and permit the workers to earn as much as they liked; but they were not prepared to engage workers on the piece-work system and supplement any deficiency in wages. I know that hon. members opposite do not believe that a minimum wage should be paid regardless of the services rendered. I have here a report which discloses the tragic state of affairs that can be created by union organisers, and refers to Mungana. Mr. O'Keefe, the late member for Chillagoe, when speaking at Herberton on 24th April last, is reported in the Herberton "Times" of that day, to have said—

"Mr. O'Keefe drew a sharp comparison between the contract system and day-labour as applied to the working of the Mungana mines. Under the contract system, said Mr. O'Keefe, it costs only 17s. 6d. per ton in production, whereas the production by day labour was £2 19s. 6d. per ton."

Those remarks were made by one of the members of the late Government just a few months ago. There is an admission by the ex-Labour member for Chillagoe that the mining rate at Mungana increased from 17s. 6d. per ton under contract to £2 19s. 6d. per ton under day labour. But he said a few more things which bear out what I said just now in regard to the suspension of the rural award. He continued—

"The Australian Workers' Union were responsible for the discontinuation of the contract system at Mungana, while the Government had to keep Chillagoe open under such disability and, in addition an obsolete plant. Is it any wonder that Chillagoe is not working to-day?"

Our party believes in payment by results as far as possible. Of course, we know that that system cannot be applied in all cases. Why should a man who is capable of doing so not earn a good deal more than a minimum wage as set down by the Board of Trade and Arbitration? He should not be denied that opportunity.

A matter which was also brought up on the floor of this House, and was referred to myself in the course of the election campaign, is the Babinda State hotel. I expressed myself very plainly on this matter in my speech at Babinda. I there said that our party, if returned, proposed to dispose of the whole of the State enterprises with the exception of the State Insurance Office and the railway refreshment-rooms. Hon. members opposite need not be afraid, then, in regard to those two enterprises. When I was asked what would happen to the Babinda hotel, I said that it would be disposed of in due course, together with the other enterprises. That policy is being carried out.

Mr. HYNES: You will have some explanation to make to the farmers connected with the Babinda mill.

Mr. DUFFY: They know that the policy of this Government is to dispose of the Babinda hotel; and I hope that by the time the next election occurs there will be half a dozen more hotels in that district. That is

[Mr. Duffy.

what the people are looking for. Whilst I am speaking on this question, it is only right that I should contradict a few remarks that have recently been made concerning the Babinda hotel. The management of that hotel is a credit to the manager and his wife. Every resident in the district is particularly pleased with their business ability. I have had the pleasure of staying at the hotel on a few occasions recently, and, without fear of contradiction, I can state that it is equal to any hotel in Brisbane. My desire is to remove any wrong impression in that direction.

There are other matters to which I hope the Government will give early attention—I believe they are on the job now—one of which is the land question. For many years the ambition of our settlers in Queensland has been stifled. I quite admit that the late Government had no experience of the perpetual leasehold system of tenure of which they were so fond; and I also admit that, if hon. members opposite were closely scrutinised, it would be discovered that they personally favour the freehold system of tenure. We also find that Mr. C. J. Ryan, the late member for Eacham, and the late Premier, Mr. McCormack, joined a company that purchased a large freehold estate in the North, subdivided it, and are now selling it under freehold tenure system. I do not blame them for that. If a man shows enterprise and vision, he should not be stifled; but it is much to their discredit to advocate one system of land tenure when dealing with the government of the people, and, at the same time, in their private transactions, to uphold the freehold system of land tenure.

Mr. KELSO: It is hypocrisy.

Mr. DUFFY: The great cry of the Opposition has been that the State should have the unearned increment on land. Our party however maintain that there is no unearned increment on land; that it is all collectively earned, and that the people who are prepared to improve that land should share in that increased value. Surely these people who go out into the country and put up with hardships that many people in the town would never dream of are worthy of more encouragement than they have received in the past? Surely they are worthy of something better than a lease which provides for a reappraisal of rent every fifteen years? One hon. member opposite said that our forefathers got into trouble in Ireland over leasehold. I understand that our forefathers left Ireland to get away from leasehold, but surely not to come to it out here. (Laughter.) In any case, as I understand the tales told by our grandfathers, bad as the landlords were in Ireland, they only demanded high rentals, or whatever rentals they could get, from their tenants; they left it at that. Here, however, the Queensland Government, not satisfied with extracting as high a rental as possible, valued the land in excess of its true value—a fact which has been borne out recently by the action of the Land Administration Board in reducing rentals. Further, the Queensland Government imposed all sorts of little irksome conditions and pin-pricking restrictions on the people when they did get them on the land—and, if any of these people made a living after that, the Government caught them per medium of the income tax. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAHER: There are traps everywhere. (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. DUFFY: They must certainly be a hardy lot of people to stand that sort of thing; but, if they could stand it, then the Government imposed a few more burdens in the shape of hospital taxes, infectious diseases taxes, and main roads taxes, notwithstanding the fact that the main roads are used by all. There was a suggestion that another one might be imposed—a water tax—but the outcry was so insistent that the Government decided to suspend that impost. It is quite on the cards that, had the present Opposition been returned to power, we might have had a little Bill brought in to provide for the payment of a tax of a penny in the £1 to cover ministerial expenses. (Government laughter.)

If there is one day on which the whole of the rural population of Queensland should go into mourning, it is the anniversary of the day on which the present member for Cairns was appointed Secretary for Public Lands in a Labour Government, because from that day the man on the land was subject to conditions which he had never previously known. The hon. gentleman had a vision of thousands of little farms all over Queensland, looking down to the "big boss farmer" in Brisbane. (Laughter.) His vision was that Queensland should be covered with these little pocket-handkerchief farms, and that, if any of the farmers had a setback, they would come to him in Brisbane for assistance, and would receive it if they supported his party. I have reason for thinking that, because, when, during the last campaign, my opponent at Eacham was asked about main roads he said, "It all depends on the amount of support that you give me in this campaign how many main roads Eacham is going to get after this."

Mr. McCormack also decided on the policy of "one man one farm" in Queensland. It did not matter to him how large a family the man had, what finance he had, or what ability he had. That counted for nothing with the hon. member. A settler could not even lease a little paddock without waiting until the big boss farmer down here in Brisbane said he could lease it. He might only want it for a month, and, by the time approval was granted, it would be too late. The Secretary for Public Lands had to give his decision in all cases, and even to-day serious delays take place. This is so in connection with the transfer of a sugar farm in my electorate to a buyer who has no other land. The transfer was completed and lodged and everything in order in October, 1927, and it is not through yet.

Mr. PEASE: What have you been doing?

Mr. DUFFY: That is what I am afraid to answer when I go back. I only heard of it yesterday, and I hope that long before I go back I shall be able to say that everything is all right.

Settlers who pioneer land distant from a railway station always look forward to a reward when they sell out to come back to town. But, under the tenure that has been granted, when the settler comes to sell, the selection has no value because of the taxes and other payments that have to be met. Even if the selection is sufficiently improved to create a value for the improvements, if the owner desired to dispose of them, the late Secretary for Public Lands always refused to transfer if the buyer had any other land. I hope the present Government will soon remedy that matter. Up to 1924,

the Land Act laid down the area a man could hold in any district, and there was no trouble in regard to a transfer. So soon as a transfer was in order and sent in, it was completed; but that is not so to-day. To show what was in the late Minister's mind when he commenced to administer the Land Act, let me quote a couple of provisions which appeared in the Palmerston Land Settlement Bill of 1923. Clause 6 (7) reads—

"The Minister may require a selector, within a time to be fixed by the Minister, to clear and plant with artificial grass or grasses an area not exceeding 50 acres of his selection, to be located and defined by the Minister."

He was going to tell them where they must plant it. Then clause 9 reads—

"The Minister may require any selector to supply a factory established by the Minister with primary products or stock for treatment by such factory at such time and in such quantities and numbers as the Minister may deem desirable."

After reading that there is no question as to what the Secretary for Public Lands thought at that time of land settlement, and what he would have liked to do. That is what he would have liked to see, but, fortunately for the people of Queensland, the Palmerston land settlement scheme is still as it was at that time; the Government did not go on with it, and under those conditions it was just as well they did not. I hope that the present Government will push on with the Palmerston land settlement scheme, and open many other big areas which are necessary for the State, and that they will open up land in sufficient areas to enable settlers to make more than a living in an average season. If settlers make a bare living in an average season, it will only lead them into trouble later on, because everyone connected with land settlement knows that there will be a setback when bad seasons come. It should be the aim of the Secretary for Public Lands to see that adequate areas are provided, which will enable a settler to make more than a living during an average season, and also be something for him to hand down to his children afterwards. He should be given a freehold title.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUFFY: I would also like to refer to the timber question in the far North—the position may have been as bad down here as it is there. I am speaking of the forestry administration under the late Government. The method in the past has been to squeeze everyone connected with the industry, so as to get every penny possible out of it and not put any money back again. Everyone who has had any dealings with the Forestry Department has been put through the same process for the last seven or eight years, and I believe that the late Premier quite agreed with that policy. I do not think there is any Government department in Queensland that has earned more contempt and ridicule and is more distrusted than the Forestry Department, and there must be a reason for it. Everyone is looked upon as a parasite, and, according to them, should not be in the business at all. Nothing escapes its greedy eye when it comes to look for more revenue. I would remind the hon. member for Townsville that there is no award for bush workers in the timber industry in North Queensland. The

Mr. Duffy.]

best wages in the North are being paid to the whole of these workers without an award. These hardy and self-reliant men work on a piecework basis; they believe in doing hard work and getting well paid for it. We never hear of any of them coming to the Government for assistance. Without an award they are able to make very good wages except when they are working for the Queensland Forestry Department. During the last four or five years the Forestry Department has adopted a scientific method of reducing wages and costs by, if possible, reducing the cost of marketing timber from 25 per cent. to 50 per cent.—that is between timber-getters, haulers, and loaders. From then on there is no reduction. This policy is wrong. The only place where sweating has taken place in the timber industry in North Queensland is in connection with the Forestry Department.

It has commenced a system of calling tenders for the work, and, by keeping the teamsters short of work, they get semi-starvation prices. These it does not accept in most cases, but the Forestry Department officers interview the tenderers, and, if they reduce their prices to starvation level, they give them the contracts. The work done in North Queensland is at ridiculous prices, and that is the result of the policy of the late Labour Government, who were supposed to stand for good wages. We heard one hon. member on the floor of this House almost crying in his plea for the workers, and appealing for good conditions, in spite of the fact that these are the conditions that they have imposed in my district for years past.

**AN OPPOSITION MEMBER:** What about the forestry agreement in North Queensland?

**Mr. DUFFY:** There is no forestry agreement in North Queensland. There is no need for the system of rationing timber that the heads of the department have adopted. They should fix the price—as they do—at a reasonable market rate, and supply the markets of Queensland and of Australia. That is their job. We were recently successful in having an extra 4s. per 100 superficial feet added to the duty on timber imported into Australia. One would naturally think that there would, in consequence, be a great falling-off in the importation of timber, but imported timbers are coming into Queensland ports freely, whilst our timber is allowed to rot in the bush. I would say to the members of the Forestry Board that, if they are not able to supply the local market and keep out imported timbers, they are not doing their job. That is one part of their job, the other being—instead of theorising in long journalistic phrases put before Parliament each year—to carry on a vigorous policy of reforestation. It is admitted that more cabinet timbers die—and, when they die, they are useless in six or eight months owing to borers and so on—than are removed from the forests, yet the department officials will tell you that they are doing their bit. They are doing nothing. I say that we should have a vigorous reforestation policy, and at least one-third of the revenue of the department should be expended on that object. In the past I think that an amount equal to 10 per cent. of their revenue has been spent for this purpose, but that 10 per cent. was charged up to posterity; it was taken out of loan money and not out of revenue, which I think is a disgraceful state of affairs. I claim that we would make far more work for sawmillers and timber-workers

in North Queensland if the Forestry Department would act on the principle that we want to keep the mills working in North Queensland, and if they endeavoured to have all the timber sawn there.

[7 p.m.]

For quite a long time I have advocated in North Queensland that the timber should be broken down by our own workers in our own sawmills. I have been informed that any legislative action to give effect to those ideas would constitute a breach of Federal laws; but I have pointed out a very simple way of overcoming the difficulty. I am not advocating a further extension of the system of auction sales; but I suggest that, when the timber is being sold at the upset price, Melbourne and Sydney buyers should be compelled to take a certain percentage of building timber, and they would then find it necessary to buy the sawn timber, and not export cabinet woods in the log. In that way the work of converting the logs into sawn timber will be preserved for our own employees. It is a matter of indifference to the sawmillers what the price of logs may be so long as there is a market for sawn timber at a price which will allow of a fair margin of profit. On my suggestion I cannot in any way be accused of advocating cheap log timber for sawmillers, because sawn timber is based on the price paid for the timber in the log. I have not very much more time at my disposal, and I am, therefore, unable to deal at further length with the timber question, but shall avail myself of another opportunity later to deal with it.

I desire particularly to refer to the obligations imposed by the late Government on the returned soldiers who have settled on the land in Queensland, and in North Queensland in particular. Those settlers have every justification for demanding that their grievances should receive immediate attention. Having acted on the advice of the experts of the department when controlled by the Labour Government, these men have been compelled to waste eight or nine years of the best part of their lives through no fault of their own. They are in their present position because of the unsound advice tendered to them by the department. It matters not the source from which the necessary funds are obtained; but they must be obtained promptly in order that these settlers shall have justice. I shall have more to say on this subject also at a later stage.

Another matter that has exercised the minds of the people of Queensland for quite a time, and a matter that requires an immediate remedy, is the system of providing for promotion based on seniority. The present Government are of the firm opinion that promotion should be based on merit, and on merit alone. The Opposition allege that they are of the opinion that it should be based on seniority; but, whilst that may be their alleged belief, it is not carried out in practice by them. If they had observed that practice when appointing the leader of their party, the honour should have been conferred upon the hon. member for Bundaberg, and some hon. member other than the hon. member for Herbert would have been appointed deputy leader. However, they did not act on the basis of seniority, and I leave it to hon. members to judge as to the reason why. Promotion based on seniority actually kills incentive in any person to improve himself and better to equip himself

with knowledge to enable him to advance in that walk of life in which he is engaged. I hope the present Government will take early steps to insist that at all times promotion must be based on merit.

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

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your selection by this House. I know of no member who has ever sat in this Chamber who could fill that high office with more dignity than yourself. I was very pleased when you were elected to the position by the unanimous vote of the whole Chamber.

I also wish to congratulate the mover of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Bulimba, and the seconder, the hon. member for Cook, upon their very able first addresses.

This debate has taken up very many pages of "Hansard." I do not intend to direct my remarks over the great field which politics cover; but I would be doing no more than justice to the motion if I confined my remarks to the question of unemployment. The real issue is not what the Government think of the Opposition, what the Labour Party think of the Moore Government, or what we, as a Government, think of the unlamented Theodore-McCormack Government; neither is the real issue the slough of party politics or the mistakes of the past. In my opinion, the issue before this Parliament and before the Parliaments of Australia is whether the changes necessary in our social and industrial organisations are to be made by rash and reckless experiments, or by carefully thought-out plans and constitutional methods. We are living in a great age. For 2,000 years change has been going on—call it evolution or the emancipation of the human race, whichever you like. The world to-day differs radically from what it was in bygone times. The world at large outside this glorious Commonwealth has already awakened to the potent fact that this is a progressive age in which modern methods have revolutionised production. The hoe has given place to the tractor; the sickle and scythe have given place to the reaper, binder, and harvester; animal and steam power have given place to oil and electrically driven machinery; artisans and mechanics have been supplanted by precision machinery; mass production has taken the place of production on a smaller scale, enabling one man in a few hours now to do what would have taken many men many hours to do in former days.

Mr. COLLINS: That is so. You are getting on the right track at last.

Mr. FRY: People's conception of life is being adjusted to the new environment. If I read events and the times aright, that is where we stand to-day. The people are demanding an ever-increasing share of the wonderful things that this new civilisation has brought within the reach of man, but they are unable to appreciate fully the comparative values of the factors of production, distribution, and exchange. Many have yet to learn that political economy has shown that natural causes determine the division of wealth amongst the different factors of industry—land, labour, managing skill, and capital necessary to production. They fail to realise also that these natural causes have changed but

slowly. The circumstances in which we find ourselves mark a stage in the progress of the world. The mother country and the sister Dominions have already awakened, and have stepped out to the front rank of the battle of progress, but Australia, and particularly Queensland—the infant nation of the British Empire—is still slumbering in the dream state.

Mr. BRUCE: Well, wake up! (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FRY: Yes, we shall require to wake up if we are to face the difficult situation in which we found ourselves on taking over from the Labour Government, with a large army of unemployed to be considered. Queensland, with her wonderful potentialities, has prospects much brighter than any other country in the world. Nature has blessed us beyond expression with a most beautiful climate and sunshine sufficient to give birth to, nurture, and mature every industry under the sun known to man. But, notwithstanding the magnificent generosity of nature, Australia has the smallest population and the largest percentage of unemployed of any nation in the world.

When speaking a few days ago, I quoted certain figures relating to unemployment, which figures were challenged by hon. members opposite. To substantiate my previous remarks I now intend to quote an article which appeared in the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin," and was reprinted in the "Telegraph" of 20th April, 1929—

#### "QUEENSLAND UNEMPLOYMENT.

##### "A SIGNIFICANT ANALYSIS.

"According to the 1921 census, 42 per cent. of Queensland's population are breadwinners. The population of Queensland in 1928 was 914,471, and 42 per cent. of this number is ...	384,078
"Of these breadwinners, 40 per cent. work on their own account, assist without pay, or are indefinitely described or stated. Therefore deduct ...	153,640
"This shows the total number of Queensland wage-earners in 1928 to be ...	230,438
"From this deduct the following:—	
Incapacitated returned soldiers on pensions	7,854
Old age pensioners (male) ...	7,568
Invalid pensioners (male) ...	3,429
Average daily number of inmates in hospitals and asylums, of both sexes and all ages ...	6,049
	24,960
"This gives the total number of wage-earners in Queensland who, in 1928, were available for work ...	205,478
"Of these there were in full-time employment at the end of June last (vide page 51, 'A B C of Queensland Statistics') ...	123,202
	82,276

"The balance are those wage-earners who had either only part-time work or none at all. Of these, the special unemployment investigation (vide page 51 of 'A B C of Queensland Statistics') found that 72,261 persons had part-time employment only. The report does not state the extent to which these persons were employed, but allowing it to have been half-time and deduct ... .. 36,130

"This shows the number of wage-earning breadwinners for whom no work was available to have been ... .. 46,146

"Less than one in seven of Queensland's breadwinners were in full-time employment, and more than one in four of those were Government servants."

These figures coincide with the figures given by the Secretary for Labour and Industry in the Labour Government of 46,000 unemployed and 69,000 partly unemployed. But the question that we have to consider is—What do these figures mean to this Legislative Assembly, charged with the control of the lives, comfort, and wellbeing of these 46,000 unemployed?

Mr. DASH: You are a long time relieving unemployment.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You were in power fourteen years and did nothing.

Mr. PEASE: You made the promise.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRY: I do not want to interrupt this dialogue. This is what it means: In this State of Queensland we have men and women of splendid physique, full of radiant health, and bubbling over with virility, who are seeking honest labour and are unable to find it.

They are asking of this Government and every Government—I say this Government because we are in power. Party politics must be swept aside if we are to deal with this question. They are asking this Government for the bread of life. What I want to know is: Are we going to give them the stones of indolence and poverty, or are we going to put aside all our differences? I speak to members of the Opposition as well as to Government members. Are we going to sink our diversified opinions and forget the mistakes of the past? I am of the opinion that we are dwelling too much on the mistakes of the past instead of devoting our time to the problems of the present.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: That is a reflection on your Government.

Mr. FRY: How can there be any reflection on this Government when this condition was brought about while the late Government had control of the affairs of the State? I appeal to hon. members opposite—and, after all, there is nobody here who should put on the penitent robe and try to help to solve the unemployed problem more than hon. members opposite. They had fourteen years of office, and their policy went a long way to create unemployment. They were opposed to private enterprise, and their policy was to create socialisation of industry; and they imposed taxation which made it

[Mr. Fry.

almost impossible to carry on industry. They created disturbances in the industrial sphere so as to make efficient organisation impossible. With the disturbances going on, on the one hand, and the Government imposing taxation on the other, industry was crippled; and the condition of things in Queensland to-day is largely due to the administration of the late Labour Government.

Mr. PEASE: You can alter it.

Mr. FRY: Of course we can alter it, but it takes time. If there is an orchard which is growing fruit, and a man comes and cuts down the fruit trees, we shall have to wait a considerable time before we can get fruit again from those trees. It takes time to recondition the State after being ill-used in such a way by the Labour Party.

Mr. KIRWAN: How do you account for the position in the United States of America, where there is no Labour Party?

Mr. FRY: I dealt with the hon. member's figures with regard to the United States of America in the last Parliament, and I showed that they were entirely incorrect. If I had time, I would turn up the figures again, but I shall take the opportunity, if time allows, later on in the session, and quote them again for the benefit of the hon. member. I am asking the members of the Opposition if they will throw aside their shibboleths and get to work and try to bring about better conditions which we all wish to see. Hon. members opposite were over here for a long time, and are responsible for the present conditions. The present Government are getting to work, and are endeavouring within a few weeks to bring back prosperity to this State. As I develop my argument I shall show how the present Opposition managed the affairs of the State when they were in power. Hon. members opposite should have vision to look over the political hill, and see whether they cannot find the dawn of a brighter and more prosperous day. There is one thing I wish to say—and that is that the eyes of the world are upon this Parliament. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: On Canberra.

Mr. FRY: I suppose the eyes of the world are on Canberra, but they are also on this Parliament. Hon. members opposite cannot get away from the fact that the unemployment problem was the issue at the last election. I would again appeal to hon. members opposite to consider this question of unemployment and deal with it seriously.

If I see the position clearly, if we will only get on with the job, we shall find that the financial markets of the world will be opened to us. Men of science, men of letters, men of finance, will come to our assistance in developing the vast natural resources of this State, just as they did in America and other countries with similar records of progress. It is poor comfort for the unemployed, who cannot help themselves, to hear members of Parliament making light of any suggestion aimed at creating such an atmosphere amongst members that they will devote their energies and attention to solving the problem.

Now I want to give a brief review of the State activities, which seem to have a bearing upon the unemployment to which I have referred. Notwithstanding our great natural resources, which could provide employment

for many millions of people, and, despite the fact that the McCormack Government received an annual income of approximately £2,000,000 from the land, £3,000,000 from income tax, and £11,500,000 from other sources—a total of £16,500,000—they had to borrow £20,000,000 in the past four years in order to employ our people and prevent a slump in trade. Of that £20,000,000 47 per cent. is unproductive—that money is lost. Although the late Government were receiving large revenues, they had to borrow £20,000,000 in four years to keep up a state of artificial prosperity while they were trying to introduce their policy of the socialisation of industry, and the annual interest bill during their term of office was increased from £1,975,000 to £5,000,000. During the same period the national debt increased from £56,000,000 to £112,000,000. The interest on that money must be earned, and there is no chance of earning it unless trade and industry are producing it. The great trouble under the previous Government was that there was no encouragement to industry to go on producing. Apparently the Government who have just gone out of office had no idea that the world was making progress. Had they had any such idea, they would have paid attention to the growing problem of unemployment, which must be solved at an early date.

[7.30 p.m.]

It is necessary to impose taxation on industry in order to meet our interest bill; but the heavier the impost of taxation the greater the difficulties imposed in the direction of competition between the industries of this State and the industries of other States and other countries. A heavy burden of taxation means crippled industry; and, once industries become crippled, trouble commences. To-day we have reached the stage in the matter of taxation and business enterprise that it is a case of the dog eating his own tail. The Labour Government placed no limitations whatever upon their desires to secure loan money.

Mr. PEASE: A large proportion consists of conversion loans.

Mr. FRY: If that be so, why has the public debt increased year after year? The hon. member does not believe what he is saying. The more we increase our public debt the heavier becomes our interest bill, making it necessary to borrow more money. The more money that is borrowed means more taxation and an increased burden on industry, which, in turn, results in the closure of certain industries with consequent unemployment. That is an elementary principle of economics. That is the position facing Queensland to-day. Industry is unable to provide any additional sum by way of taxation, and, in addition, we are unable to secure the necessary loan money to meet our requirements.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why did your Government promise to borrow £2,000,000?

Mr. PEASE: What about the Bruce-Page Government?

Mr. FRY: I am not worrying about the Bruce-Page Government at present. I am very much concerned with the problem of unemployment and the disastrous state of affairs created in Queensland by the McCormack Government. I have submitted figures in an endeavour to make my argument clear. There is urgent necessity for

a new industrial policy to provide adequate employment without increasing taxation. It is imperative that capital and labour should advance hand in hand. The greatness of our country depends largely on the relation of capital and labour and the division between them of the products of industry. There must be improved organisation in production, distribution, and exchange. There must be an equal distribution of work and the equitable sharing of prosperity, which can be achieved under the system outlined by the Moore Government on the lines of increased co-operative enterprise in industry. I am afraid that the mere wage service has been responsible for creating the separation of the classes with irresponsibility and neglect on the moral side, with unemployment, poverty, suffering, and degeneracy on the material side.

Our aim is to build up a system of industry in which the great mass of the workers will not only have a direct interest in its profit and prosperity, but eventually will become part-owners of the capital invested in the business. This is what we mean by the co-partnership of labour. It is the duty of any Government so to frame their economic policy as to conserve their own industries for the benefit of their own people. If the people are employed in manufacturing from our own raw materials, the wealth thus created will meet the legitimate needs of the State and bring prosperity and happiness into the homes of the people. I am sure that the hon. member for Bowen will agree with me in stating that trade and commerce is the life-blood of a nation, and that without it a nation must die. It is only by encouraging trade and commerce that a nation becomes prosperous. It is only by that means that you strengthen the moral fibre of the people. If there is a weakening in the moral fibre of the people, it is very difficult indeed to maintain constitutional government.

Mr. HYNES: Is the hon. member in order in reading his speech?

Mr. FRY: I am sorry that the hon. member does not appreciate my advocacy of the unemployed problem—(laughter)—and my championing the cause of the men out of work. The late Government have lost a considerable amount of money in their various activities and, notwithstanding the fact that the State is losing by these activities and the injudicious expenditure of loan money to lose £2,500,000 every year, encouragement should be given to industry to enable employees to become part-owners of the industry in which they are engaged. Notwithstanding the fact that we are told that there is no money available, and that borrowing is impossible at the present time, I would say that it is absolutely necessary to borrow to meet immediate needs. That money should be borrowed abroad. I am opposed to borrowing this money within our own shores, because it will not improve the material position so much as new capital. It should be borrowed on the guarantee of the Government that the money will be used solely for constructive purposes and for the relief of unemployment. If we do so, the wages paid to the unemployed for good, honest toil will be put into circulation, and will return to the Treasury with interest to be paid on the borrowed money. I think that a tariff and excise should be placed upon all commodities entering Australia that could and should be manufactured here. It

*Mr. Fry.]*

should be our aim to produce and manufacture the needs of the people.

Work can only be found for the unemployed if avenues are created by which they can be absorbed. I think that heavy duties placed on imported motor cars and accessories would stimulate the establishment of the motor industry on a large scale in Australia; and, if we did that, we should be finding an opening for skilled men who unfortunately are unemployed to-day. What are we going to do with the unemployed? They dare not steal. If they steal, they are punished; yet—and this is the serious part of it—whilst they dare not steal they dare not work. They have walked the streets for months vainly searching for employment whilst the Labour Government looked on and did nothing. These are the men who are asked to be loyal to the Government, to the country, and to the nation; yet they have not the means by which they can exercise that individuality which God gave them to earn an honest living.

OPPOSITION interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: You are quite radical.

Mr. FRY: I do not care whether it is radical, conservative, or anything else, so long as it is true. Let me remind hon. members opposite that they helped to create the position which I have pictured, and I appeal to them, to help in remedying the present unsatisfactory state. In fourteen years the Labour Government increased the public debt by £56,000,000, and such is the position to-day that we cannot borrow a shilling. Let hon. members opposite do the fair thing, throw aside party differences which, after all, go for nothing, and try to help in the formation of schemes which will give immediate employment to those who are workless. Rather than continually ask this Government "What have you done?" let them say, "What can we do to help you?" When they have done that, they will prove themselves truly representative of the people outside.

Mr. COLLINS: Why do you not do it?

Mr. FRY: Fancy that interjection from a member of a party which did absolutely nothing to assist the position during fourteen years of Government?

The first matter to which attention should be given is the encouragement of land settlement, because the future of Queensland is dependent on wealth production from the land. It should be remembered that no man will embark on land settlement unless there are prospects of his receiving an adequate return for his labour. It has been truly said that the incentive to produce is the hope of reward; so that every assistance possible should be given to those who make their living on the land. Let no vexatious restrictions be imposed; let the land laws be liberal; do everything possible to provide schools for the children of those on the land. I speak earnestly, because my experience both in Parliament and in travelling about the State has taught me that the farmer thinks that he is feeding the man in the city while the latter is imposing harassing restrictions. That is what he thinks, and until you remove from him the thought that he is being crushed, until you show him that there is something to be gained by going on the land—that the land laws are to be made more liberal so as to

give him a reward for his labour—until you show him that his children will have opportunities of becoming well educated, he is not going to be satisfied.

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

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*): If one wanted any evidence of the sincerity or want of sincerity on the part of the Government in regard to the unemployed, we have had it just now from the previous speaker. That hon. member, as well as other Nationalist candidates, talked during the election campaign of what they were going to do for the unemployed. Amongst other things they told the electors of Queensland that they were going to borrow £2,000,000 to find 10,000 new jobs at once. Speaking the other night on the Bill to reduce parliamentary salaries, the Deputy Leader of the Government was good enough to get up in his place and state that dishonest advocacy was something that should not be indulged in in this House. In fact, he accused me of dishonest advocacy. All I can say in reply to the Deputy Leader of the Government and Minister for "Points of Order" is that his party's advocacy during the election campaign was dishonest political advocacy, and won for them the control of the Treasury benches, and now they have no intention of carrying out their policy. During the present debate members of this party have stated that the Government promised to find 10,000 new jobs, and that they promised to raise £2,000,000 for that purpose. They said they would find the jobs immediately, and some of the speakers said they would find them at once, and they asked us to produce our proof. I have here along with other matters something that they distributed up in my electorate as well as in other electorates in Queensland. (Displays placard previously exhibited in Chamber by the hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Kirwan). It reads—

"Result of election: Mr. Moore ? seats.

"Mr. McCormack ? seats.

"Majority for ? ?

I do not know whom that was for—whether it was for "Independent" or not.

"Is it a job?"

It was a job all right—

"Queenslanders, thousands of your fellow citizens, their wives and children are looking to you to-morrow to vote them a job."

And they are still looking for that job, and the hon. member for Kurilpa says the present Government are "stony-broke," and cannot raise a "bob" of loan money—

"Mr. McCormack has nothing to offer them. Give Moore's scheme a chance!" and

"£2,000,000 for 10,000 workers.

"Change the Government!"

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: And they did change the Government.

Mr. DASH: What is wrong with it?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: There is nothing wrong with it at all.

Mr. DASH: This is the important part—  
"Authorised by P. T. C. Shaw, Terrica House, Brisbane."

(The hon. member then exhibited the placard to the House.)

[*Mr. Fry.*

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member turn down that placard?

Mr. DASH: I am going to quote it again.

The SPEAKER: Will the hon. member kindly turn it down?

Mr. DASH: I am going to quote from it. (Interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. POLLOCK: I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Will the hon. member sit down.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Put him out!

Mr. COLLINS: "Put him out!" Is that your idea of justice?

Mr. POLLOCK: I am going to state my point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Will the hon. member sit down?

Mr. COLLINS: The prayer says, "Truth and justice."

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to inform the House that the hon. member for Gregory came up here and told me that he wanted to take the notes previously quoted by the hon. member for Brisbane down to Mr. Dash. I said: "You can have them back, but they must not be exhibited." He said, "All right; they will not be exhibited." And they will not be exhibited. (Interruption.) They will not be exhibited in this House. (Further interruption.)

Mr. POLLOCK: Under what Standing Order are you doing that?

The SPEAKER: I stated before the dinner adjournment that the hon. member for Brisbane was in order in exhibiting that placard and quoting from it, but I am not going to allow the hon. member for Mundingburra or any other hon. member of the Opposition to do the same.

Mr. POLLOCK: We are going to insist on it. (Opposition interjections.)

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Mundingburra, who has quoted the whole of the placard, to turn it down now.

Mr. POLLOCK: We won't turn it down.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I desire to raise a question of privilege—

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Mundingburra to continue his speech, and to turn the placard down. If he does not do that, I must ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. STOPFORD: I wish to be heard on a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member if he is going to obey my call to order. Is he going to obey my call? I ask him to turn the placard down on the seat.

Mr. DASH: I want to quote from it.

The SPEAKER: Is the hon. member going to obey my call? He has already quoted the placard.

Mr. DASH: But I want to quote again from it.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not going to quote again from it.

Mr. HANLON: You don't like it.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER: There is no question of privilege at all. I ask the hon. member for Gregory to sit down.

Mr. POLLOCK: Mr. Speaker—

#### SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER: I name the hon. member for Gregory for defying the authority of the Chair.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): I beg to move—

"That the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Pollock, be suspended from the service of the House for one week."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. POLLOCK: I am going to insist on my rights.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Gregory to sit down.

Mr. POLLOCK: I won't sit down. Surely a member is entitled to raise a question of privilege!

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to obey my call and sit down.

Mr. POLLOCK: I won't sit down. You are not going to run this place under "Rafferty's rules."

The SPEAKER: Neither am I going to run the Chamber under Pollock's rules. I ask the hon. member to sit down. The question is—

"That the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Pollock, be suspended from the service of the House for one week."

As many as are of that opinion say "Aye"; on the contrary "No"; the "Ayes" have it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Divide!

The SPEAKER ordered the division bells to be rung and called upon Messrs. G. P. Barnes and Hill to act as tellers for the "Ayes," and Messrs. Brassington and Bulcock to act as tellers for the "Noes."

Messrs. Barnes and Hill took their places at the table and proceeded to act as Tellers for the "Ayes;" but Messrs. Brassington and Bulcock remained in their seats.

In division:—

Mr. POLLOCK: Tyranny!

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Mussolini!

Mr. KERR: You must sit down.

Mr. POLLOCK: I will not sit down. You must think you are Mussolini. The trouble is that this has got under your skin, and (turning to Mr. Speaker) it has got under your skin, too.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I desire to raise a point of order. Have I the right to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, sitting here as I am? I want to know why you have not taken notice of the hon. member for Gregory.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is only ordinary decency to allow any member to state a point of

*Mr. Stopford.]*

order. The trouble is that this has got under your skin, and (turning to Government members) you don't like it.

[8 p.m.]

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I have been a member of this House for nearly twenty years. My point of order is that the proceedings of this Chamber should be conducted according to parliamentary practice as laid down by May. I raise a point of order sitting here while this division is taking place. It has been the custom of this Parliament ever since I have been a member to permit hon. members to raise points of order. My point of order is this: Mr. Speaker, what right have you to compel any member of Parliament to give up his notes to you?

Mr. POLLOCK: You can put us out, but you cannot make us take this sort of business.

Mr. HANLON: They don't like the evidence of a swindle.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, are you going to answer my point of order?

Mr. POLLOCK: Hon. members opposite will get it under their skins about the unemployed before they finish.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: We will get under your skin.

Mr. BULCOCK: That is the way to get rid of your critics—put them out.

Mr. HANLON: Why can you not face your own propaganda?

Mr. BEDFORD: Name the party!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The reduction of £5 a week has got under your skin.

Mr. HANLON: This is the first Government that could not look at its promises within three months after the elections.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Secretary for Public Instruction had a consultation with Mr. Speaker, and they went outside with the Clerk of the Parliament. They came back having decided that this propaganda was getting under their skin, and they would not allow it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. POLLOCK: We all saw it! You saw the Speaker about it, and arranged the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No!

Mr. POLLOCK: Of course you did; we saw you!

Mr. STOPFORD: You cannot allay these ghosts.

AYES, 35.

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

Tellers: Mr. G. P. Barnes and Mr. Hill.

[*Mr. Collins.*

NOES, 22.

Mr. Bedford	Mr. Hanson
„ Brassington	„ Hynes
„ Bruce	„ Kirwan
„ Bulcock	„ Pease
„ Collins	„ Pollock
„ Conroy	„ Riordan
„ Cooper	„ Smith
„ Dash	„ Stopford
„ Duulop	„ Weir
„ Foley	„ Wellington
„ Hanlon	„ Winstanley

In the absence of the tellers called by Mr. Speaker to act for the "Noes," Mr. G. P. Barnes and Mr. Hill recorded the names of members voting "No."

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. POLLOCK then withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*): Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a question of privilege. I desire to ask under what Standing Order any member of this House can be ordered to lay down his notes? You, Mr. Speaker, the other day ruled on a question of privilege raised by me that the Secretary for Mines was entitled to quote from any notes he so desired, and that no member had any authority to demand that he should surrender possession of those notes. I have been in Parliament, Mr. Speaker, for something like fifteen years, and I have never known an occasion where any member of this House was interfered with in connection with his reading from notes or quoting from election placards. It has been done repeatedly after every election, and I protest with all the emphasis at my disposal, Mr. Speaker, against the attitude you have taken this evening. I claim very definitely that the action taken this evening is derogatory to the standards of Parliament. I ask you to quote the Standing Order under which you have taken this action, and I also ask you to remember your oath of office as Speaker.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Government interjections.)

The SPEAKER: A Speaker in carrying out his duties is not governed by Standing Orders only. The Rules of Practice, decency, and common sense have to be observed in carrying out the various duties pertaining to the office of Speaker.

Mr. STOPFORD: They apply equally to both sides.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a question of calling for notes at all. The hon. member knows, as every hon. member in this House knows, that I did not interfere in any shape or form with the hon. member for Brisbane while he was using the placard or quoting from it; but, after some hon. member on the Opposition side placed it on the front Opposition bench, it was evident that it was being displayed simply with the idea and purpose of creating some disorder in debate.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: The exhibition of the placard in the manner in which it has been exhibited is absolutely disorderly and contrary to the rules that should govern the conduct of this House and of any well-ordered debate.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: While I am on my feet, I would like to say something else. The hon. member for Gregory said that I conferred with the Deputy Leader of the Government

and with the Clerk of the Parliament, and that among the three of us it was decided that the placard should not be shown in the Chamber.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): That is not right. What the hon. member for Gregory said—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Sit down!

Mr. STOPFORD: I will not sit down until the Speaker says I must sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understood the hon. member for Gregory to say that the Deputy Leader of the Government, the Clerk of the Parliament, and myself had conferred together.

Mr. STOPFORD: No. The hon. member for Gregory said that the Deputy Leader of the Government conferred with the Clerk of the Parliament, and then they came in and gave you your orders.

The SPEAKER: They did nothing of the kind.

Mr. STOPFORD: We say they did.

The SPEAKER: I do not know anything of what the Deputy Leader of the Government and the Clerk of the Parliament did; but I do know that neither they nor anyone else came to me and asked me to do a certain thing. I have now to name the hon. members for Barcoo and Balonne for disobeying my order to act as tellers in the division.

Mr. STOPFORD: I will go while the going is good. (The hon. member then left the Chamber.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): I move—

“That the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Brassington, and the hon. member for Barcoo, Mr. Bulcock, be suspended from the service of the House for one week.”

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

The SPEAKER: The question is—

“That the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Brassington, and the hon. member for Barcoo, Mr. Bulcock, be suspended from the service of the House for one week.”

When the division bells rang the Opposition members present, with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. W. Forgan Smith, left the Chamber. Mr. Dunlop, the hon. member for Rockhampton, crossed over to the Opposition benches.

Question—“That the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Brassington, and the hon. member for Barcoo, Mr. Bulcock, be suspended from the service of the House for one week” (*Mr. King's motion*)—put, and the House divided:—

In division:—

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: What right has the Secretary for Public Instruction to consult with the Clerk of the Parliament, anyhow?

Mr. CLAYTON: You always did it.

Mr. W. FORGAN SMITH: I never attempted to give the Speaker or the Chairman a lecture on how they should conduct their business.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you remember when you gave the Chairman of Committees directions quite openly one night?

Mr. BRAND: When we were having an all-night sitting?

AYES, 38.

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

Tellers: Mr. Annand and Mr. Fry.

NOES, 2.

Mr. Dunlop	Mr. Smith
------------	-----------

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER then directed Mr. Harris, the Principal Messenger, to remove the placard from the front Opposition bench.

The Principal Messenger proceeding to obey Mr. Speaker's direction, the placard was taken from him by Mr. Cooper, the hon. member for Bremer.

The SPEAKER: Mr. Harris, will you kindly bring that placard to me?

Mr. COOPER: I am taking this.

The SPEAKER: Mr. Cooper, will you hand that placard to Mr. Harris?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: By what right do you demand that?

Mr. Cooper was proceeding to leave the Chamber, carrying the placard, when—

The SPEAKER said: I name the hon. member for Bremer, Mr. Cooper, for disobeying the direction of the Chair.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. R. M. King, *Logan*): I move—

“That the hon. member for Bremer, Mr. Cooper, be suspended from the service of the House for one week.”

Mr. STOPFORD: Why, you have suspended more men than you have found work for!

Question—That the hon. member for Bremer, Mr. Cooper, be suspended from the service of the House for one week (*Mr. King's motion*)—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 38.

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

Tellers: Mr. Kelso and Mr. H. M. Russell.

NOES, 2.

Mr. Dunlop	Mr. Smith
------------	-----------

Resolved in the affirmative.

*Hon. C. Taylor.*]

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. DASH (*Mundingburra*), resuming, said: When I was interrupted, I was dealing with the question of the unemployed. No doubt the Government are ashamed of the posters which they issued during the election. They know that they did not mean what was said on the posters, and that it was done for the purpose of vote-catching. They have been successful in gulling the people, causing them to vote for them because they thought there were going to be jobs for 10,000 workers found immediately and work for the men and boys and girls of this State. When we were prepared to bring forward our evidence as to their statements and posters—which we did—I was relieved of the document that I was quoting from. However, time will tell whether hon. members opposite are prepared to carry out their promises to the electors or not. The hon. member for Kurilpa, when speaking, said that the unemployment question was a very serious one. It is a wonder that he did not think of that during the election campaign.

Mr. Fry: I did.

Mr. DASH: During the election campaign he said that the Government would find work immediately for 10,000 men. Now, when the Government are confronted with the position, we find that they are not prepared to find any work or any new jobs for the unemployed as they promised to do during the campaign. I notice that the Government "Whip" is going around "giving the office"—a very old procedure that has been adopted a few times in this House. However, I am not concerned whether hon. members opposite walk out and draw attention to the state of the House or not. The onus is on the Government to keep a House, and not on the Opposition; therefore, it will not affect me in the slightest whatever action they take in this matter.

If they are afraid and ashamed to stand up to their election promises and the criticism of this party there is only one thing for them to do—walk off the Treasury benches and leave them to men who are prepared to carry on and do something for the unemployed. Instead of finding the 10,000 new jobs, what did they do? In the "Daily Mail" of 5th September, there is the following article:—

"FOUR-DAY WEEK.

"*Railway Workers.*

"Over 1,000 Men Affected.

"The Minister for Railways, Mr. Godfrey Morgan, said yesterday that, owing to the shortage of loan money, and in order to give longer employment to those men engaged in certain works now in progress, the Cabinet had decided that, commencing next week, only four days a week would be worked, operations to cease on Thursday night of each week."

That is the position that the Government find themselves in after making this absurd promise during the election campaign. They cannot even keep the men who are in employment on full time, let alone provide any work for new men. They also promised work for the girls and boys, yet in reply to a question directed by me to the Secretary for

Railways in the early part of this session, it was disclosed that although 200 boys had passed the examination for entrance into the Railway Department, the Government could not find work for one boy, let alone all the boys and girls to whom they promised work during the election.

Moreover, as reported in the "Daily Mail" of 31st August last, the Leader of the Government is starting to repudiate what has been said and done during the campaign. The extract reads—

COUNTRY FIRST.

"Not to be forced.

"Mr. Moore's Decision.

"Goombungee, Friday.

"He did not intend to be forced to do things that he believed were not in the best interests of the country; he would not do things because somebody at election time had made a promise with which he had nothing to do, said the Premier (Mr. Moore), in declaring the annual show open to-day."

He did not make that statement prior to the election because he knew that the people would thereby be awakened to the political propaganda of his party.

A good deal has been said by members opposite about the rural workers' award. Hon. members opposite stated that they would not interfere with the decision of the Court—that they would repeal the 44-hour working week legislation and the basic wage, and leave the matter to the court. On the 22nd November, 1923, the Australian Workers' Union filed a claim in the court for employees engaged in or in connection with farming, chaffcutting, orcharding, market gardening, horticulture, dairying, and poultry-raising. It was filed in accordance with the Industrial Arbitration Act, section 7 of which says—

"The court shall have all the powers and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in addition to the powers and jurisdiction conferred by this Act, and may hear and determine all questions arising under this Act."

The same section also provides that the court may move on reference by industrial unions, employers, or the Minister, or of its own motion or on the motion of any person interested. That procedure was carried out. On the 29th November of the same year, the Australian Workers' Union filed a claim for an award for employees engaged in or in connection with the clearing or preparation of land for the purpose of cotton cultivation and for employees engaged in cotton cultivation and/or harvesting. I quote these facts to show that this award for rural workers was well considered by the court, and the Government had no right to interfere with it in any shape or form. On the 3rd December of that year, the then president, the late Chief Justice McCawley, made orders on summons for directions in respect of both claims, fixing the parties and requiring answers to be filed on or before the 25th February, 1924.

[8.30 p.m.]

On 3rd April, 1924, in accordance with the powers conferred by the court, an application was made by the Council of Agriculture, under section 19 of the Act, to state a case in writing for the opinion of the full bench

[Mr. Dash.

as to whether there should be an award for the industries as set out above, and if so, for what section. That application was made under section 19, which reads—

“Any judge of the court may, if he thinks fit, and shall on the application of any party bound by any decision, award, or order, or interested in any proceedings before him, at any stage and upon such terms as he thinks proper, state a case in writing for the opinion of the full bench, consisting of all the judges of the court, including himself, upon any question of law or of fact arising in such proceeding.”

The full bench sat on 8th April, 1924, and the president stated the following case for the opinion of the full bench:—

“1. Is it in the public interest that the application of the Australian Workers' Union of Employees for an award for employees engaged in farming, including the cotton-growing industry or any section of the said industry, be further proceeded with?”

“2. If so, should the court recommend the appointment of an industrial board—

(a) To make an award for the said industry or any section thereof.

(b) To make after inquiry recommendations to the court as to the regulation of the said industry or any section thereof for the purpose of making an award?”

We have heard a good deal of talk about co-operation in industry and round-table conferences. We shall see how the Government deal with the question after all this procedure has been gone through. The case was argued on 15th and 16th April, 1924, and the court recommended to the hon. the Minister in each case that an industrial board be constituted, consisting of four members and a chairman, and that there should be remitted to the said board the claim of the Australian Workers' Union for an inquiry on the following questions:—

“(a) Whether in the public interest an industrial award should be made for the said industry or any section thereof;

“(b) Assuming that the court will make an award or awards, what, in the opinion of the said board, should be the provisions of the said award?”

On 6th June, 1924, two industrial boards were appointed, the Cotton Farm-workers' Industrial Board and the Farm Workers' Industrial Board, the chairman of the former being Mr. Arthur Dean, ex-police magistrate, a very honourable gentleman, and the chairman of the latter board being Mr. Patrick Mortimer Hishon, police magistrate. Representatives of employers and employees were appointed to each board. The boards travelled throughout Queensland, and on 23rd September, 1924, the Cotton Workers' Industrial Board submitted its report, the majority consisting of the chairman and the employers' representative advising that an award should not be made, and the minority, the employees' representatives, favouring an award. On 27th January, 1925, the Farm Workers' Industrial Board submitted its report, the majority consisting of the chairman and the employees' representatives favouring the making of an award, and the minority, the employers' representatives, advising that an award should not be made. The further hearing of

the claim was fixed for 6th April, 1925, but had to be adjourned until the end of the month to suit the convenience of the court. On 16th April, 1925, the president of the court, the late Mr. Justice McCawley, died. During the same month Mr. Justice Macnaughton resigned, and Mr. Justice Webb was appointed president of the court.

Now, the Australian Workers' Union did not proceed further with the claims then before the court, but on 30th June, 1926, filed a new claim for an award for employees engaged in or in connection with farming, chaffcutting, orcharding, market-gardening, viticulture, dairying, pig and poultry-raising, cotton-growing, and harvesting, or the clearing and preparation of land for any of the foregoing purposes. On the 4th, 5th, and 6th April, 1927—nine months later—the Board of Trade and Arbitration heard argument on the claim, and on 21st April delivered judgment setting out that they would make an award for certain callings mentioned in the claim and advised the parties to confer. That judgment was delivered on 23rd May, 1927, page 1793 in the “Government Gazette.” The full bench of the Board of Trade and Arbitration decided that an award should be made after hearing evidence extending over two years or more. What I explain about, and what members of this party complain about, is this—that a certain procedure has to be followed when a party desires the Board of Trade and Arbitration to reconsider its decision. We find that the Government did not take any action under the various clauses of the Act to state a case before the Full Bench, neither did the Minister intervene in the first instance. The court recommended that a board of inquiry should be appointed, and the Government of the day established that board of inquiry. That board of inquiry travelled throughout the State, and, after taking evidence and hearing argument, made its report. The Board of Trade and Arbitration, after hearing argument and reading the evidence, decided to make an award. On 13th June last, during the currency of that award, Mr. David Pfrunder, an orchardist residing in the Stanthorpe district, for and on behalf of himself and the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing, of which he is a member, filed an application to exclude from the award the orchardists in the Stanthorpe district. That was purely a local action on behalf of the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing—a party interested in the award. The Board of Trade and Arbitration announced that one of its members, Mr. Ferry, would go to Stanthorpe and investigate the matter on the spot. After receiving Mr. Ferry's report the Board of Trade and Arbitration on 24th September, 1928, granted the application. The Government of the day did not consider it advisable to intervene or interfere with the court in any way. On 4th April this year Mr. Archibald, of Oakey, and the Council of Agriculture made an application to exempt from the award any work performed in connection with the growing and harvesting of maize. The Government stated that they did not intend to interfere with the court. The Premier, speaking in this Chamber in reply to a question by the hon. member for Ithaca, said he did not intend to interfere with the court—that it was his intention to leave all matters to the court. What do we find? While this application was before the

*Mr. Dash.]*

court the Government stepped in and, by Order in Council dated 23rd May last, removed it from the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade and Arbitration. That Order in Council was published in the "Government Gazette" at page 1431.

If they are so anxious to leave matters to the court, why did the Government interfere with the jurisdiction of the court? They say that they had a mandate from the people of Queensland to intervene, but I say emphatically that they had no mandate to interfere or intervene in the manner in which they did. Ample power exists in the Act for the Crown to have cited a case before the court and allowed the rural workers to state their case. Evidently they intend one law for the employers and a different law for the employees. It was, however, good enough for the union and the employees to go to the expense of filing a claim and paying for advocates to assist the Board of Trade and Arbitration in framing an award. Let me say, too, that several farmers—honest farmers—were in favour of an award of the court. I desire to cite section 7 (1) (iv.) of the Industrial Arbitration Act, which says—

"Jurisdiction of the Court.—To define and declare the relative rights and mutual duties of employers and employees according to what in the opinion of the court should be the standard of fair dealing between an average good employer and a competent and honest employee."

Taking that into consideration, the Board of Trade and Arbitration fixed an award; and we want to know why the Government interfered with that decision. Under the Act the President of the Board of Trade and Arbitration has conferred upon him all the powers conferred upon a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland. What we can expect from the present Government in future is that if a decision of the Supreme Court is given against themselves or some of their supporters, they will come to this Parliament with a Bill to repeal the decision given by a judge of the Supreme Court.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Your Government did that.

Mr. DASH: They will do that in connection with the Board of Trade and Arbitration although the Act confers upon the president all the powers enjoyed by a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland. Furthermore, the Act provides that no decision of the full bench of the Board of Trade and Arbitration shall be taken to a higher court, which means that there is no appeal from a decision of the full bench of the Board of Trade and Arbitration either in regard to a question of law or a question of fact on any industrial matter. But the Government are not prepared to allow the Board of Trade and Arbitration to carry out its own decisions. After all, if the employers of rural workers were so hardly treated, why did they not adopt the same procedure as was followed by the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing and the other people I have mentioned? If the Board of Trade and Arbitration in future gives a decision that is unfavourable to employers of labour, what can we expect?

[Mr. Dash.

We know from statements made by Government members that it is proposed to amend the present Industrial Arbitration Act, and I would not be surprised to find them mutilating that Act to such an extent that some of the awards will be made absolutely useless if not altogether repealed, because if they are prepared to do it in respect of the downtrodden worker—the rural worker is the most downtrodden worker in the community—they will not hesitate to do it in regard to other workers who are in receipt of better wages. If there had been a request from the Employers' Federation to intervene, then the Government should have done the fair and honest thing to the employees in the industry and filed a claim in the court under the provisions of the Act. But the employers were not prepared to take advantage of the Act. I do not think the employers have been in any way backward in appealing to the court. They brief the best counsel to draw up their claim and they employ the best advocates they can get to put their case before the court. The court then deals with the case, and the president of the court, who is a very able man, gives reasons for whatever decision is come to or whatever action is taken. The court listens to argument on both sides and is very careful not to do anything to cripple any industry. The Secretary for Labour and Industry cannot point to one industry that has been crippled by an award of the court. Rather have the awards of the court placed industries on a proper footing. They have given the honest employer of labour a fair chance of competing with the unscrupulous employer who is prepared to take all the advantages that he possibly can under the laws of the State. As a union representative appearing for many years in the Industrial Arbitration Court, I have found the judges of that court reasonable and at all times prepared to listen to argument. They have been very fair in their comments and always give sound reasons why they have arrived at their decisions. It must be remembered that a large number of awards have been honoured by the workers in industry, and I want to say that some employers also carry out the awards to the letter. During my experience we have only had to deal with those who were not prepared to do the fair thing by the court or by their employees. We strongly protest against the action of the Government in this matter, because the law is there. When they were in office they placed upon the statute-book the Industrial Peace Act, which debarred the workers' representative from appearing in the court if he was a paid official of the union, but at the same time they allowed the chairman of directors, whether he were a lawyer or not, to appear on behalf of the employers.

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

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, Wynnum): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.