

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 1935

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

2. What period of time is allowed Walkers Limited for the construction of such parts?"

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. J. Dash, *Mundingburra*) replied—

" 1. £555 15s.

" 2. Nine weeks."

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Fiftieth Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, Building Societies, and Industrial and Provident Societies, being for the year.

Fourteenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Main Roads, being for the year 1934-1935.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under "The Supreme Court Act of 1921."

Regulation, dated 17th October, 1935, under "The Trust Accounts Acts, 1923 to 1925."

Regulations, dated 9th October, 1935, under "The State Advances Acts, 1916 to 1934."

SUPPLY.

SEVENTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY—RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Hanson, *Buranda*) presented the resolutions, reported from Committee of Supply on Tuesday, the 12th instant.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I move—

"That the resolutions be now received."

Question put and passed.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The resolutions having been taken as read, The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I move—

"That the resolutions be now agreed to."

And hon. members indicating a desire to discuss Resolutions 2, 4, 5, 8, 14, 16, 23, 28, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 42, 45, 56, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it would be well that I should mention that these resolutions are being taken separately and each hon. member has a right to speak for forty minutes on every resolution, that the Minister in reply has the same time and his speech will close the debate on that resolution.

Resolution 1—"Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor"—agreed to.

Resolution 2—"His Excellency the Governor—Balance of vote"—

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Rockhampton*) [10.39 a.m.]: I desire to raise the question of the office of State Governor. It is not a new one, but it is very important, and a matter upon which I feel strongly. I think the practice of foisting an imported Governor upon the people of Queensland should be discontinued. It seems to me it is an insult

Mr. Larcombe.]

WEDNESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER, 1935.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. G. Pollock, *Gregory*) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

QUESTION.

CONSTRUCTION OF PARTS FOR LOCOMOTIVES BY WALKERS LIMITED.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*) asked the Minister for Transport—

"In reference to his answer to my question on Friday last—

1. What is the total amount of the orders given to Walkers Limited, Maryborough, for parts required in connection with the construction of locomotives at the Ipswich railway workshops?

to the intelligence, the manhood, and the national status of Australia. It is a constitutional impertinence of the first magnitude and should cease as early as possible. As the Premier is going to London shortly I suggest that his presence there will be a convenient opportunity again to raise this matter, which is important to Queensland and to all other States of the Commonwealth. I know that on previous occasions former Labour Governments have endeavoured to have the practice altered and induce the authorities to regard Australian citizens as eligible for that office, but their efforts were not successful.

The attitude of the home authorities is that they will not consider a change in the procedure unless a united request comes from all the States of the Commonwealth. I think that is begging the question. It is evasive and side-stepping, and we should not take that answer as definite and final. I think each State of the Commonwealth is entitled to determine its own policy in respect of this important matter, and it is absurd and inconsistent to deny the rights to those States that desire to bring about a change until all the States are agreed. One State could hold out and thus delay the reform indefinitely. That irritating, annoying, and disconcerting attitude of the home authorities is causing much apprehension and discontent in Australia, and is contradictory of our alleged self-governing power.

We have a very fine example of an Australian citizen Governor in the gentleman that now occupies the important position of Governor-General of Australia. That is a good example and a sound precedent that could be followed in the appointment of a State Governor. Sir Isaac Isaacs has undoubtedly been a great success. He has filled the position of Governor-General with ability and dignity and has controverted all the objections that were raised against his appointment, either personally or in principle, by sycophantic, snobbish snipers who attacked the practice of appointing Australian citizens to the position.

It has been suggested that there is some degree of inconsistency on the part of the Australian Labour Party, in making the request that emanates from myself and other members of the party, because it has from time to time elected leaders who were not Australian-born. There is no inconsistency at all. In such selections it was people of the Commonwealth and the States that made the choice. That is a vitally important distinction. If the people of Queensland desire to have an overseas citizen appointed as State Governor I have no objection, but I object to the home authorities imposing Governors from overseas upon Queensland and other States of the Commonwealth, irrespective of the wishes of the people. If citizens of other parts of the world are eligible and if the States of Australia desire to select them, let them do it, but there should be no coercion or forcing in the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two aspects of this question—that of principle, and that of economy. I have elaborated my view from the viewpoint of principle and my remarks have no personal significance. I am not reflecting on the present or any past occupant of the position of State Governor of Queensland. I am discussing the prin-

[*Mr. Larcombe.*

ciple, in respect of which I have elaborated my arguments quite apart from personal considerations. From the second viewpoint also there is a splendid opportunity for the people of Australia. They may economise by inducing the home authorities to inaugurate a change of principle and adopt the reform the Australian Labour Party and the Queensland Labour Government have endeavoured from time to time to bring about. If the principle were recognised of appointing, say, the Chief Justice of Queensland instead of an appointee from overseas, as the link with His Majesty that is now considered necessary, much money could be saved. The cost of Parliamentary Government in Australia to-day is approximately £1,000,000 a year and much of that money is expended on the office of State Governors and on Legislative Councils. We can do without both with advantage.

Mr. MAXWELL: With disadvantage.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LARCOMBE: With advantage. In Queensland for approximately fifteen years there has been no second Chamber, no Legislative Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LARCOMBE: Much of that £1,000,000 could be saved if we could effect the reform of enabling, say, the Chief Justice of Queensland to perform the duties required of a State Governor. To-day the position is entirely different from what it was prior to federation. We have a Governor-General who is a link between the Australian dominions and His Majesty and there is not now the same necessity to have imported Governors, with all the costs that surround the carrying out of the duties of that office. When federation of the Australian States was being considered, Sir George Dibbs and other statesmen thought it would be unnecessary in a system of federation to have the office of State Governor continued. That was a sound commonsense viewpoint and one to which effect should be given without delay. It is a reform that we should strain every nerve to bring about in Queensland.

It will be said that if we appoint a Queensland citizen as State Governor he may have been a party politician and therefore there may be a prospect of the office being dragged through the mire of party politics. That is an insincere and hypocritical objection. There is no such danger. Sir Isaac Isaacs is an example. Prior to becoming Governor-General of Australia he was a party politician, but in his high office he showed a perfect detachment and never allowed to obtrude the party political attributes that characterised his utterances in the Commonwealth Parliament when he was a member thereof. He has shown perfect detachment. He has thrown aside for ever the mantle of party politics and has filled the office with dignity and success. He was a brilliant scholar, a great statesman, and an eminent jurist, and he achieved marked success. One regrets the bitterness of the attack that was made upon him when he was appointed, and the prediction that failure would follow his occupancy of the office.

Again, we have the example of the Lieutenant-Governor in Queensland, Sir James Blair, who was a strong party

politician, but who since he has become Chief Justice and occupied the position of Lieutenant-Governor has never for one moment allowed party politics to intrude into his judgments or decisions, or into his outlook on life, social or otherwise. Therefore, I submit there should be no disqualification of Queenslanders and Australians. They should be eligible and should be given an opportunity to fill these offices, in the same way that Sir Isaac Isaacs was. I am confident that they would fill them with equal success.

The argument that it is possible that a Queenslander, being a party politician, would besmirch the office is further belied by the fact that the appointees of the British authorities have quite frequently been party politicians or men who have been in politics for many years. Take the present Governor of Queensland, Sir Leslie Wilson. He was a party politician for ten years in England, but that fact did not disqualify him. He has not allowed politics to intrude into the discharge of his office in Queensland. Nor would any true Queenslander of ability, experience, and standing allow such questions to intrude into the office to which he might be appointed. Then, again, the English authorities appointed Lord Stonehaven as the Governor-General of Australia. He was a party politician before he came to Australia. He came to the Commonwealth, carried out his duties well, returned home, and re-entered party politics. So we see that there is no psychological difficulty, that Queenslanders or Australians can show just as perfect a detachment from party politics as appointees from the other side of the world. Therefore, I hope that the Premier will raise this question in England and endeavour to make the change that I suggest.

In conclusion, I desire to say that the question is not a party political one. One of the most powerful advocates of the change I urge was William Watt, one time Acting Prime Minister of Australia, one time acting leader of the anti-Labour Party in this Commonwealth. He was most insistent upon the necessity for the reform, and other powerful leading lights in the anti-Labour Party have been just as emphatic in their support of it. I hope it will receive favourable consideration.

Mr. FOLEY (*Normanby*) [10.52 a.m.]: I desire to support the remarks of the hon. member for Rockhampton, and in doing so I do not wish to adopt any mean petty national outlook. I am not objecting to an individual. I realise that most of the men who have come from overseas to take up the positions of Governor-General of Australia and Governor of this State have been men of splendid character and have discharged their duties admirably and to the benefit of Australia. But there is an outstanding sentiment in Australia that Australians should be appointed to these positions, men with an Australian outlook who when touring the State or the Commonwealth will be able to communicate that same outlook to the rising generation. Most of our overseas Governors and Governors-General have undoubtedly had what one might term an imperialistic outlook, although there has not been any great evidence that they have endeavoured to obtrude it when making visits to different parts of the State, and the sentiment that we should have an Australian-born with an

Australian outlook in such a position is very strong.

As has been already pointed out, the Lieutenant-Governors of Queensland have carried out their duties with the highest honour to this State and the people generally. We have, therefore, shown to the authorities responsible for the appointment of Governors that we can produce men quite capable of filling the positions.

The Imperial authorities have decided that when the majority of the Australian States agree that the system of appointing Australian Governors should be adopted they will concur in that view, but why should Queensland wait until the majority of the Australian States are in agreement on the point? In my travels, at public gatherings, and in private conversation I have heard very strong views in favour of the appointment of Australian citizens as Governors of the various States, and in view of the very strong demand in this direction I suggest that the Premier raise the matter again with the Imperial authorities during his next visit to London. He should endeavour to induce them to alter their decision to concur in the appointment of Australian citizens only when the majority of the Australian States agree and to decide that if the feeling in Queensland is strong this State should have the right to nominate one of its citizens to this high office.

Mr. KING (*Maree*) [10.56 a.m.]: No political party can be accused of disloyalty in holding that the citizens of this country should be appointed to the high offices of Governor and Governor-General. I take the view that such an office should be filled by a gentleman who has rendered distinguished service to the State or Commonwealth. I do not suggest that that individual must be a native-born Queenslander or Australian, but he should be a person who has rendered a distinguished service to this country. I think it is recognised by everybody that the Government of a State are consulted by the home authorities before the actual choice is made, and the appointee always receives the approbation of both the State Government and the home authorities.

No one can justly criticise the appointment of Sir Isaac Isaacs as Governor-General on the ground that he was not capable of filling the position because he was an Australian-born citizen. This very eminent gentleman was born in the small town of Beechworth, in Victoria, worked assiduously, and by determination and ability became a learned jurist and statesman, and eventually was elevated to the highest public position in Australia—Governor-General. His term of office is drawing to a close, but in the evening of his life he has the satisfaction of knowing that he enjoys the undoubted confidence of all sections of the Australian public. There are many other eminent and reputable gentlemen who could quite fittingly fill the positions of Governor and Governor-General, gentlemen who have rendered distinguished service to this country, and on that account are more capable than others of understanding the requirements of the Australian public. A Governor from overseas has to acquire practically the whole of his knowledge of Australian requirements after his arrival, but—if a special knowledge is required for the performance of the office of Governor in a satisfactory and efficient

Mr. King.]

manner—the person who has given years of service to the State is better able to decide upon the requirements of our people and understand their difficulties than the most capable man from overseas. I hope that in the not very distant future a Queensland citizen will be appointed to this high and honourable position. I am satisfied that when his term expired no one would be justified in criticising his administration on the ground that it was inferior to the work that may have been done by any Governor from overseas.

Mr. POWER (*Baroona*) [11 a.m.]: In supporting the criticism of the appointment of Governors from overseas I have no intention or desire to cast any reflection on the present occupant of the office of Governor of this State. It has been said, and will be said again, that the appointment of a local gentleman as Governor will savour of party politics. Let us analyse the appointments made from overseas over a number of years. Their politics have always been of the Conservative type. They have usually sat in the British House of Commons or House of Lords, and have not been supporters of the Labour Party. We have in Australia men with qualifications equal to those of any imported gentleman. An all-Australian should be appointed to the office of Governor because he is more conversant with the wants and conditions of the people. I agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that some gentlemen who has rendered invaluable service to Queensland should receive preferment when the appointment is being considered. I have no hesitation in contending that the Chief Justice, Sir James Blair, would make a very excellent Governor. I hope that the Premier will use his best endeavours in having a locally born resident appointed to the office.

Mr. BRASSINGTON (*Fortitude Valley*) [11.3 a.m.]: The Labour Party stands for many well-defined principles, one of which is that an Australian should be appointed to the office of Governor-General or Governor. The party had the opportunity of putting that principle into effect when Sir Isaac Isaacs, the ex-Chief Justice of the High Court, was appointed Governor-General of Australia. Every citizen, irrespective of his political opinions, will agree that that appointment was one of the finest that has ever been made in the interests of the Commonwealth. Sir Isaac Isaacs is a big Australian, a man possessing many valued gifts, and he has filled the office in such a manner that it has been universally agreed that he has given in it still more splendid service to Australia. His appointment disposed of the argument often brought forward that Australians cannot discharge the duties of the office of Governor-General or Governor of a State. The splendid service rendered by Sir Isaac Isaacs proves the case of the Labour Party that future appointments to that high and dignified office should be made from among men resident in Australia.

Hon. members opposite very often attempt to make this very important question a matter of party politics. It is not a matter of party politics; it concerns a matter that is more important—Australian sentiment. Every citizen of this great Commonwealth who believes in its future destiny recognises that it must be developed to enable it to progress until it attains the highest possible

[*Mr. King.*

position among the nations of the world. The Labour Party believes in the creation of an Australian sentiment, and that being so we are on sound ground in advocating the pursuit of that objective by the appointment of Australian residents to the responsible office of Governor-General or State Governor. There is nothing wrong with that principle. It is sound and progressive and we can give as an example of its success the history of the practice in the United States of America, where Governors are elected by the people. Hon. members opposite cannot point to an instance where that principle has been against the best interests of those States. The Labour Party in Australia is not the only one in the Empire that believes that appointment to the office of Governor should be made from local residents: the principle is very strongly supported in Canada, another British Dominion. One of the Canadian provinces, Alberta, departed from the principle of importing Governors and appointed a local resident, the appointment proving successful. No argument can be adduced to prove that the principle is not sound or that it is against the best interests of the people.

Hon. members opposite continually assail the Labour Party for its attitude on this matter. The Opposition approve of the principle of importing men from overseas to carry out the duties of Governor in this State. Their imperialistic outlook determines their attitude; they regard the matter from an imperial point of view that is not in the best interests of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Prime Minister, Mr. Lyons, while touring the old country recently, hawked the position of Governor-General from one person to another, and became the laughing-stock of the people. Surely hon. members opposite do not approve of that conduct!

The appointment of Sir Isaac Isaacs as Governor-General of Australia was one of the finest that has been made in the history of the Commonwealth. That gentleman demonstrated beyond doubt that an Australian can fill the position with credit to himself and honour to the Commonwealth, and that the ties with the mother country are not impaired by such a choice.

I sincerely hope the Labour Party will have the opportunity of carrying out its policy, and that not only shall we have a Governor-General selected from the Australian people, but that our State Governors will be appointed from within Australia and will be men conversant with Australian sentiment and conditions. The principle is a sound one and is favoured by the Australian people. It is only opposed by imperialists who favour a policy that is inimical to the welfare of Australia.

Mr. WATERS (*Kelvin Grove*) [11.10 a.m.]: The principle advocated by the hon. member for Rockhampton is supported by the average Australian citizen. No reasonable, still less a cogent argument, can be put forward against an Australian citizen being appointed to the position of Governor of the State. In this regard I wish to refer to the indecent haste shown by the Moore Administration in appointing to the position of Governor of this State the present occupant of that office when the matter was one that should have been the concern of the incoming Government. The Moore Government had the audacity to appoint a

Governor instead of allowing the people's will, as reflected at that election, to be put into execution.

It is argued against the practice of appointing an Australian citizen to the office of Governor or Governor-General that some person connected with party politics might be appointed. It would be horrifying to the Opposition if a Labour man were appointed to the responsible office of Governor! Hon. members opposite overlook the fact that most of the appointments in recent years have been of men who had been connected with political organisations in the old country; if not directly connected with them as party representatives, they have shown allegiance to some brand of political organisation. Lord Stonehaven is a case in point. He was a very active member of the Conservative organisation in England before his appointment as Governor-General of this country.

The TREASURER: He is chairman of it now.

Mr. WATERS: Yes. He did not secure the post he aspired to, and as a sop he was offered the position of Governor-General of Australia. That is typical of the motives of expediency that have dictated the appointment of Governors-General and State Governors over the past twenty or thirty years. The present occupant of the office in Queensland was for many years a politician in England—many of his past successes were won in party politics—but that has not debarred him in any way from carrying out the functions associated with the office. There is the instance in New South Wales where a State Governor endeavoured to dictate a policy to the Government of the day. Lord Strickland was told to mind his own business, and promptly bundled home. Since then no Governor has attempted to dictate policy to the Administration.

No one can justify the appointment of any other than a local citizen. I would not restrict the appointment to a person born in Australia—no one should take that narrow viewpoint. Any Australian citizen, a man that has been resident in Australia and has had the franchise and has taken part in the development and the welfare of the country, should be eligible for appointment, provided he has the qualifications for the position.

Powers and functions of State Governors have materially changed in recent years. The powers are considerably lessened, and the responsibilities have decreased since federation, prior to which each State exercised the powers now possessed by the Commonwealth Government. Very definitely do I say that to-day the office of Governor is a sinecure, and there is no reason why an Australian citizen should not be entitled to the emoluments and the credit attached to the position.

Having regard to these facts and the fact that the office is merely a connecting link between the State Government and the Dominions Office the duties could well be discharged by an Australian citizen. I look forward to the day—I trust it is not far distant—when this Government will have an opportunity to give a lead to the other Australian States and appoint an Australian citizen to the office of Governor of the State of Queensland, just as a Commonwealth

Labour Government appointed an Australian citizen in Sir Isaac Isaacs to the office of Governor-General.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [11.17 a.m.]: When the referendum was being held on the formation of the Commonwealth of Australia we were told by all prominent men that a vote in favour of the proposal would enable the offices of State Governors to be abolished, and there would be a Governor-General for the whole of the Australian States. There is no doubt that this would effect economy. I am still of opinion that it would be a good thing if the States of Australia agreed to abolish the office of State Governor, and allow the Governor-General to act for all the States. This would mean that the Governor-General would live in each State for a period of the year. There is no reason why he should not. By so doing he would become better acquainted with the various States.

Those who advocate the continuance of the practice of appointing men from overseas consider that such an appointee on the expiration of his term of office, and on his return to Great Britain, is a very good ambassador for the State. It is contended that he is able to impart knowledge and information to the people in other countries and in that way does good service for the State. There may be something in that argument, but if any change is to be made, I favour the abolition of the position of State Governor. The expense of maintaining it would be saved, and the money could be used in other ways with benefit to Queensland. If the Treasurer is in favour of abolishing the position of State Governor, I suggest that he raise the matter at some future conference. The Governor-General could do all the work that is necessary, without being overworked in any way. He could assent to Bills, and negotiate with the Imperial Government on behalf of Queensland. I hope that the Treasurer will endeavour to bring about the fulfilment of the promise that was made to the Australian people prior to federation that if we approved of it we should be relieved of the responsibility and expense of a State Governor.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) [11.20 a.m.]: I congratulate the hon. member for Rockhampton upon raising this matter, and also hon. members opposite upon the unanimity with which it is being discussed. Every hon. member of the Opposition who has spoken this morning has agreed with hon. members on the Government side that some change should be made. It is gratifying to know that Parliament is so unanimous. I am not one of those who consider that the fact that a man has been a member of Parliament should be a bar to his accepting any appointment. I am prepared to believe that if a member of this Parliament was appointed Governor of this State the question of party politics would not be raised. If the Leader of the Opposition was appointed Governor of Queensland, I am sure that he would fill the duties of that position with the greatest success, despite the fact that he had been a politician for many years. On the other hand—instead of appointing a man who was partly an importation, owing to the fact that he came from Victoria—suppose that the hon. member for Stanley, who is a Queensland, was appointed. His photograph appeared in

Mr. Gledson.]

the paper the other day as being in the Vice-Regal party at the Melbourne Cup, and he looked exceptionally well with his top hat and spats. He is a Queenslander who could mix in society and take part in social events, and I am sure that he would do credit to the position.

I have come in contact with a number of estimable gentlemen who have been appointed Governors of Queensland. Everyone of those gentlemen, whether he had been engaged in politics or not, carried out his duties as Governor of Queensland without taint of politics. But that does not alter the attitude of hon. members on this side of the House. We do not cast any reflection upon any gentleman who has been appointed by His Majesty the King to represent him in Queensland, but we do say that His Majesty could select a Queenslander who would carry out the duties of Governor of Queensland as well as the men who come from the other side of the world. In fact, I consider that Queenslanders would carry them out more efficiently because they know the country, they know the people and the conditions they live under. Whenever an appointment is made from the old country the imported Governor considers his first duty to be to tour the whole of the State in order to become acquainted with the Queensland people and Queensland conditions. He is thus able to speak at social gatherings and at other places with a complete knowledge of their difficulties and requirements; and these are the major duties of a Governor to-day. The early Governors of the Australian colonies were able to exercise the power of life and death over Australian subjects, but in the course of time responsible government was evolved. In the very early days of Australia the government was that of the Governor and a nominated council, but to-day democratic rule prevails, and the will of the people is expressed through their representatives elected on the broad franchise. The Governors of to-day, as heads of the Executive Councils, have very definite instructions from the home authorities as to their duties.

I agree with hon. members opposite that the political outlook of the people of Australia has changed considerably since the days of federation. The appointment of an Australian citizen to represent the King in the high and important position of Governor-General has been so satisfactory that the people of this State have every right to insist that one of our own citizens should be appointed to the office of Governor. What sound argument can be adduced against the contention that a local citizen, born of British stock, imbued with ideals that are common to British people, and with a considerable experience of the conditions of our people, should be denied that opportunity? I am satisfied that we have amongst us many eminent gentlemen who could discharge the duties of that high office with credit to themselves and benefit to the people. Sir Arthur Morgan acted as Lieutenant-Governor and the Hon. William Lennon, a member of the Labour Party, also acted in that important capacity during the absence of the Governor. The Hon. William Lennon was a man of excellent business capacity, and was a member of this Parliament. He carried out his duties as Lieutenant-Governor with credit to himself, with honour to his party, and with benefit to the people generally. The Whip of the

[*Mr. Gledson,*

party opposite is a man who devoted a considerable portion of his time to his own business prior to his entry into this Parliament. His Majesty the King could, if he thought fit, appoint the hon. member to represent him in this country. What more fitting person could be selected for the important office of Governor than an hon. member who is able to say, "My business was always above-board. Nobody can point the finger of scorn at me for anything that I did while I was in business. I can hold my head up and say that everything that I did was right and proper?" He has performed his duties as a legislator in this Parliament in a very efficient manner from his point of view, and I am satisfied that he would endeavour, as a Queenslander, to carry out the duties of Governor with the same honesty of purpose.

We could continue talking about this matter for a very long time, but some hon. members on this side of the Committee are anxious to deal with other votes, and do not wish us to take up too much time on this important question. I hope that during the coming years we shall be able to say not only that we have men in Queensland who are competent to fill the high and honoured office of representative of His Majesty the King in this State, but that they have done so. I am sure that we should be able to say that no appointee from overseas could do it better. The people of Queensland as a whole would be gratified at the appointment of a Queensland citizen and neither the prestige of the State nor that of the Government would suffer from it.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*) [11.31 a.m.] : The whole system of appointing Governors from overseas is a relic of the colonial days when apparently the Colonial Office in London did not consider that there was anybody in Australia good or worthy enough to be a Governor of an Australian colony. The States of Australia have long ceased to be colonies and are now a Commonwealth—which means a republic, a term that has not been applicable to Britain since the Cromwellian days before the restoration of that Christian Monarch, Charles II., as King of England.

The whole system of importation of Governors could well have its reply if Australia, Canada, and South Africa said, "We intend to appoint the next King of England, but you are going to keep on paying for it." That is precisely the position here. Somebody else appoints the Governor-General of Australia or a State Governor, and the Australian citizen is graciously permitted to have the honour of paying his salary and upkeep. Generally, the status of the men so appointed—certainly the Governor-General—has been so mediocre that it is almost impossible to ask a man in the street who was the last imported Governor-General and get a reply—he cannot give you a name. The imported Governor has made such little effect on the whole course of Australian life that he is forgotten the day after his departure. Now the great shining example of a big man as Governor-General of this Commonwealth has only been shown in one case, the case of the present Governor-General, Sir Isaac Isaacs. His accession to that position must be an example to the Australian boy for all time. He was a son of very poor parents. Self-educated in the beginning, before he was

out of his teens he was earning his living by teaching men much older than himself; obtained university degrees, and was a practising barrister at twenty-four years of age, Attorney-General of the State of Victoria, Attorney-General of the Commonwealth, Chief Justice of the High Court, and finally Governor-General of Australia. All his predecessors—and the people who come after him if they are imported—will never have 1 per cent. of the importance or the effect on the Australian life of the future that the appointment and the services rendered by Sir Isaac Isaacs as Governor-General have given.

If we wish to behold the esteem in which Australian Governors have been held, we have only to look back on the people who have been appointed. Sometimes they were naval or military officers temporarily out of a job because, unfortunately, there was peace and not war, and at other times party hacks whom the British Government desired to placate with jobs, or get rid of as possible rivals and dangerous to have about the premises anyhow. And if we want to learn the general esteem in which the Dominions Office in London holds Australian Governors we need only look at the rate at which they appraise them. We have only to remember that the ex-Governor of New South Wales, Sir Philip Game, on his return to London, was promoted to be Commissioner of Police. Presumably a Governor-General on his return to England could be appointed a superior adviser to inspectors of nuisances.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [11.36 a.m.]: The matter raised by the hon. member for Rockhampton and the debate that has ensued are very important to the members of this House. The hon. member has drawn attention to an aspect of government within Australia that deserves the attention of every citizen. There has never been any ambiguity about the attitude of the Labour Party in Australia towards it. The appointment of Governors from amongst Australian citizens has been on the Labour platform for many years, both in Queensland and the other States. In short, that platform lays it down that so long as the office of Governor continues, a Queensland or Australian citizen should be eligible for appointment to it. There is no reason why an Australian citizen should not be appointed to any such position.

It is argued that it is desirable to have men who have not been associated with any division of political opinion within the Commonwealth. That argument cannot be sustained, for the simple reason that first of all you need men of ability, and that men of ability and strong character very naturally have definite political opinions, and express them, too; so that argument falls to the ground. Anybody who is worth while at all has definite views about politics and about the organisation of society of which, of course, political opinion is a mere expression.

We find in the judiciary, which is probably the most important arm of the administration of the law, men who have taken a prominent part in politics—both on the High Court bench and the Supreme Court benches of the States. Generally speaking, those appointments have been justified by results. There is no reason why a man who has been a prominent member of a

Government should not be eligible for the position of a judge, and when so appointed should not administer the law with ability, discretion, and impartiality. It is the duty of a judge to administer the law impartially and honourably, apart altogether from any opinion that he might have as to the wisdom or otherwise of that law. The same thing holds good of a Governor. There have been precedents in Australia for the practice for which we contend, and no one can argue that the States that established those precedents suffered thereby. In Victoria for many years Sir William Irvine carried out the duties of Lieutenant-Governor with credit to himself and advantage to the State. That gentleman was a judge at the time he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor, but previously played an important part in the politics of Australia, and was for a period Premier of Victoria. There have been examples of Lieutenant-Governors in every State, including our own, and Queensland has never suffered in consequence. The most recent appointment was in Western Australia, where the ex-Premier of the State, in the person of Sir James Mitchell, has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor. No one, not even his political opponents, takes any objection to that appointment, and no one can say that the Government of the day in Western Australia suffers any loss because the ex-Leader of a different party is Lieutenant-Governor of that State. We are all in favour of that practice; nothing but good can result from it.

It is quite true—no one will argue to the contrary—that the men who have been appointed to Queensland as Governors have been eminent men, and have carried out their duties with discretion, and invariably with conspicuous ability. To argue in favour of a locally appointed Governor is not to argue against the present incumbent of the position. Sir Leslie Wilson has occupied it with credit to himself and benefit to the State, and he has gained the encomiums generally speaking, of all sections of the community.

I think it was the hon. member for Dalby who made the suggestion that I might take the matter up, if I favoured it, at a Premiers' Conference. It has been discussed at various Premiers' Conferences. It has been discussed between the Governments and the Secretary of State for the Dominions. The Victorian Parliament on three separate occasions on non-party divisions, declared in favour of an Australian citizen being appointed Governor of that State. Probably the hon. member for Rockhampton will remember the occasion on which I personally raised the matter with Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for the Dominions, when he was visiting Australia. His reply was that the Imperial Government denied that any Australian citizen was debarred from any appointment they might make to Australia or elsewhere and were prepared to consider the appointment of Australians as Governors if a definite opinion of all the Governments was expressed in favour of it. That is the position as it stands to-day. Victoria, Tasmania, Western Australia, and Queensland have on former occasions recommended the appointment of one of their citizens and they can still do so. And that is the position that we as a Government take up. In the event of a vacancy occurring at any time in Queensland while the Labour Party remain

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

the Government a recommendation will be made in favour of the appointment of an Australian citizen to the position.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: There is no doubt full and probably favourable consideration would be given to such a recommendation. Members generally understand the practice of making the appointment. For many years past, as the result of one unfortunate appointment, it has been the practice to submit to the Government of the day the name or names of a gentleman or gentlemen that the Imperial Government propose to recommend to the King for appointment. If any objection is lodged by the Government to any of the nominees I assume the Imperial Government would not submit that name to the King. In the Commonwealth it is the function of the Commonwealth Prime Minister to make a recommendation and not the Secretary of State for the Dominions. If the Australian Prime Minister cares to exercise that authority he can make a direct recommendation to the King without the intervention of the Secretary of State for the Dominions, but in the case of a State the recommendation is made through the Dominions Office.

The functions of a Governor are defined in the Constitution and the instructions to Governors, but changes have taken place in recent years in the practice, particularly since the passing of the Parliament Act in Great Britain, the Act that abolished the veto of the House of Lords and sets up for all time that the complete control of finance lies with the elected representatives of the people. At that time King Edward VII. gave certain assurances to the Prime Minister and those assurances laid down principles that should be followed by Vice-Regal representatives in any part of the British Empire. I am entirely in favour of the filling of vacancies by the nomination of Australian citizens.

Resolution 2 (His Excellency the Governor—Balance of Vote) agreed to.

Resolution 3—“*Executive Council*”—agreed to.

Resolution 4—“*Legislative Assembly*”—

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) [11.48 a.m.]: As this may be my last opportunity this session I desire to bring under the notice of the House an incident that took place during the absence of the Premier on business of the State. There are many hon. members who understand the position. During the passage of the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill there was an understanding between the Home Secretary and myself that only the second reading stage would be taken last Friday, and that the Committee stage would not be taken last week. I am not blaming the hon. the Home Secretary, but I was very much surprised after having notified my leader and other members of this party that arrangements had been made by myself with the hon. the Home Secretary by which the Minister agreed that after the second reading had been completed the Committee stages would not be taken immediately, to find several hon. members of the Opposition informing me that it was the Government's intention to force the Bill through all its stages on that day. I ridiculed the suggestion. I said that the Home Secretary

had given his word to me and I did not believe it. However, to satisfy my colleagues, I telephoned the hon. the Deputy Premier and I said, “There is a rumour going through the House that it is the intention of the Government to rush the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill through all its stages in one day. Is that so?” The Deputy Premier said, “Yes.” I said, “That is not fair. It is not in accordance with the agreement I made.” I then told him that the Minister in charge of the Bill had informed me that if we got through the second reading on the Friday he would be perfectly satisfied, and the Committee stage of the Bill would not be entered upon that day, but would be taken during this week. The Deputy Premier said, “I am in charge of the House.” I said, “Very well, we shall see.” A man's word, Mr. Speaker, should be his bond, even though it may be to his detriment. I enter my protest and bring the matter under the notice of the Premier, and I hope that such a condition of affairs will not obtain during the second session of this Parliament. It places hon. members on this side of the House in a most invidious position.

I draw the attention of the House to the statement by the hon. the Deputy Premier, who was in charge of the business of the House—“There will be ample time for discussion of the Bill.” He also said, “There is no intention on the part of the Government to pass the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill through all its stages in one day. The Bill will be initiated in Committee to-day and hon. members will have an opportunity of discussing it again to-morrow.” I am no better than any other hon. member on this side of the House, but I want to say that if I enter into an agreement to-day, even though it was to my own detriment, I would adhere to it. An agreement was entered into by the Home Secretary and we were not given sufficient time to discuss the matter. The reason given by the Deputy Premier for not allowing us sufficient time was that two or three issues of “*Hansard*” were taken up by speeches of the Opposition that were absolutely valueless and waste of time. He also discussed the question of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill of 1929, which, he said, was gagged through before sufficient time had been given to his party, then in opposition, to discuss it. The first such Bill in 1929 dealt with salaries and, Mr. Speaker, that was not gagged.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It was.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is no good making inane interjections. It was not. I refer hon. members to 1929 “*Hansard*,” pp. 142 and 369. Labour members were then in opposition, and they discussed the matter. There was only one amendment and one division on the second reading and one division on the Initiation in Committee. On p. 2081 of 1929 “*Hansard*” appears the report of the discussion of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, No. 2, dealing with life passes on the railways and the privileges accorded to members of the Legislative Council. The then Opposition adopted the proper method. They called for five divisions.

If I were to allow the statements of the Deputy Premier to go without challenge, it might be imagined that practically the whole of the time of this session had been taken

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

up by members of the Opposition. To disprove such a suggestion, I find on going through "Hansard" that up to the time the Deputy Premier made the statement of which I complain Government members had spoken 303 times and Opposition members 360 times. When one remembers that it is the duty of the Opposition to criticise the measures the Government bring down, it cannot be contended that that amounts to a waste of time. Nor are hon. members opposite justified in contending that the resolution enabling the Government to put Appropriation Bills through all their stages in one day was passed because the Opposition wasted time. Such a contention is ridiculous. The Secretary for Public Lands accuses the Opposition of wasting time, but his speeches on the Estimates of his department occupied twenty-nine pages of "Hansard."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Estimates of my department are very important.

Mr. MAXWELL: That may be so. I consider that the hon. gentleman wasted time, and I assert now that hon. members opposite deliberately wasted time this morning with the object of preventing hon. members on this side from discussing more important matters. I should be wanting in my duty as Whip of the party if I did not ventilate this matter so that the people outside may know what is taking place. I am bringing it under the notice of the Premier, and I sincerely hope that any arrangement that is made in the future between a Minister and the Whip of the party on this side will be honoured. I do not blame the Home Secretary, but I do blame the hon. gentleman who was in charge of the House. I hope that we shall not have a repetition of such a thing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. P. Pease, *Herbert*) [11.57 a.m.]: I do not know the motive of the hon. member for Toowong in raising the matter to-day unless it is that he wishes to apologise to certain people because his party failed to discuss the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill in a proper way. Hon. members realise that in the absence of the Premier I am in charge of the House. I did not make any such arrangement with the hon. member for Toowong, as Whip of the party opposite. In any case, his statements are incorrect, because the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill was debated for two days. When I moved the resolution suspending the Standing Orders and giving the House power to pass Bills through all their stages in one day, I said—

"There is no intention on the part of the Government to pass the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill through all its stages in one day. The Bill will be initiated in Committee to-day and hon. members will have an opportunity of discussing it again to-morrow."

The Bill was initiated on Thursday and passed the second reading stage on Friday. The Opposition were not capable of debating the Bill, which was one of the best ever introduced into this Parliament. As Acting Leader of the Government I was quite prepared to allow it to be debated throughout Thursday, that was on the initiation stage, which after all is the most important stage of a Bill.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: We had not seen the Bill at that stage.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It was not a question of seeing the Bill. If ever a better exposition of a Bill was given than that given by the Home Secretary of the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill, I have yet to learn of it. The Home Secretary spoke for nearly an hour on the initiatory stage, and I am sure every fair-minded person will admit that it was one of the finest speeches ever delivered at that stage of any Bill. He gave hon. members a full explanation of the measure. As a matter of fact, he has been complimented on his speech, not only by members of the House, but also by people outside. After he had given his explanation hon. members opposite should have known the contents of the Bill from A to Z, but they were not game to tackle it. When the Home Secretary had completed his speech the Leader of the Opposition rose and spoke for twenty-five minutes. Three other members of the Opposition followed in turn and spoke in all thirty minutes. During the initiatory stage of the Bill hon. members opposite devoted fifty-five minutes to a consideration of it. Imagine my surprise to be informed at twenty minutes to 1 o'clock that the Bill had passed the first reading! The Opposition were allowed full discussion on the Bill.

Mr. MAXWELL: They were not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The hon. member may say so, but I have given proof of my assertions. The Bill was brought down for its second reading on Friday and it was debated fairly fully. In the Committee clauses 1 to 5, 7 to 9, 11 to 21, 23 to 27, and 29 to 36 were passed on the voices. The whole of the discussion by hon. members opposite centred round four clauses of a total of thirty-six, and if hon. members will read "Hansard" they will see that what I say is correct. All that hon. members opposite complained about was the personnel of the proposed commission, that there was no right of appeal from its decisions, and that it was to be clothed with very extraordinary powers. They were the only factors that they debated.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not true.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am quoting the truth from "Hansard."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask hon. members on my left to restrain themselves. There is room for only one speaker at a time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The proof is contained in "Hansard" itself. Only four clauses out of thirty-six were discussed by the Opposition. No division was called at any stage. It passed through the House after a very full debate. I believe that the hon. member for Toowong is really apologising to some interests outside who are chasing up the Opposition for failing to discuss matters that they consider to be in their interests. Otherwise, why did he get up?

The hon. member knows that so far as debates in this Chamber are concerned that it is his duty to confer with the Leader of the House for the time being. He never approached me about anything. As a matter of fact had the second reading taken longer than was anticipated I might have

Hon. P. Pease.]

considered adjourning the further consideration of the Bill. (Opposition laughter.) But the Bill was taken through all its stages and the House adjourned shortly after 8 o'clock. The object of the Opposition is merely to apologise to some interests outside because they did not discharge a duty with which they were entrusted.

The hon. member for Toowong made some reference to a statement I gave to the Press that when the Moore Government were in power they had not treated us, as the official Opposition, as generously as we had treated them. I remember the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1929, No. 2, being introduced by the then Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition, on the afternoon of the 6th December, 1929, without any notice whatsoever. If any one turns up "Hansard" of that date he will see that the hon. member for Aubigny made a very short speech in introducing the Bill—he made no attempt to debate it, he did not tell us what would happen under the Bill—and a division occurred at 5 o'clock the same afternoon. The Leader of the House then proceeded with the next stage of the Bill, moving its second reading without allowing the Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, to have a copy of it. Our Leader protested and said to the then Premier—

"Are you going on with this Bill before you circulate it?"

The hon. member for Bowen said—

"I rise to a point of order. The Bill has not yet been circulated and I contend the Premier is not in order in moving the second reading until the Bill has been circulated."

The Speaker of the day did not sustain the point of order and the Bill went through all its stages, second reading, committee, and third reading, notwithstanding that neither the Leader of the Opposition, nor the Opposition itself had received a copy of it. I find now that only three or four copies of the Bill were printed. This is the party that now prates about its rights. (Opposition laughter.) It is no wonder the Leader of the Opposition laughs, because the people realise that these tactics are not fair. Imagine a Bill dealing with the amendment of the Constitution of this State being introduced by his Government and the Leader of the Opposition not even being furnished with a copy of it! Now the hon. member for Toowong apologises for his party not being able to debate the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill. Why, they were not able to debate it, because it was such a good Bill. It was such an excellently drafted Bill that the Opposition could only debate three of its clauses, although, as I have said, we were prepared to sit longer, if necessary. The hon. member for Toowong, as Whip of his party, must realise that he must deal with the leader of the party for the time being. If his party occupied the Treasury benches his Premier would not expect us to deal with a subordinate.

Mr. MAXWELL: You were not in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I distinctly told the House when submitting a motion whereby Bills could be passed through all stages in one day that the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill would be presented on Thursday and passed through all stages on Friday. That was done.

[Hon. P. Pease.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [12.5 p.m.]: The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat said that a full-dress debate took place on the introductory stage of the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill. That is not so. You, Mr. Speaker, know that a Minister introducing a Bill gives only that information which he thinks is necessary. Generally speaking, only one or two speakers address themselves to the Bill at that stage unless the Opposition desire to stonewall it. In that case an amendment would probably be moved to delete the words "in certain particulars." So far as I know there was no intention of the Opposition to do that. I admit, as I admitted at the time, that the Home Secretary gave a long description of what was in the Bill. I was not in the same fortunate position as members of the Opposition, for it was only when I came to Parliament House at half-past 9 o'clock on Friday morning that I found a copy of the Bill in my locker. You, Mr. Speaker, know that a full-dress debate cannot take place on the introduction of a Bill, no matter whether it is important or unimportant. The next stage of the Bill in question was the second reading, which was moved on Friday. I was quite surprised at that fact, because I had just received my Bill. I had listened attentively to the Minister outlining its provisions, but I did not think it necessary to prepare amendments until the second reading stage had been disposed of. Later in the day I discovered that the Bill was to be taken through the Committee stage. That was not advisable from any point of view.

I prepared an amendment on clause 6, which I moved, and other amendments that were consequential to that amendment, if it had been accepted. My desire was to introduce a principle into the Bill to provide that the Licensing Commission would be able to prevent houses from being tied. As my amendment to clause 6 was not accepted, it did not become necessary to move the other amendments, because they would have been meaningless.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in going into details in a discussion of that Bill in this debate.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I desire to point out what happened. I think the Minister and the Deputy Premier were wrong in not adhering to the arrangement entered into with the Minister in charge of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I was never asked.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Minister in charge of the Bill had given an undertaking that we should not go into Committee after the second reading.

The TREASURER: The Home Secretary denies that.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I hope the Minister will come into the House and deny it. The Opposition Whip informed us to that effect.

The TREASURER: I think there has been a misunderstanding about the two days.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Deputy Premier bore out that statement when he said that the Home Secretary should not have dealt with it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I did not say that.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The arrangement was with the man in charge of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I said that the Whip should have dealt with me.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I agree that a matter of this sort should have been referred to whoever was in charge of the House. If the Secretary for Public Lands was not present, it was only natural that the Whip should go to the Minister, whom he would expect to consult the Leader of the House. I think that is the general practice. If the Home Secretary did not consult the Secretary for Public Lands, I do not think the Whip can be blamed. If the Home Secretary denies that he gave that undertaking, hon. members of the Opposition will have to decide whom they shall believe—the hon. member for Toowong or the Home Secretary.

I regret that members were not allowed to consider that Bill over the week-end. Last Monday I visited the country, and during my stay in Chinchilla a number of people spoke to me about the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill, and said that they had had no opportunity of protesting against it. I object to the rushing through of most important Bills before members have an opportunity of making themselves thoroughly conversant with their contents and preparing amendments that they desire to move. It is regrettable that the usual procedure was not adopted in regard to that important legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I wish to point out that I have noted an objection made by the hon. member for Dalby on two occasions during his speech that he did not receive a copy of the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I got it in my box on Friday morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is that Initiation in Committee stage was concluded not later than 12.40 p.m., according to the Chairman's book, last Thursday, and the Bills were distributed not later than 12.45 p.m., not more than 5 minutes later; and they were distributed to every hon. member in his place in the House. It is my function to see that they are so distributed, and if the hon. member was not in his place and therefore did not receive the Bill, I hope he will not say, at any rate, that those hon. members who were present did not receive copies of that Bill.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [12.12 p.m.]: The Secretary for Public Lands now says that he should have been consulted in regard to this undertaking. We were informed on the Thursday of the arrangement between the Whip and the Minister in charge of the Bill—and we are corroborated by the hon. member for West Moreton—that the Government had no intention of proceeding beyond the second reading stage on the Friday. Yet on the Friday morning we were informed that the Government intended to put the Bill right through that day. We were very annoyed about it. It was very difficult to have our protest recorded. We had lost our opportunity, the introductory stage having passed. Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I that the initiatory stage

of a Bill is not the time at which to discuss its main features. We did compliment the Home Secretary on having the courtesy—which is not often afforded to the Opposition by Ministers—to explain the main features of the Bill, but it is impossible to appreciate all the contents of a Bill by merely listening to a Minister.

The TREASURER: You had it next morning to go through.

Mr. RUSSELL: We had the Bill given to us after the conclusion of that stage and, being assured that the Committee stage would not take place on the Friday, we decided to go through the measure carefully during the week-end and have our amendments in proper form. As a matter of fact, an amendment I moved was ruled out of order by the Chairman. I do not agree with his ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSELL: At any rate I am pointing out—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not entitled to point out that he disagreed with the ruling of the Chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL: I am pointing out that had time been allowed us we should have been able to frame amendments that might have been in order, but it was impossible to go through that Bill overnight and obtain a thorough grip of the contents of it by the next day. It is a most intricate Bill and one section in particular contained a tremendous amount of very much involved matter. We could not understand the haste that was being displayed by the Home Secretary to have the Bill pushed through, after receiving an assurance that the Committee stage would be taken this week, especially as the business sheet contained, and still contains, many minor measures that had been dragging for a considerable time. However, they have been postponed in order that the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill could be rushed through.

The Opposition have very just cause for complaint. Members on this side should be allowed sufficient opportunity to digest the contents of such an important Bill, so that when the Committee stage is reached we can offer relevant amendments. We had no objection to the Bill's being put through the second reading stage on the Friday. The debate certainly was confined to the main principles, but the Bill was by its nature more of a Committee Bill than otherwise, containing as it did a great number of innovations. We were denied the opportunity of submitting amendments. Hon. members opposite may endeavour to throw dust in our eyes by citing what we did to them in 1927, when a Bill was put through the House before any copy of it had been presented. We might have been somewhat hasty in regard to that Constitution Act Amendment Bill, but it concerned the very minor matter relating to gold railway passes of ex-members of Parliament and there was no need to prolong the agony. There is no comparison between that and the matter of the many revolutionary principles of the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill. It is impossible for members to apply themselves to the main principles of a Bill merely by listening to the remarks of the Minister. We are not expert shorthand writers and have to rely a good deal on our memories. It is true

Mr. Russell.]

that we said that some of the provisions of that Bill were good, and on the second reading stage we merely amplified what we had said at the initiatory stage. It would have been useless to indulge in repetition and we considered the appropriate time to go into detail thoroughly was the Committee stage. There was no opportunity between midday Thursday and Friday morning to get our amendments ready. The Bill was of such a revolutionary nature that one wonders why so much undue haste was displayed in pushing it through all its stages on the one day and that other matters on the business sheet were postponed in order that it could be passed.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [12.18 p.m.]: The Whip of the Opposition Party has made a complaint with regard to the arrangement of business in the House. Any hon. member who has had ministerial experience knows that the Leader of the House for the time being is the person who organises the business for the day. It is quite competent for me, for example, to make arrangements with the Opposition Whip that we shall adjourn at a certain time during the day, provided the business has reached a given point. Such negotiations are conducted from time to time, and any agreements that are made are always honoured so far as this Government are concerned. I do not think the hon. member for Toowong can cite one occasion on which any arrangements that had been made were not properly carried out. Obviously, such arrangements are made subject to certain conditions. Suppose for argument's sake that we are dealing with the second reading of a Bill. As Leader, I say to the Whip of the Opposition, "Provided the second reading of this Bill goes through to a certain point to-day, we can adjourn." That proviso, of course, is necessary; otherwise the Opposition could secure an adjournment of the House at any time they desired and, by stone-walling, hold up the business. In other words, the arrangement is contingent upon reaching a certain stage of the business prior to adjournment.

I shall now deal with the specific complaint made by the hon. member for Toowong. He stated that the Home Secretary arranged with him not to go into Committee on Friday. I have been in touch with the Home Secretary, and he points out that the arrangement he made with the hon. member for Toowong had reference to Thursday's business. It will be remembered that on the morning of Thursday, the Deputy Leader of the Government moved that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent Bills passing through all their stages in one day. That motion, which was quite the usual motion for that time of the year, was carried. A Bill was then initiated in Committee by the Home Secretary, and apparently hon. members of the Opposition were concerned as to whether he intended to go right through all the stages of that Bill that day. The Home Secretary informs me that the assurance that he gave to the hon. member for Toowong was to the effect that he would not go beyond the initiatory and first reading stages on the Thursday.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is not true.

The TREASURER: That is what the Home Secretary tells me. Obviously, there

[*Mr. Russell.*]

is a misunderstanding on the part of the hon. member for Toowong.

Mr. MAXWELL: Not at all.

The TREASURER: Does the hon. member suggest that he is infallible?

Mr. MAXWELL: No, I do not.

The TREASURER: It is quite possible for anybody to have a misunderstanding about any arrangement; but the Home Secretary definitely assures me that the only information that he gave the hon. member for Toowong in this particular was to the effect that he did not propose to go beyond the initiatory and first reading stages on Thursday, and that assurance followed upon the carrying of a motion enabling a Bill to go through all its stages in one day.

What is the position? The second reading of the Bill was called on Friday. The Bill was then open to debate by every hon. member of this House. I suggest that certain people are trying to work up a kind of ramp on this matter, because, coming up in the train from New South Wales, I read in the Press that the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill had been gagged through the House. The gag has only been moved in this House on one occasion this session—I am subject to correction by you, Mr. Speaker—whereas during the period that the Moore Government were in power they moved the closure pretty nearly every day and, as you remember, Mr. Speaker, even when we called, "Divide," we were even deprived the right to have a division. Those were the methods adopted by hon. members opposite! I say that the suggestion that this Bill was gagged through the House is simply a falsehood. Such a statement appeared in an article in the Press, and I notice that later on the Deputy Leader of the House made a statement to the Press about that article. So that it was a falsehood to declare through the Press that the Bill was gagged. On the second reading of the Bill every hon. member of the Opposition and every hon. member on this side of the House had the right to speak for forty minutes. They did not exercise that right. (Laughter.) The Leader of the Opposition cannot laugh these things off. He reminds me of a line in one of Goldsmith's poems—

"And the loud laugh that spoke the vacant mind."

He can laugh as much as he likes, but the fact remains that hon. members could have debated the second reading of the Bill for a much longer period than they did. The second reading was passed between 3 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon—I refer hon. members opposite to page 216 of the "Votes and Proceedings" dated 8th November. This is the record—

"Mr. Hanlon moved, That the Bill be now read a second time.

"Debate ensued."

There was no application of the closure and the second reading was carried on the voices. If the opportunity of the Opposition to debate the Bill had been limited they would have divided the House on the second reading of the Bill as a protest. If I had been the Leader of the Opposition and the scope of the debate of my members had been limited, I should have divided the House as a protest. However, they did not divide the House, and

that is an indication that they were satisfied not only with the Bill itself, but also that the Bill had been fully debated. Their complaint is thus effectively answered. The "Votes and Proceedings" further record these facts—

"Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

"Clause 6. An amendment made.

"An amendment negatived."

An amendment was moved and negatived on the voices. The Opposition did not divide the Committee on the amendment. If they had not approved of the clause they would have divided the Committee. If I did not approve of an amendment of a Bill I would call "Divide," even if I were the only member to vote against the question. That is the only means whereby a member of Parliament can place on record his opposition either to a Bill or to a clause. If a Bill, a clause, or an amendment is carried on the voices no hon. member can honestly say in the country that he was opposed to such Bill, clause, or amendment. The only way for an hon. member to record his dissent is by dividing the House or Committee. The journals of the House contain this further record—

"Clauses 7 to 9 agreed to.

"Clause 10 (new section 13).

"An amendment proposed.

"Amendment negatived.

"Clause agreed to."

Again without a division! There is this further record—

"Clauses 11 to 21 agreed to."

No debate of any kind!

"Clause 22 (new sections 47 to 49)—

"And Mr. Russell proposing to move an amendment . . ."

An amendment was moved by the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party and it was ruled out of order on the ground that it was outside the order of leave. Whatever hon. members opposite may say about the contents of a Bill and whatever may be their lack of understanding they should at least be able to frame amendments that are within the order of leave.

Mr. RUSSELL: I do not agree with the ruling.

The TREASURER: The hon. member does not agree! Can the hon. member blame me for his lack of capacity to frame an amendment that is within the order of leave?

Mr. RUSSELL: I say that it was.

The TREASURER: The hon. member reminds me of a Johnny who endeavoured to heckle a speaker in Hyde Park. When it came to question time he asked a certain question and received an answer. The questioner then said, "I cannot understand your answer," and the speaker replied, "Can you reasonably blame me for clothing your body in fine raiment and allowing your mind to remain in rags and tatters?" That can be said of the hon. member for Hamilton. He cannot blame anybody in this House for his lack of capacity to frame relevant amendments. I have often advised hon. members opposite to study the Standing Orders and parliamentary practice. If they did so they would not find themselves in difficulties so frequently.

The "Votes and Proceedings" further say—

"Clauses 23 to 27 agreed to.

"Clause 28 amended, and agreed to.

"Clauses 29 to 36 agreed to.

"Bill to be reported with amendment."

Mr. LARCOMBE: Just after 8 o'clock.

The HOME SECRETARY: There were only seven members of the Opposition in the House.

The TREASURER: I am informed that so little interest did the Opposition take in this Bill that after dinner on Friday only six or seven of their members were not merely present in the Chamber but in the precincts of it. It is quite obvious that their friends outside have been trying to ginger them up. They appointed a "ginger group" lately and apparently this "ginger group" has protested that they let the Bill go through when they might have made some propaganda out of it.

The Home Secretary quite definitely says that no arrangement was made by him with the Opposition Whip other than on Thursday.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: The Home Secretary told the Opposition Whip then that it was not proposed to take the Bill beyond its initiatory stages that day. I have endeavoured to describe events as they occurred and no eleventh-hour repentance on the part of the Opposition will convince any reasonable individual that their members did not get ample scope and time to debate the Bill.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [12.32 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has closed the debate.

There is one Standing Order I wish to quote. During the past three years various comments have appeared in sections of the Press in Brisbane as to the Government's gagging questions through Parliament. There appears to be outside this Chamber a grave misunderstanding of the position, and the time is ripe for removing it. Standing Order 142 states—

"At any time during a debate in the House or during the proceedings of a Committee of the Whole House, and whether a member is speaking or not, any member may move 'That the question be now put'; and, if Mr. Speaker or the Chairman is of opinion that the question has been sufficiently debated, such motion shall be put forthwith without debate; and if the motion is carried, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall forthwith put the question to the vote: Provided that such motion shall not pass in the affirmative unless by a vote of at least twenty-five members in favour thereof."

The "gag" cannot be applied by any Government unless the Chairman or Speaker is prepared to accept the motion for the closure. The Premier has always asked me whether I would be prepared to accept the closure before moving a motion because if the Speaker declined to accept a motion the Government would have no redress, for a

Hon. G. Pollock.]

motion to dissent from a Speaker's ruling cannot be discussed until the following day. Therefore, no closure can be applied in the House except on the responsibility of the Speaker, and I accordingly take responsibility for whatever has been done in that regard during my term. I would mention that only once during this session have I accepted such a motion, and on not more than three or four occasions during the whole of the three and a-half years I have occupied the Speaker's chair. That, I think, is a record of which no other Speaker in the last twenty years can boast.

Resolution 4—(Legislative Assembly)—agreed to.

Resolutions 5, 6, and 7 agreed to.

Resolution 8—“*Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—Immigration*”—

Mr. KING (*Maree*) [12.35 p.m.]: The subject of immigration is a very big one, although I recognise that the amount—£1,670—appearing on the Estimates for the purpose is a very small one. That is due to the fact that immigrants are not now coming into this State in large numbers. Consequently, the appropriation has decreased. Immigration has declined because of the prevailing economic conditions not merely in Australia but throughout the world.

I wish to pay a tribute to the quality of the immigrants that have entered Australia, particularly Queensland, in the past. They have made their homes here, helped in the development of this great State, and reared children who now people it. They laid the foundation of a real, solid Australia and a progressive Queensland. These people have played their part in a manly fashion and we should pay tribute to them. I trust that when the world-wide depression vanishes more people of the type of those that were responsible for the development of this great Commonwealth, including the progressive State of Queensland, will be induced to migrate to this country.

Resolution 8—“*Immigration*”—agreed to.

Resolutions 9 to 13, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 14—“*State Reporting Bureau*”—

Mr. KING (*Maree*) [12.38 p.m.]: I have had an opportunity of seeing the good work carried out by the State Reporting Bureau, not only in this House by the “Hansard” staff, but also in the law courts, where the proceedings are reported very fully and accurately. I pay a tribute to the members of the State Reporting Bureau for the efficiency that characterises their work, and am sure that the present high state of efficiency will continue.

Resolution 14 (State Reporting Bureau) agreed to.

Resolutions 15 to 22, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 23—“*Department of Public Works—Chief Office*”—

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [12.40 p.m.]: I wish to make a plea for greater consideration for country areas in regard to State schools and other public buildings. It appears that the Government before the last election overstepped themselves in promising that certain public buildings would

be constructed, because there does not appear to be much money available for that purpose. That is very regrettable, because many State schools in the country areas are overcrowded, and it is necessary that extra accommodation should be provided in the immediate future. I trust the position is not as bad as I am led to believe it is. I have in mind a case where the plans were drawn for a new school, but the matter was hung up for twelve months. As the result of much agitation an inspector was sent out to inspect the proposed site, and that official realised the need for the immediate erection of a new school owing to the tremendous increase in attendance during the past twelve months or two years, but now the people have been told no funds are available for that building.

The Attorney-General is aware of the condition of some Government buildings at Nanango, because when visiting that centre in company with me he inspected the court house, where the ravages of white ants were so severe that the hon. gentleman was able to put his fist through some of the boards. He assured the people who were there that the building would either be repaired immediately or renewed. As a matter of fact, it would be impossible to make a good building out of it by merely repairing it. I am now astounded to find that the work is to be hung up for probably another twelve months, because funds are not available. This is very regrettable, especially because it has the effect of inducing country residents to leave the country centres for the larger cities and towns, where suitable accommodation is provided. I hope the Government will see to it that this building is attended to even at the expense of neglecting some work in a larger centre for the time being.

I again mention particularly the case of a school at Durong South, which is situated far from the railway. It would be an impossibility to send the children in the locality to another school. I trust that the Government will give the matters I have mentioned serious consideration, and will act to a greater degree in the interests of those who live in the country districts as compared with city dwellers.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [12.45 p.m.]: I lodge a protest against the expenditure on public works being used for political purposes just prior to or during an election period. Last year no small job in connection with State schools could be got through. It appeared as if all money was required for spectacular work in advertising the Government. Certainly it was put forward that the expenditure on these large works was for the purpose of providing work for the unemployed. We are now informed—after the election—that all the available money has been allocated for the completion of works commenced prior to the campaign. The Department of Public Works should not be the channel for the expenditure of money only at a certain period. The expenditure should be spread over the year, and then only on necessary works. Plans and specifications for additional accommodation at the State school at Sherwood were prepared twelve months ago. Children are at a great disability if they are taught under buildings on concrete floors and subject to cold and hot blasts of air. During the winter the concrete intensifies the cold. The present State school at Oxley has been in existence sixty

[*Hon. G. Pollock.*]

years. It is almost possible to read a newspaper at night by the light of the moon filtering through the walls. Plans were prepared for a new building, but we are informed that all the available money is required for some other purposes. The hon. member for Nanango raised a similar protest in regard to country schools. It is absolutely wrong that all the money should have been allocated before the financial year is half gone.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Enoggera*) [12.48 p.m.]: I am very sorry that the hon. member for Oxley has not been able to carry out his work as a member of Parliament as effectively as he might have done. He adopts the policy of reviewing his work and complaining that it is not to his satisfaction. The Department of Public Works has done a fair amount of good in providing work for unemployed.

I have a suggestion to submit to the Government that provision be made on the Estimates for next year for the erection of a new school at Gordon Park. I understand that the Government propose to erect a new school at Stafford upon an area of ground that in ten or fifteen years' time will not be sufficient to meet the needs of the district. If that school was erected in an area at Gordon Park, which is only 300 or 400 yards from Stafford, the Government would have an area that would be sufficient to meet the requirements of both districts for many years to come. Too much attention has been focussed upon providing for present needs; too little has been paid to the future. I raise this question this morning in the hope that a school large enough to cater for the needs of the future may be built.

Mr. POWER (*Baroona*) [12.49 p.m.]: In the early stages of this session, hon. members opposite complained about the expenditure of loan money, and said that before very long the State would be bankrupt. Now we find the hon. member for Oxley advocating the construction of a new school at Sherwood. It is hard to understand the attitude of hon. members opposite. They are always somersaulting.

Mr. NIMMO: By erecting a school at Sherwood you would be more equally distributing the money.

Mr. POWER: I am sure that the Minister is attending to those cases that he considers to be most urgent. It is all very well for the hon. member for Oxley to say that a school has been in existence for sixty years; similar remarks could be made of the whole of Queensland. I hope that something will be done to carry out the work that is urgently required at the Petrie Terrace Boys' State School, but I have every confidence in the Minister's ability to see that the right thing is done by all areas.

I rose to show the inconsistency of hon. members opposite in complaining about the expenditure of loan money, and then asking for public works in their electorates.

Mr. WATERS (*Kelvin Grove*) [12.52 p.m.]: It is very interesting to hear the suggestions of hon. members opposite that buildings have been erected in the city while country districts have been neglected. That is not correct, and the hon. member for Oxley displays an ignorance of the machinery of government. The Department of Public Works has a splendid record of achievement

for the last three or four years. It has erected excellent buildings, not merely in the cities, but in all parts of the State, and I hope that the programme will be continued on the same lines. I consider that in times of depression, when the unemployment figures are abnormally high, it is the Government's duty to carry out an extensive public works programme. The new building for the Department of Agriculture and the building at Anzac Square are wonderful achievements and are both necessary. Hon. members opposite complain that while these buildings are being erected in the city the country districts are being neglected, but it is obvious that as the Government extend their activities and new departments grow up, they must be housed in suitable premises.

The Government are to be congratulated on their foresight in embarking upon a vigorous programme of public works during the present time when building costs are relatively low, but the Opposition are sternly opposed to the policy because they know that it will provide employment for the people. During their term of office they spent less loan money on public works than was spent by any Government over the past twenty-five years, and thereby denied the people opportunities to obtain much needed employment. The present policy of the Government can be justified on the ground that the money is being wisely spent and that in the erection of public edifices that will be a monument to their capacity and administrative ability they are providing useful employment for our citizens who would otherwise be unemployed. In addition to the artisans directly employed in building construction employment is also provided for a large number of people engaged in subsidiary industries manufacturing material and equipment. I know that hon. members opposite are very apprehensive, because the policy is bound to be successful, but they had an opportunity of embarking upon a similar policy between 1929 and 1932 and failed to do so.

Mr. EDWARDS: They did do so.

Mr. WATERS: They did not. They failed to seize the opportunity to embark upon a similar policy, which must have been of an immense benefit to many people who were unemployed for a long time. They pursued a policy of deflation, because they were not concerned about improving the conditions of the people. They should have realised that many countries throughout the world had adopted a similar policy to ours, because they conceived it to be the duty of Governments during times of depression to engage upon a vigorous public works programme so that the people could be helped. If the Leader of the Opposition had had that foresight and breadth of vision that a Premier should possess he would have understood the changed and changing conditions throughout the world, and would have decided to embark upon an important programme of public works so as to increase the volume of employment for the people.

The work of maintaining public buildings throughout the State is proceeding in a very efficient manner. The people are convinced that the policy pursued by the Secretary for Public Works is calculated to confer the greatest benefit on the community.

Mr. Waters.]

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) [2.0 p.m.]: I was rather interested to hear the hon. members for Nanango and Oxley complain that no public works or buildings had been carried out in their electorates. The departmental report discloses that the opposite is the case. It says—

"The past financial year, from 1st July, 1934, to 30th June, 1935, has been responsible for another heavy building programme much in excess of anything previously attempted."

That is indicative of the heavy works programme completed during the year and in contradiction of the statement of the hon. member for Nanango. The hon. member for Oxley complained that whereas plans had been drawn for a new school at Sherwood the work had not been proceeded with. He also said that at nighttime he could read through the cracks in the walls of the State school at Corinda. I do not know what he was doing there at nighttime "all by himself in the moonlight." Inspectors of the department are continually visiting State schools, and had the hon. member brought those facts before the department an inspector would have been despatched to investigate it. I am quite sure that no inspector would allow any State school building to fall into such a state of disrepair.

The report gives an interesting resume of the work carried out by the department last year, which it summarises thus—

"The greatest activity in building construction in any one year in the department's history.

"The highest loan expenditure by the department in any one year.

"The highest number of employees in any single year's pay sheets.

"The highest return in number and value of individual permanent buildings yet recorded.

"A definite advance in construction methods throughout the State.

"The full absorption of loan and revenue allocations approved by Parliament."

That statement speaks for itself and discloses that the department last year established a record. At times departmental expenditure falls short of the appropriation by Parliament, but in this case the whole of the appropriation was expended.

The record of the department last year was a record also in the architectural improvement of our public buildings. That fact is exemplified in the very fine report of the department, which though not very large contains illustrations of very fine buildings that have been erected in all parts of the State. There is an illustration of the new nurses' quarters at the Gympie Hospital, which is obviously a credit to the department. There is an illustration also of the Women's Hospital now in course of construction in Brisbane. The building is a very fine one and will be second to none in the Commonwealth, not only in architectural design but in utility. In fact, reports state that the building itself will be unsurpassed by any other of its kind in the Southern hemisphere. An improved type of teacher's residence is shown in the illustration of the new residence on the Townsville Railway Estate. The design is in

[Mr. Gledson.

contrast with the old teacher's residence and has wide verandas and every comfort. It also possesses the latest villa front. As the hon. member for Rockhampton reminds me, this building has been specially designed for the tropics and will enable the teacher to live in comfort that was denied him previously.

The picture of the new dormitory for farm boys at St. Lucia portrays an airy and spacious building with ample veranda space. Were it not for the fact that the Torwood Police Station building has "Torwood Police Station" painted on it, one might easily assume it was the residence of a professional or business man. The department also deserve commendation for the beautiful Baby Clinic building in Herschell street, Brisbane. It was many years before a suitable site could be obtained for that building, which provides ample accommodation and an excellent environment for those people occupying it.

Another item that interests me is the new police station under course of construction in Toowoomba. The department has been requested to erect similar buildings in Ipswich, and I understand that work will be carried out when money is available. The new police station at Toowoomba will stand as a monument to the administrators and artisans of the department, from the Minister down. The hon. member for Rockhampton will no doubt be pleased when the new police court is completed at Rockhampton. The picture indicates a very square building, but I dare say that is most desirable from the point of view of utility. At any rate, as the hon. member for Rockhampton says, the department has given them a square deal in erecting that building. The building of a new police station at Dalby indicates that the activities of the department are not confined to the centres of Brisbane, Cairns, and Toowoomba, but extend into the country areas. I have had an opportunity of inspecting the Government buildings at Cairns, which have been constructed on a most pleasing design and are a credit to the department. It is obvious that our public buildings are being designed with due regard to aesthetics as well as utility.

If the hon. member for Oxley reads the report of the department he will find that the first section of the Nundah State School—the foundations of which have been built to carry a three-story building that will be sufficient to meet the requirements of that district for many years—has been completed. That indicates the nature of the work that is being carried out outside the city area.

The PREMIER: There is a new State school at Yeronga.

Mr. GLEDSON: The Premier reminds me that a very fine school has been erected at Yeronga in the electorate of the hon. member for Oxley. The hon. member gave much credit to the department at the time for the building, but to-day he criticises it for allowing a number of Government buildings to get into a state of disrepair. I do not want to belabour the matter, or take up the time of hon. members, but the report shows a very fine intermediate school at Victoria Park and State schools at Oakleigh and Ipswich. There is nothing monotonous in their design. They are not built to standard. Each one fits in with its surroundings, and has proper regard to its

purpose. Before any plan is drawn up officers of the department inspect the site.

At the present time an extremely well-constructed building is being erected in Anzac Square. This is to accommodate certain Government departments, and the design is adapted more to utility than beauty, although beauty has by no means been overlooked. The officers of the department are also to be congratulated upon their work in the block of buildings in William street used by the Department of Agriculture and Stock. The original building was erected many years ago. The Department of Public Works is not only concerned with the erection of school and other departmental buildings but, as shown by the report, has also undertaken the erection of hospitals for the Home Secretary's Department. A number of maternity wards have been built throughout Queensland. As in the case of Government offices and school buildings, the officers of the department inspect the site or the buildings to be altered and design accordingly. The officers of both departments collaborate, and the result has been very fine maternity wards in various centres of the State. Working also in conjunction with the Home Secretary's Department the Department of Public Works has been responsible for the erection and equipment of dental hospitals. Hon. members opposite no doubt would like some of these social conveniences in their areas, and I am at one with them in that respect. The Home Secretary has intimated to me that my centre is fortunate in this respect, and I understand that in the near future officers of the Department of Public Works will be working on the erection of a dental clinic at Ipswich. I understand the clinic in Teewoomba is a credit to the officers of both departments.

Last year a large sum of money was expended upon the erection of schools, school buildings, and teachers' residences throughout the country centres by the Department of Public Works—in many cases by local labour under the supervision of departmental officers. The works programme in the country districts was greater last year than ever before in the history of Queensland. We find from the report that the cost of the schools has been considerably greater than the amount usually expended. One school was estimated by the Department of Public Works to cost £16,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: Where is that?

Mr. GLEDSON: In Ayr. In one country centre alone £16,000 was spent on a school! It cannot be contended that the Department has confined its activities to Queen street, Brisbane! In other centres, the department has remodelled and considerably improved school buildings. When I was a lad first attending school in Queensland, the buildings were only about 1 ft. from the ground, the windows between 9 and 10 inches wide at the most, and one had to peer at one's slate and school work until one did not know whether one's eyes were in one's head or not. That condition of affairs has been altered by the Department of Public Works. Buildings that are erected nowadays are designed for the comfort of both students and teachers, and ample ventilation and light are given. Many existing buildings have also been brought up-to-date in these respects.

As a further indication that the department is not confining its activities to the city, we find in this report that the sum of £1,684 was expended upon the erection of a domestic science and manual training school at Babinda, and lavatory blocks with sewerage installations costing £1,635 were erected in the same district. In the Ipswich district, new lavatory blocks were erected, and septic systems installed at the Central Girls' School and Central Boys' School. Everyone will agree that that policy is to be commended.

I take this opportunity to thank the Minister and his officers for the splendid work they have done in constructing buildings and providing up-to-date conveniences. No part of the State has been neglected. The department has catered for districts in the South, Central, and North. A new school was erected at Bundaberg North at a cost of £1,180, and another at Burleigh, a seaside resort that caters for the holiday requirements of many children from the out-back parts of the State. There was no Government school building at Burleigh for many years. I passed through Burleigh the other day and I noticed that it was completed, that the grounds are being improved, and it would appear that it will be ready for the children in the very near future. The estimated cost was £1,340. I do not think that any children are attending the school at the present moment. The report also indicates that a new school was erected at Parramatta, just outside Cairns, at a cost of £1,517. The department was instructed to erect a building with accommodation for 560 pupils—quite a large number. The Western districts have not been overlooked. A domestic science and manual training building has been constructed in conjunction with the Charleville State School at a cost of nearly £1,000.

All these buildings have been constructed on modern lines. Many years ago, when the system of rural schools and domestic science and manual training was adopted, the work was carried out in little dingy rooms under school buildings. At times there was not enough natural light to enable the teachers to carry out their work in a proper manner and artificial light had to be frequently used. The Department of Public Works has now constructed modern kitchens with up-to-date culinary equipment, including convenient cupboards, racks, and lockers. The buildings are well ventilated and in manual training schools convenient benches have been built for carpentering, tin-smithing, leather work, and other trades, and very attractive cupboards have been constructed to enable the students to display their work. These modern buildings and equipment have not been provided only in the electorates represented by members of the Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why should they be?

Mr. GLEDSON: I am pointing out that that is not so, because I understood that the hon. member for Oxley complained that similar improvements had not been carried out at the Sherwood and Oxley State Schools as in other electorates. The Department of Public Works is giving attention to every electorate throughout the State. Take the Childers State School, the remodelling of which is in progress at an estimated cost of £3,110. That estimate is three times in excess of what is being spent on some schools

Mr. Gledson.]

in the electorates represented by Government members.

Mr. MAXWELL: What are you stonewalling for?

Mr. GLEDSON: I should be one of the last hon. members to indulge in stonewalling tactics. (Opposition laughter). I am pointing out certain facts of which I considered this Committee should be cognisant. The hon. members for Oxley and Nanango complained that public works were not being done in their electorates. I am giving proof of the contrary. The £3,110 being spent on the Childers State School is not for the erection of a new building; it is to remodel the old building to enable the whole of the school practice to be modernised. Then I find that the Coolangatta State School in the Albert electorate is being added to and remodelled at a cost of £1,505, and domestic science classes have been established. The old building was erected on a hill, and as it was so small the teachers had to take several classes on the ground floor. The remodelling will enable woodworking and domestic science classes to be conducted. The report also discloses that the Dalby State School is being remodelled, with additions, at an estimated cost of £3,811. Hon. members will admit that that is a considerable sum of money to expend in that centre, but Dalby is a growing district, and the department recognises that its public buildings must be in keeping with its importance. So it is being remodelled to provide seating accommodation for 408 primary and sixty-four high school pupils. The ventilation and lighting of the old building, which were far from satisfactory, will be made adequate, and will be better arranged. Previously the light shone in the eyes of the pupils, which detracted from their comfort and impaired their efficiency. The light will now shine over the pupil's left shoulders, and enable them to work in comfort.

The department is also doing work for the Gatton Agricultural High School and College, which is controlled by the Department of Agriculture, and is in the electorate of West Moreton. It is spending £11,442 in the construction of a new dormitory to accommodate additional students, and repainting the whole of the buildings. It is also proposed to erect a glass house in order that the students may study plant propagation under the climatic conditions that obtain in other countries.

The remodelling and additions at the Gordonvale State School are estimated to cost £5,100, and at the Ingham State School £3,965. The Ipswich North State School, when completed, will cost £12,900, and the sewerage installation at the Maryborough Central State School is estimated to cost £2,624. The remodelling and additions at the Murgon State School are estimated to cost £1,698. I congratulate the hon. member for Wide Bay upon having that work carried out. The cost of the domestic science and manual training buildings at the Pomona State School are estimated at £1,150.

I congratulate the department on the excellent work it carried out last year and it is continuing to carry out this year, for which it deserves the commendation of every member in this House.

[Mr. Gledson.]

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) [2.40 p.m.]: The hon. member for Ipswich spoke at great length on matters ranging from lavatories at State schools to kitchens at hospitals. I do not know whether the hon. member considered it was a very interesting dissertation, but it is only what one would expect from one who spoke with the object of stonewalling.

There is no doubt the department's report indicates that a good deal of money was spent last year in connection with State schools and public buildings generally; but it is also true that a large amount of money has been spent in the city, compared with the amount spent in the country. Thousands of pounds have been spent on public buildings in the cities but the hon. member could only mention one or two cases where money had been spent in the country. We are not worried about the amount that was spent; we do complain, however, that prior to an election the Labour Party always speed up expenditure in order to make it appear to the people that a wave of prosperity is sweeping over the State, but so soon as the election is over there is a curtailment, especially in country areas. The hon. member for Nanango has complained, and I complain, of the lack of expenditure on State schools in the country districts at the present time. In many instances I have been able to prove to the Department of Public Instruction that a new school building or repairs to an existing one are warranted, and the matter has been then referred to the Department of Public Works which informs me that work will be carried out when funds are available.

Funds are available at the present time for erecting buildings in the cities and towns, but unfortunately some country residents must lack proper facilities for the education of their children. A school and teacher's residence were authorised in my electorate some two years ago. Although I have worn out the carpets in the offices of the heads in the Department of Public Instruction I am informed that funds are not yet available. Yet immediately prior to the last election many works were undertaken.

It would be a very good thing if a sum of money were placed on the Estimates to be used by the Department of Public Instruction in doing small jobs on the buildings under its care, which at present have to be referred to the Department of Public Works for report. A great deal of red tape is used and costs are incurred in having an inspector of the Department of Public Works journeying to small schools in outlying districts to report on the need for a new rail on the veranda, or a new set of steps. The work could be undertaken by the Department of Public Instruction through the school committee, which could engage a local carpenter. I trust the Minister will have the suggestion adopted. It would be the means of providing better facilities for education in the country districts. We should look very thoroughly into the question of education in Queensland. This is a primary producing State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must remember that he is not dealing with the vote for the Department of Public Instruction, but with that for the Department of Public Works.

Mr. CLAYTON: If we ask people to go on the land and reside in country areas we

must provide proper school buildings for their children, and which are erected by the Department of Public Works. The adoption of the contract system has resulted in our being as successful as we are at the present time, but we can do a great deal more. Under this system the money available for public buildings can be made to go much further than under the day labour system. I venture to assert that school buildings in country districts are now erected under the contract system 40 per cent. cheaper than by day labour.

Mr. JESSON (*Kennedy*) [2.48 p.m.] In almost the same breath the hon. member for Wide Bay complains of the expenditure of money by the department, and that allegedly necessary improvements have not been made in his electorate. It is obvious that as he only returns to the House on Tuesday and leaves on Friday he has not bothered much about his electorate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: The policy of the Department of Public Works during the past three years has been to create work for the unemployed, and at the same time provide social facilities such as schools and hospitals.

It is a well known fact that public works create an improvement in trade, for greater employment means greater spending power in the people. So primary producers, manufacturers, and retailers all derive benefit from the revival policy of this Government. As I mentioned some days ago, the Tory Party in England are initiating a £24,000,000 public works revival scheme, having evidently realised, from their observation of the actions of Governments in what they may regard as unimportant parts of the Empire, that such a policy brings about an improvement in conditions.

The hon. member for Wide Bay, the hon. member for Nanango, and other hon. members opposite have suggested that the Department of Public Works is confining its activities to the city and giving no consideration to the country. That suggestion will not be accepted by hon. members on this side of the House who represent country districts. As a country representative I am very grateful for the work of the department in my electorate, and I think that in those words I express the feeling of the majority of hon. members representing country districts on both sides of the House. My district has been particularly well looked after. Schools have been repaired, painted, and kept in good condition. The Ingham State School has been remodelled and the buildings moved so that the children will not be so subject to the discomforts of wet seasons and extreme heat. The only other improvement I should like to see to that school is the installation of a dental clinic. The work at that school was carried out by day labour at a cost of £3,965—many pounds under the estimate. It will be completed within a week or so, when the school will be holding its jubilee, at which I hope to attend. A fine gang of men is working at that school, in charge of Mr. Rooney as foreman of works. They travel to outlying districts to effect urgent repairs, and the work at the Ingham State School is a credit to them and the department. This gang has proved conclusively that with the right men the day labour

system is far preferable to contract. I had experience of the contract system during the tragic period between 1929 and 1932.

Under the contract system we had to be out on the job all hours of the day, from early morning till late at night. One of the workers was paid 2s. a week more than the others to set the pace, and if we could not paint the same area or do the same amount of carpentering as he we were severely censured by the boss, and often sacked. At that time the labour market was over-supplied with the very best tradesmen the State could produce, but to-day it is very difficult indeed to get a skilled man. Under the contract system the employer insisted on the last ounce of blood and sweat, compelling his workers even to avail themselves of the full moon to nail on roofs, paint houses, and do other work. Carpenters were compelled to act as plumbers and painters too, and thereby restrict the opportunity of other tradesmen to secure employment. Hon. members opposite know that the majority of contractors are nothing more nor less than sweaters, and sweat their men for sixteen hours a day.

Mr. EDWARDS interjected.

Mr. JESSON: Judging from the appearance of the hon. member for Nanango I should say he has not sweated very much in his life. I have not had time to ascertain the total amount expended by the department on school buildings and other educational facilities last year. An Intermediate school, estimated to cost £16,000, is in progress of construction at Ayr, but the report does not disclose whether it is being constructed under the day labour or contract system. I am satisfied that if it is being constructed under the day labour system, and the gang of workmen employed is equal in efficiency to the men employed at Ingham, the department will be very well pleased with the results.

Domestic science and manual training buildings estimated to cost £1,684 are in process of construction at the Babinda State School. They will provide dressmaking and cookery rooms, a woodwork room, and a sheet metal workshop, and be of undoubted advantage both to the teachers and the pupils. The Government are to be congratulated on extending domestic science and manual training classes, and thereby helping school children to become more than square pegs in round holes, in that they are thus able to gain an elementary knowledge of the trades to which they may be apprenticed on completing their schooling. The classes offer considerable incentive to the children to prepare for the battle of life. In "the good old days," as some hon. members opposite term them, the children on completing their schooling, were forced out into the hard world to earn a meagre livelihood at selling newspapers or some other menial occupation, but, thank goodness, the Labour Government have abolished those bad practices, and the poorer children of our generation have an equal opportunity in life with the children of wealthy parents to prepare for the struggles ahead. A sum of £1,635 is also being expended on lavatory blocks and sewerage at the Babinda State School.

In his opening remarks, the hon. member for Wide Bay made some ridiculous statements about sewers and kitchens, but these

Mr. Jesson.]

are two very important factors in the life of the community. If children are not properly nourished and cared for they are unable to equip themselves with the knowledge needed to enable them to fight the battle of life. I am glad that the old, filthy, unhygienic, and insanitary methods have been cast overboard, and that the Government have decided that nothing but the best sanitary conveniences are good enough. The hon. member for Wide Bay remains in the same old groove, the single track, and will never get out of it as long as he lives. He does not believe in building good kitchens or improving the sanitary conveniences of State schools. I remember that when I attended school in the Hawkesbury River district we could always locate the sanitary conveniences with the aid of our noses. Thanks to a Labour Government, such conditions are rapidly changing in Queensland.

A new school is being erected at North Bundaberg at an estimated cost of £1,180. Children must be educated in healthy and congenial surroundings; their first impressions are the lasting impressions. A child reared and educated in bright and healthy surroundings will be better fitted for the fight for life than one reared and educated in uncongenial and insanitary surroundings, and it is the policy of the department to erect buildings that will give them that environment.

A new State school is being erected at Burleigh Heads to accommodate forty pupils, at an estimated cost of £1,340. I am pleased to note that the department has made provision for a folding partition in this school. Some time ago I made representations to the Minister to adopt the folding partition in many of our schools, but he told me that State schools were erected for the education of our children and not for the holding of dances. The Government should encourage social functions in State schools in the country districts. The fixed wall has been removed from schools in my electorate and replaced by the folding partition, which enables the school committee to organise weekly or fortnightly social functions. Many of the school committees in my electorate are hard pressed for funds. That at Garbutt's Siding, on the outskirts of Townsville, despite the economic handicaps of the last four or five years, raised enough from social entertainments to provide every child attending the school with books and material. Folding partitions also indirectly contribute to the educational welfare of the children. I am very pleased that the Minister has reconsidered his decision. The Parramatta State School at Cairns is having additions at an estimated cost of £1,517. The partitions in this school will also be of the folding type, so that my suggestion fell on fertile soil. Now that the partition has been removed the room will accommodate all the children when they are assembled to hear an address by a visitor, such as a member of Parliament, a Minister of the Crown, or a minister of religion; previously many of them had to stand in the sun.

The domestic science and manual training buildings at the Collinsville State School are estimated to cost £985. These buildings are similar to those at Babinda, with the exception that they are on low stumps. The work at Collinsville represents a fine effort to

[Mr. Jesson.

provide accommodation for the children who are obtaining their initiation into the trades they desire to follow. The installation of sewerage at the Collinsville State School is a progressive step on which both departments are to be commended. The schools in the south-west and north-west have not usually the advantage of such hygienic arrangements.

The remodelling of the Childers State School is estimated to cost £3,110. The work is in progress and when completed will provide a new class-room and make the school brighter. Labour's slogan is, "Brighter schools will make brighter children," and I am pleased to know that the Secretary for Public Works is giving effect to it.

The remodelling and additions to the Cunnamulla State School are estimated to cost £1,770, those at Dalby £3,811, and those at Coolangatta £1,505. The remodelling and additions to the Gordonvale State School are estimated to cost £5,100, the erection of the Ipswich North State School £2,900, and the sewerage installation at the Maryborough Central State School £2,624. I trust the Minister will be able to have the sewerage system installed at the Ingham State School at a later date. The remodelling and additions to the Murgon State School are estimated to cost 1,698, and domestic science and manual training buildings at the Pomona State School at £1,150. The sewerage installation at the Sandgate State School is estimated to cost £1,900. I am sure the hon. member for Sandgate was pleased to note that, and as I live at Sandgate I appreciate the efforts of the department.

The erection of a State school at St. George is estimated to cost £2,277, and a teacher's residence at the Southport State School £1,063. These works are characteristic of the treatment meted out to teachers in the country. In some places they have to ride several miles to and from school, and the farmhouses at which they are accommodated do not always provide congenial surroundings. The average school teacher is very intelligent and used to the comforts of civilization, and at a farm he has to get up early if he wishes to have breakfast when it is cooked.

The farmer comes home at lunch time and continues his work in the cool of the afternoon, and the school teacher has to wait until all hours in the night for a hot meal. As conditions are, such a state of affairs could not be avoided. Of course, the farmer cannot be expected to alter his routine, especially because in a great number of instances he charges the school teacher merely a nominal fee or nothing at all. Nor do I think the teacher would desire it. The majority of teachers do not whinge but adapt themselves to rural conditions. The present Government have realised that to get effective work from a teacher they must see to it that he is happy and contented. School teaching is recognised as being one of the most arduous callings a man or woman could follow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will have to connect his remarks with the vote under discussion.

Mr. JESSON: The provision of a teacher's residence adjacent to the school conduces to contentment, and the Department of Public Works is entrusted with the duty

of erecting a suitable building. A teacher's residence at an estimated cost of £1,065 is in course of erection at the Southport State School, with lavatory blocks and sewerage installations at £1,850.

A State school and teacher's residence at Toobanna, a sugar-growing centre 6 miles from Ingham, have been completed at a cost of £1,780. The old school was a small building on low blocks, and during recesses the children had to find shade under the mango trees in the yard. The new building is on high blocks and provision is made for a great amount of light and fresh air. The teacher's residence is a credit to the department. During the next fortnight or so I shall have the honour of officially declaring the school open, although the inhabitants of the district cannot be said to be favourable to the policy of the Labour Party, so that the suggestions emanating from hon. members opposite are refuted.

A new school is being erected at East Toowoomba, and additions are being made to the Warwick East State School. In regard to the latter, the report states—

"A new wing has been provided at this school, having three class rooms, with verandas on three sides and connected to the existing building by a covered way. The construction was of wood with iron roof, and the area under the school concreted and closed. The addition accommodates 120 pupils."

This speaks very well for the foresight of the department, for under the administration of Labour Governments the State will certainly progress.

The Department of Agriculture and Stock is spending £11,600 on extra office accommodation. Hon. members who take the trouble to walk down William street will see a very fine building that will help the officers of the department to carry out their arduous duties under better conditions.

The work of the department in the provision of baby clinics in country centres is to be commended. For many years I have agitated for the establishment of one at Ingham, but without success. I am pleased to say that a clinic has now been erected by the Country Women's Association and fitted out by the Department of Public Works. The need for that clinic is emphasised by the fact that the average daily attendance is 20.8. Since I have been in Brisbane, I have been astonished at the number of baby clinics in various suburbs. The buildings have been designed with an eye to hygiene, they are easily kept clean, and are a credit to their architects.

Some time ago I inspected the asylum at Goodna, and was very favourably impressed by the excellence of the building that has been erected by the Department of Public Works under the day-labour system. It is so designed that the warder in charge can supervise the whole of the wards without leaving a table in the centre of the room. Every comfort is provided for the unfortunate inmates, and the element of danger has been reduced to a minimum. Windows are set in cavities in the wall, and there are no sharp corners upon which the patients can injure themselves. The layout is such that fresh air and sunshine are admitted to the building and adequate protection is

provided against excessive heat. The building is certainly a credit to the department.

I was also highly delighted with the excellence of the work being carried out by the department at the Brisbane General Hospital, where many workmen are erecting a block of buildings that will be a lasting monument to the humane policy of this Government.

I did not intend speaking at such length upon this subject, but I felt it my duty to reply to the statements made by hon. members opposite who, speaking with their tongues in their cheeks, condemn the great work that is being carried out by the Government. If the money was being thrown away on useless "sand-shifting" jobs I should be the first to object, but it is being expended on a revival policy which has proved of great benefit to the State and the people.

Resolution 23 (Department of Public Works—Chief Office) agreed to.

Resolutions 24 to 27, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 28—"The Treasurer—Chief Office"—

Mr. WALSH (*Mirani*) [3.23 p.m.]: The main subject to which I wish to refer is the question of representation at the International Sugar Conference in London next year. I think it will be readily agreed that the results of the conference will have an important bearing on the future of the sugar industry in this State, and that it is essential that Queensland should be represented. In this House recently, the hon. member for Isis, who appeared to be speaking with some authority—as if he had been briefed by the sugar organisations—represented that no request had been made by the sugar industry that it should be represented at the conference. I do not wish it to be understood that I am speaking with the authority of the Queensland Canegrowers' Council, which is quite capable of looking after the interests of its own members. The hon. member for Isis was quite definite in his statement that he knew that no request had been made for anybody to go from Queensland on behalf of the sugar industry, but his statement was not in accordance with the facts, and I desire to take this opportunity of stating that as far back as September last a request was made by the Queensland Canegrowers' Council that Queensland should be adequately represented. The hon. member for Isis may doubt my statement, and to place the matter beyond doubt I shall read this letter, dated 25th September, 1935, to the chairman of the Sugar Board, Mr. Short—

"RE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR CONFERENCE.

"You will remember that in a recent discussion mention was made of the fact that it was essential our Queensland Government and the sugar industry should be as strongly represented as possible at the forthcoming International Sugar Conference, at which it is proposed to deal with the question of over-production.

"With this in view, our association requests your board to bring under the notice of the Government that we think they should make every endeavour to see that Queensland interests are well represented.

Mr. Walsh.]

"We understand, of course, that export quotas are more a Commonwealth matter, and that no doubt the Commonwealth Government has been asked to interest itself in the proposed conference."

I wish to stress this part of the letter—

"On the other hand, in this case it is the Queensland sugar industry's interests which should predominate, and we feel sure you will agree direct representation would be preferable.

"We realise that Governments interested will, to a considerable extent, be responsible for the personnel of any representation, and trust you will bring the abovementioned views under the notice of the Premier.

"Yours faithfully,

"R. MUIR."

That letter completely disposes of the contention of the hon. member for Isis.

In order to prove that the request has not come from only one section of the industry, I quote this telegram sent to the Treasurer by the Mackay District Cane-growers' Executive, of which I am a member—

"It is the opinion of the Mackay District Cane-growers' Executive that the Queensland sugar industry should be strongly represented at forthcoming international sugar conference to be held in London, as it is understood questions will be considered which may seriously affect the future welfare of this State's sugar industry. It is desired that you attend such conference as Queensland's representative, if at all possible. Kindly advise your views this request."

That executive represents about 2,000 growers, or approximately 25 per cent. of the total number in Queensland. It has no desire to dictate to the State or Commonwealth Government in the matter, but it considers that it has the right at least to make the request to the Premier.

I also propose to quote a letter from the Mackay Sugar Manufacturers' Association. The association is representative of all of the sugar-mills in the Mackay district, and I quote the letter to show that the industry as a whole, quite apart from the political views held by hon. members on this side, desires that the best possible representation be available to the industry at this conference. I know the members of this association personally, and to my knowledge not one of them supports our party. The following letter to a certain extent strengthens the request from the growers:—

"The Mackay Sugar Manufacturers' Association.

"Mackay, 9th October, 1935.

"The Honourable,

"W. Forgan Smith, M.L.A.,

"Brisbane.

"Sir,—At a recent meeting of this association—representative of all the mills in the district—reference was made to Press reports on the matter of representation of the sugar industry at the conference being convened at home by Mr. Malcolm MacDonald for the consideration of a scheme for the stabilising of sugar prices, and the suggestion

[Mr. Walsh.

that you be approached to attend the conference in the interests of our industry was noted, and I was requested to say that the members of this association are fully in accord with the suggestion, and are hopeful that you may see your way to represent the industry on this occasion, in view of the vital importance of the matters to be discussed.

"Yours faithfully,

"S. WATT,

"Hon. Secretary."

There again is direct evidence to rebut the statement of the hon. member for Isis. Requests have come from numerous parts of the State, including official bodies such as the Queensland Cane Growers' Council, that the Treasurer should attend this conference in their interests. There is nothing strange in this request when one realises that in 1934 both associations extended a similar invitation to the Treasurer to attend on their behalf a conference to be held in London. We also know that the general manager of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, Sir Philip Goldfinch, during the holding of that conference, drew public attention to the ability of the Premier to deal with questions affecting the sugar industry. His long experience as a representative of the sugar industry and his interest in it made him, Sir Philip Goldfinch stated, as capable as anyone else of dealing with all phases of it.

I propose quoting from a letter of a more recent date in regard to this matter. I have stressed the fact that the Queensland Cane Growers' Council have no desire to dictate to the Commonwealth Government any more than the Mackay Cane Growers' Executive, but as the interests of Queensland are pre-eminent they consider that bodies representative of the producers should have some voice in naming the delegate to the international conference. Mr. A. R. Townsend has been mentioned, and the Mackay Cane Growers' Executive has no objection to his accompanying the Treasurer as the official adviser or Commonwealth representative. We are not fussy on that point! We realise that the Commonwealth Government, like the State Government, have a right to select their own representative, but we say that as the conference is of such far-reaching importance the case for the industry in this State should be put by someone directly interested in this State and the future welfare of the industry. The cane-growers, through their organisation, have indicated that in their opinion no person is better qualified to represent their interests efficiently than the Treasurer. The Queensland Cane Growers' Council, following on its letter of 25th December last, wrote to the chairman of the Sugar Board on the 28th of October, as follows:—

"RE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR CONFERENCE.

"Dear Sir,—

"Further to our letter of the 25th September, we desire to bring under your notice the following:—

"Recently the Mackay District Cane Growers' Executive wired the Honourable the Premier dealing with representation at this conference, and pointed out the desirability of the Premier himself attending such conference as the

Queensland representative if at all possible. The Premier in acknowledging this request set out he would discuss the matter with the Prime Minister during his forthcoming visit to Melbourne.

"We have since been requested by the Mackay District Executive to take this matter up with the Prime Minister, with a view to supporting Mr. Smith going as the Commonwealth representative and the suggestion that Mr. Townsend also accompany Mr. Smith.

"The consensus of opinion of our executive members is definitely that it would be of considerable advantage to our industry if Mr. Smith could be in London at the time of the conference, preferably, of course, as a direct representative, but if not there is little doubt that in his position as Premier of this State, he would be able to watch our interests very carefully and be in close touch with any proceedings.

"The views of our council members have been placed before the chairman of this association, Mr. George Johnson, and he now instructs me to request you to place the views of the council before Mr. Smith.

"This will enable Mr. Smith, when discussing the matter with the Prime Minister, to point out that the industry is very desirous of him taking part in the conference, as so much is at stake so far as this State and our industry is concerned.

"It is thought you will agree, taking everything into consideration, that this is a far more preferable way of dealing with the suggestion than a direct approach to the Commonwealth Government at this juncture.

"Yours faithfully,

"R. MUIR,

"Asst. Secretary."

The hon. member for Isis should be satisfied—and I am sorry he is not present—that the request for representation at the International Sugar Conference overseas has come from the industry itself.

For some reason or other hon. members opposite showed a desire to discuss the sugar question. That was shown during the recent industrial trouble in the sugar industry in the North. Legislation dealing with it is before the Federal Parliament at the present time, and as a sugar grower and one representing a sugar district I think it is desirable that as little as possible should be said about the industry at this stage.

The extension of the embargo has been referred to by the hon. member for Isis, and the extension of the preference that was obtained at Ottawa. The hon. member is a sugar grower and as one who is actively associated with the canegrowers' associations has every facility for obtaining information on questions relating to the industry, yet the hon. member made a statement that the Ottawa Conference was responsible for the extension of that preference. That may be partly true, but it is important that I should mention the matter, because there seems to be a desire on the part of a section in this State that the industry should be represented at the International Sugar Conference by a departmental officer. I do not wish to underrate Mr. Townsend's ability—I have

the highest regard for that gentleman—but at the same time I believe the question is too important for representation by a departmental official. Hon. members know what happened at Ottawa, where Mr. Pike represented the sugar interests and was not able to get inside the door, with the result that the sugar preference question as it affected Queensland was not discussed at all. The South African delegate to Ottawa, having a status that enabled him to attend that conference, was able to get an extension of the preference for one year. As a result the Premier of Queensland and the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Lyons, sent a joint cable to the Prime Minister of England asking for the same extension of preference. Whether the hon. member for Isis wished to mislead the House and the canegrowers I do not know, but his statement was certainly liable to do so.

The hon. member also referred to certain forms of control that are now exercised in that industry, making it appear that the Government led by the hon. member for Aubigny had concurred in the growers' decision in the matter. That is not so. I think I can claim to know what I am talking about in this respect, because I have had a considerable association with the canegrowers interests.

If the hon. member for Isis and the Leader of the Opposition read the verbatim report of the 1929 conference of the Queensland Canegrowers' Association they will learn that that body, and also the Australian Sugar Producers' Association, passed resolutions specifically excluding 1929 from the operations of the proposed peak year scheme. If they care also to read the verbatim report of the conference of the Queensland Canegrowers' Council in 1930 they will find the same resolution, with a slight alteration, was agreed to. I have not the verbatim report for 1929, but I have that for the 1930 conference, and for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition I desire to quote the remarks of the chairman, Mr. Johnson. He said—

"I will get the secretary to read the minutes that were passed at that June conference."

When he refers to the June conference he means the conference of sugar interests, as opposed to that of the sugar growers—a point that is vital to remember. The conferences of both associations of growers were held in March. The conference I now refer to was held in June, shortly after the election of the Moore Government. It was this fact that prompted me to make these remarks, and also those I made concerning this matter in the debate on the Address in Reply. The Moore Government introduced this scheme after it had been turned down, as it were, by the Secretary for Agriculture in the previous Government, the present Treasurer. Further, the matter had not been investigated to ascertain the likely effects in certain areas then more or less in the initial stages of development. Proceeding, the chairman said—

"I will now read the motion so we will be sure everything is in order."

That is, the motion that was agreed to at the conference of sugar interests, which reads—

"That the highest output of sugar of each mill in Queensland in any one

Mr. Walsh.]

year since 1915 be taken as the limit of any future year production for that particular mill. All sugar produced by any mill beyond this limit or any sugar manufactured from cane grown on unassigned lands shall be deemed to be extra surplus, and shall be placed in a separate export pool, and the price payable being the netted price realised for all sugar exported, provided that in the cases of mills which have not reached a peak year equivalent to twenty weeks' crushing at the average weekly rate attained in the 1929 season, such peak year shall be deemed to be a tonnage based upon twenty weeks' crushing at that average rate, the cane so determined to be converted into terms of sugar.

"The reassignments of all lands by the Central Cane Prices Board shall be finalised and simultaneously gazetted at the close of the coming crushing season.

"The Sugar Board shall be deemed the authority to fix the peak years of all mills in accordance with these resolutions.

"That the Government be asked by this conference to make an announcement at an early date that it will in 1930, when acquiring the sugar for that season, insert in the proclamation clauses which will give effect to the resolutions passed by this conference in connection with the peak year scheme."

I desire to point out that the inclusion of 1929 in these quotas has been responsible for adding approximately 25,000 to 30,000 tons of sugar to what is known as the "No. 1 Pool." The greater portion of that has gone to thirteen mills in the far northern areas. It has had the effect of reducing the price of cane in the Proserpine and Mackay district, areas in which so much settlement has taken place in recent years owing to the development of lands along the North Coast railway line. The inclusion of the 1929 production in these quotas has had a very serious effect on the electorate I represent, and also that represented by the hon. member for Isis, although I do not think the canegrowers generally have been made aware that it has been responsible for reducing the prices in those areas.

At a later opportunity I intend to go more fully into this matter of the peak year scheme, because I am of opinion that the matter should not be allowed to rest. The Leader of the Opposition may raise the point that this Government have not altered the position, but the fact remains that the proclamation giving full legal protection to these quotas was issued by the Moore Government in 1930. It is very difficult for the Governments that follow to alter such a state of affairs for these people—the sugar interests, to use a convenient term, have been given the legal right to include that sugar in the No. 1 Pool.

It is very difficult to review the position until after a definite export programme has been decided upon, but I hope that the Government will review the position in the light of circumstances as they exist to-day, once the policy decided upon by the International Sugar Conference is made known.

I am pleased that the Treasurer has accepted the invitation to represent the industry at that conference, and I feel con-

[Mr. Walsh.

fidant that whatever part he plays in the deliberations of that conference, Queensland interests will be adequately safeguarded. Although the Commonwealth Government are the deciding factor so far as the quota is concerned, it must be evident to anyone who has studied the sugar industry that the machinery necessary for carrying out such agreements is largely Queensland's. For that reason it is all the more desirable that someone in a high official position should represent this State.

Mr. McLEAN (*Bundaberg*) [3.51 p.m.]: The hon. member for Mirani has stated clearly the position with regard to the sugar industry in Queensland. The hon. member's remarks concerning the effect of the Sugar Agreement upon farmers in his electorate apply with equal force to the district I represent, one of the oldest sugar-growing centres in the State. The hon. member has outlined the difficulties suffered by canegrowers with regard to Nos. 1 and 2 pools as a result of action taken by the Moore Government in 1930. So seriously has it affected the canegrowers in my electorate that many of them are in a very parlous position. They have been able to harvest only 60 per cent. of their cane and are finding it difficult to make ends meet. I hope that there will be a review of the whole position in the near future so that justice will be meted out to those canegrowers who are suffering from disabilities.

It is a glowing tribute to the Treasurer of this State that he should be selected by the Australian Sugar Producers' Association and Queensland Canegrowers' Council as their ambassador at the forthcoming International Sugar Conference. There is no man with a more intimate knowledge of the difficulties besetting the sugar industry than the Treasurer.

Mr. MAHER: You are giving him an extra stripe.

Mr. McLEAN: The stripe has already been given to him by the sugar-growers, irrespective of political opinions. It is pleasing to note that the political opinions of their members did not prevent them from selecting the man they considered to be the most capable to represent their interests overseas.

The Bundaberg refinery is equipped with the most up-to-date machinery, but it is unfortunate that it can operate for only a short period of the year because a considerable quantity of raw sugar is sent for refining to other States. The farmers and the workers engaged in the industry are suffering considerable disabilities on this account and I urge the Government to give serious consideration to the matter. The sugar can be refined just as efficiently at Bundaberg as at any other refinery in the Commonwealth, and I suggest that the Sugar Board allocate a greater quantity of raw sugar to the Bundaberg refinery so that it may operate for a longer period than at present—say, up to nine months.

I join with the hon. member for Mirani in expressing the hope that the unfortunate agreement that was entered into in 1930 by the Moore Government and imposed so many disabilities on the industry will be reviewed at an early date.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [3.57 p.m.]: The matter that has been raised by the hon. members for Mirani and Bundaberg is of considerable importance to Queensland. Early next

year a conference will be called by Great Britain to consider the distribution of sugar throughout the world. It is not an Empire conference; it is a world conference. The Chadbourne Agreement has come to an end, but the parties to it observe its provisions nevertheless. Since the war the cultivation of sugar-cane and sugar beet has extended very considerably. Sugar has played a very important part in the economic life of all sugar-producing nations and great attention has been given to bounties and similar concessions tending to increased production.

The Chadbourne Agreement represented an arrangement between the various sugar-producing countries of the world to ration the market and to provide for orderly control, but since it was entered upon, production has materially increased, owing to some extent to a policy of economic nationalism that has prevailed throughout Europe, including Great Britain. At one time Great Britain was not a sugar-producing country, but since the Government there offered a bounty to encourage the growth of sugar beet, it has become a sugar-producing country. The cost to the British exchequer on this account has been very considerable, but that is a matter for the British Government. If the people of any country decide to become self-sufficient in these matters, it is entirely a matter for them and their Government. Stated shortly, the position is that more sugar is produced in the world to-day than ever before in its history, and that the value per ton is less than ever before in the memory of any hon. member in this House. The people who were responsible for the Chadbourne Agreement and the British Government—acting on their own initiative—have come to the conclusion that the present situation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely and the British Government have therefore convened a conference for the purpose of considering the matter.

At 4 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Hanson, *Buranda*) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Empire countries producing sugar will be entitled to representation at that conference, at which an endeavour will be made to arrive at an agreement whereby markets will not be glutted and effective orderly control applied. Briefly stated, those will be the principles governing the convention, but it remains, of course, to be seen whether those objectives can be achieved.

Queensland has never been a party to the Chadbourne Agreement, but for some years past has been a sugar exporting country. It is because of that fact that we are vitally interested. Of the sugar produced in this State, 60 per cent. is consumed in Australia; the remaining 40 per cent. is sold abroad, our chief customers being Great Britain and Canada. There has been a revenue duty, as long as I can remember, in the British Isles. Under the Finance Act passed by the British Parliament, there is a rebate to the Dominions on that duty equivalent to 3s. 9d. a cwt. That means that the sugar producer in Queensland gets an advantage in the tariff to the extent of 3s. 9d. a cwt. That, of course, is of material help, and we appreciate it very much; obviously, we could not continue to export sugar if any reduction in the rebate or duty took place. We send about 80,000 tons of sugar to Canada, which, apart altogether from the

Ottawa Agreement, has a special trade treaty with Australia, in terms of which we have a tariff advantage in that Dominion.

The real interest of Queensland in this conference is first of all to secure, if possible, a long term agreement based on the existing agreement with the British Government, that is to say, that the existing rebate on Dominion sugar shall be continued. The rebate on sugar imported from Crown Colonies is £1 a ton in excess of that granted to Dominion sugar. The justification for that discrimination is that Britain is more directly concerned with the domestic policy of her Crown Colonies than that of her Dominions. The Dominions are regarded as being able to look after themselves. The sugar from Crown Colonies on which the special rebate is accorded is a fixed tonnage; that is to say, Crown Colonies receive the rebate I have mentioned on the sugar duty for a given quantity of sugar. Therefore, from a Dominion point of view we are interested with the Crown Colonies, first of all in the maintenance of existing duties; but we are further interested in the retention of our existing markets. It is eminently desirable that we should be able to continue to export sugar to Great Britain to the extent that we are now doing. This also brings under review what is known as the peak year scheme.

The peak year scheme was initiated by the industry itself. The Leader of the Opposition will remember that both sections of the industry recommended that he give effect to that scheme. It has worked fairly well up to the present, and is a rough and ready approximation to justice. No scheme has yet been devised that will give complete satisfaction to all interests concerned, and the peak year scheme, as it is now known, is the best that has yet been devised to cope with the situation.

The scheme is embodied within the agreement between the Prime Minister of Australia and the Premier of Queensland, so that some such policy must be continued. Its justification is obviously this: that there must be a point at which it ceases to be profitable to produce sugar for export. What point that is has never been scientifically determined—nor is it likely to be, because the amount available for export depends so largely on seasons and climatic conditions generally. There obviously must be a fixed point at which it ceases to be profitable to export sugar; it must bear some relation to the amount sold and consumed within Australia.

When I was in England about eighteen months ago I discussed this very matter with Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister and the Earl of Plymouth. Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister at that time was Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Earl of Plymouth was his Parliamentary Under Secretary. The Earl has made a special study of the sugar industry, not only as to its Empire ramifications, but also in other countries; and he presided over a conference some three years ago, having for its object the extension of what is known as the Chadbourne plan. I explained to those representatives of the British Government what we had done to control our own domestic supply, and to regulate production in Australia. I pointed out that under the Sugar Cultivation Act we had a definite regulation of the area or areas of land that might be

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

put under cultivation, and under the peak year scheme, by proclamations under the Sugar Acquisition Act, we had control of the total volume, and that in any discussion of the quotas that might be adopted at a future date by the British Government we claimed—because of that early control—that we were entitled to a quota on the basis of the averages we had been sending up to the time that control was effected. The Secretary of State for the Colonies agreed with that argument after some discussion. That of course in no way binds them in any matter of future policy. I merely mentioned it in discussion, basing it of course on equity.

It is obvious that a problem of such a nature presents many difficulties to all Governments that may be involved. Love and affection does not enter to a very large extent into these conferences. Obviously the representatives of the various interests will fight for their own hand—they will fight for a policy that will suit them as individuals—and no one can foresee the final result. However, it is devoutly to be hoped that such a conference will arrive at decisions that will be equitable to the parties concerned and will further stabilise the Queensland sugar industry. It is obvious that at such a conference Queensland's interests should be adequately represented. Under the Constitution of Australia the Commonwealth Government have the power to control trade and commerce beyond the Dominion; in other words, any trade treaty or trade agreement is between the Commonwealth Government and the other Government or Governments concerned. I put that statement very clearly, because of statements that have appeared in the Press to the effect that we in Queensland were putting forward a proposal that I should represent the Commonwealth Government at this conference. No such proposal has ever been seriously made. The Commonwealth Government are entitled to, and no doubt will, appoint their own representative. When a Government appoints a representative that representative must be subject to its control.

Therefore, a member of a Government other than the one so represented could not be appointed as its representative, but the proposal is that Queensland should have a representative who could act in conjunction with the Commonwealth representative. In other words, a position should not arise similar to that which occurred at Ottawa, where the South African Union had its representatives actually at the conference and we did not. At Ottawa representatives of the industry itself in South Africa were given the right to speak on its behalf when important matters were being decided. The Queensland Government have always pursued a policy of co-operation with the Commonwealth Government in these economic matters.

I should like to point out that much mischief often results from the use of economic negotiation in party political interests. Irrespective of party it is a Government's duty to help any industry under its control. And we have always been willing to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government for the economic stabilisation of any industry in Australia in general and in Queensland in particular. Evidence of that assertion is to be found in the Dairy Stabilisation Agreement and the Wheat Agreement in respect of which

[Hon. W. Forgan Smith.

legislation will be consummated in a few days, also by the Sugar Agreement to which the Commonwealth Prime Minister, representing Australia, and the Queensland Premier, representing this State, are the two parties. I appreciate very fully the interest that the Commonwealth Government have displayed in the renewal of the sugar embargo for five years. The Commonwealth Government are with Queensland the parties to that contract, and I understand a Bill providing for its ratification will be passed through the Parliament of the Commonwealth at an early date.

Now, a five-year stabilisation is good for the industry and also for the people of Australia. There are enemies of the sugar industry who unfairly attack the Commonwealth Government for having entered into this agreement. Such people are either unacquainted with the facts or are deliberately evading them for reasons best known to themselves. Costs of production are increasing. Costs of materials of all kind are increasing in Australia and consequently such increases apply equally to the sugar miller and grower as to any other section of the community. Who can say what the price levels in Australia will be five years hence? It will be seen that the conditions of the agreement are not by any means one-sided. The agreement is of advantage both to the consumer and to the producer for the period for which it is made. It gives the producer stabilisation. He can control his crops according to the returns he is able to get. It also gives the consumer stabilisation. He knows his price for a period of five years. The proposal is sound from the point of view of equitable Australian policy.

At the interview I had with the Prime Minister I discussed the matter of representation in London, and he agreed that Queensland's case should be adequately put. First of all I wrote him a letter setting out the position. The Prime Minister is fully seized of the necessity that Australia's case and Queensland's case should be adequately represented at the conference in London. I have had the opportunity of meeting the representatives of the industry in the West Indies, Java, and elsewhere, and therefore realise the necessity of Australia to have as strong a delegation in London as can be fielded for the occasion. Those people will see to it that their industry is properly represented, and it is up to Queensland and Australia to be adequately represented too.

I do not wish to say anything further on the matter at this juncture, other than to indicate to the industry and the people of this State that the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Government are fully seized of the importance of this industry. Both Governments are thoroughly in touch with everything that is taking place, and are in accord as to the necessity for adequate representation in London.

Resolution 29 (The Treasurer—Chief Office) agreed to.

Resolutions 29 and 30 agreed to.

Resolution 31—"Harbours and Marine"—

Mr. POWER (*Baroona*) [4.19 p.m.]: During the debate on the Estimates dealing with the Harbours and Marine department a statement was made by an hon. member

opposite that only three prosecutions for staking fishing nets had taken place during the past twelve months. I have been informed by the Treasurer that forty-four prosecutions were instituted during that period—which shows that hon. members opposite are absolutely irresponsible and their statements are made without ascertaining the true position. The amount expended on salaries for six inspectors in that department was £1,476. In addition, the police force are empowered to take the names of offenders and the department then takes action to prosecute. Considerable damage is done by staking nets, because fish that are too small to go to market, or are unsuitable for human consumption, are wantonly destroyed. The officers of this department also do very valuable work by attending the fish markets and measuring the fish, to be sure that the standards are observed. They also prevent the sale of female crabs. If action was not taken to prevent the destruction of female crabs and immature fish, our already seriously depleted waters would become fished out. We know that the staking of nets has resulted in the taking of smaller quantities of fish from waters that previously contained an abundant supply, and I am pleased to know that the officers of the department are doing their work effectively. It could be reasonably argued that if only three prosecutions had taken place during the year the officers were lax. The inspectors receive help from the police force, but a policeman cannot be expected to spend the whole of his time running up and down the beaches to prevent the staking of nets. The information that there were forty-four prosecutions during the past twelve months gives the lie direct to the statement made by an hon. member of the Opposition that only three prosecutions were instituted, and proves that the department takes a serious view of any such breach of the regulations.

Resolution 31 (Harbours and Marine) agreed to.

Resolution 32—"Marine Board"—agreed to.

Resolution 33—"Bureau of Industry"—

Mr. KING (*Marce*) [4.24 p.m.]: I think every hon. member appreciates the importance of the Bureau of Industry and welcomes a full and frank discussion on its activities. It was created by the Bureau of Industry Act of 1932, and although it has been in existence for only a very few years, it has achieved very remarkable results. It was empowered to report on—

- (a) Reproductive works that will provide employment and increase the wealth production of the State;
- (b) The organisation, capitalisation, and labour conditions of particular industries;
- (c) The trade of Queensland, both overseas and interstate;
- (d) Stock of commodities, both primary and manufactured;
- (e) Monetary conditions and both wholesale and retail prices;
- (f) Employment and unemployment generally, and in particular industries and localities;
- (g) The relations between employers and employees; and,
- (h) Any other matter, including any questions of unfair competition, or

of sweating, or of monopolies detrimental to the public or to any section thereof which the Minister or the bureau may consider to be in the public interests; and to further the objects of this Act.

In addition to the above powers the bureau may be entrusted with the following inquiries:—

- (a) To review the statistics of employment and unemployment throughout the State;
- (b) To inquire into the causes and extent of unemployment within the State or any part thereof;
- (c) To inquire into and consider the most effective measures to be taken for temporarily or permanently reducing or eliminating unemployment within the State or any part thereof;
- (d) To investigate and consider proposals for the productive development of the lands of the State.

It is also empowered to hold an inquiry into—

- (a) The income and productivity of Queensland year by year, and the estimated production of any year.

Mr. MAXWELL: What are you quoting?

Mr. KING: The hon. member for Toowong is afraid that I may displace him as the quotation champion in this Chamber, but I have no desire to do that. He will long remain the proud holder of that great distinction. I have quoted some of the powers that may be exercised by the bureau in order to lay the foundation for the remarks that I am about to make. I repeat that the bureau has been in existence for only a short period, but it has been of inestimable value to Queensland in that it has been responsible for launching many gigantic schemes. It has the power to investigate and to recommend. It will be readily admitted that no scheme should be launched before a proper investigation is made, and in this connection the bureau has the undoubted advantage of being able to make the fullest possible inquiry before a scheme is undertaken and public money is expended. It also has the power to recommend. If hon. members opposite were willing to submit various factors for the consideration of the bureau in dealing with certain projects, they would be considered with all the other factors and a recommendation made to the Government. The bureau also has power to initiate schemes that it considers will be of advantage to the people. It is less likely to blunder into gigantic schemes than any other corporate body because of the fact that it is constituted by fifteen members drawn from various occupations.

I am pleased that hon. members opposite are taking a keen interest in this debate, because a great advantage is to be derived from the bureau. We all recognise that its work is both continuous and definite, and we can rely on its personnel playing their part in helping Queensland through her difficulties. "The Bureau of Economics and Statistics Act of 1930" was repealed when the Bureau of Industry Act was enacted, but the Bureau of Economics and Statistics had the saving grace that it had collected in its archives certain data that can now

Mr. King.]

be used for the material betterment of Queensland.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I move—

“That the question be now put.”
(Laughter).

Mr. KING: If the hon. member had moved the motion of his own volition I would have voted for it. I was about to refer to the powers of the Bureau of Industry when I was rudely interrupted by the hon. member for Dalby. The bureau possesses the powers of a royal commission. It can enter any industry and exercise the powers conferred on it under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts to collate information and arrive at a reasonable and just decision. Queensland is a large country, and has great tracts awaiting development. Nobody outside the bureau has gathered more information concerning our industries. It also possesses machinery that can be promptly and effectively operated to deal with such questions as the development of our idle lands. It can be utilised in a dozen and one ways. Its constitution is broad and its representation is an epitome of our whole life, including the commercial, trade unions, and industrial interests. It is a very efficient organisation.

It has been responsible for examining the proposal to construct a bridge at Kangaroo Point; and no hon. member can reasonably suggest that bridge is not justified. An immense undertaking of that nature will employ approximately 600 men for a period of five or six years, and the bridge will be a great asset to the State. The Government recognise and hon. members opposite also recognise that the problem of unemployment has to be faced. Any profitable work that will help to liquidate unemployment should be undertaken. I invite hon. members opposite to state any reason why the bridge should not be constructed and why the people should not have a transport facility in that area.

Can any hon. member opposite reasonably argue that the Stanley River scheme is not for the benefit of Queensland? In addition to providing work for a large number of people it will minimise flood risks and open up a large area of country.

The various activities of the bureau demonstrate clearly that it has entirely justified its existence.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) [4.40 p.m.]: The hon. member for Maree has raised a very important matter in connection with the Bureau of Industry, the activities of which extend all over Queensland and affect the workers throughout the State. The hon. member for Maree explained its constitution and traced its activities. I propose to refer to some of the work it has done during the past year in helping industries. The following is the text of its report in connection with the assistance rendered to the Mount Isa Mines:—

“The guarantee for a loan of £500,000 sterling has been operative during the year. The conditions have been met and the necessary information has been supplied. The whole of the amount may not be required, and it is gratifying to be able to report that since the improvement in the prices of lead and silver this year, the mine is no longer working at a loss on actual disbursements. Mine

[*Mr. King.*

development for sulphide ores has proceeded according to plan, and the zinc concentrates plant is being assembled. The first shipment of concentrates is expected shortly. For some months after the guarantee was provided the prices of metals were below the level at which the company agreed to continue operations, but there is now a good prospect that the loan should be repaid within the time specified.”

The House witnessed the spectacle a few minutes ago of the hon. member for Dalby attempting to gag the hon. member for Maree when he was dealing with this bureau, an organisation that is endeavouring to find work for the unemployed throughout Queensland. Hon. members opposite on a previous occasion opposed any help being granted to the Mount Isa Company Limited on the grounds that the Government had no right to provide such help or to give a guarantee, even though it would enable the company to keep men in employment. The report shows that the guarantee has not cost the Government anything, but on the other hand, since it has enabled the company to provide work for thousands of men, has saved the Government a large sum in relief work. This opportunity should not be lost of pointing out that the bureau has justified itself and how necessary it is that we should vote funds for it to carry on its work.

The next item dealt with in the report is the Hornbrook Highway, in respect of which the report states—

“The guarantee for £100,000 on the security of the highway became operative in May, 1935, and the highway was opened for traffic on 4th October. The average number of employees engaged on construction in 1934-35 was 216. In addition, a large number of men were engaged upon timber supplies.”

Without costing the Government a penny the guarantee enabled 216 men to be kept in employment.

In connection with the Morris Woollen Mills at Redbank the report states—

“The maximum guarantee to this company has been extended from £8,000 to £12,000, but only £10,500 has actually been made available. There is room for this company in addition to those formerly established, because of the large imports of woollen goods from other States. The employment given varies from twenty to fifty persons.”

These are some of the matters investigated by the Bureau of Industry in order to ascertain how the Government can best assist industries that, in addition to providing for our own needs, will provide employment for Queensland men and women, boys and girls. The bureau has also been of assistance to the Queensland Cardboard Company. It reports—

“Since its re-establishment last year this company has been more successful, and an additional machine has been installed to produce a lined board for cartons. The guarantee, which was reduced from £4,000 to £3,000, remains at that figure. From twenty-four to thirty-seven persons are employed, according to the number of shifts worked.”

Merely by giving a guarantee and without any expenditure these industries have been assisted and have thus been able to carry on

their work and give employment. A loan to Shand's Gulf Meatworks Company was guaranteed up to the comparatively small sum of £7,500 to enable it to treat cattle in the Gulf of Carpentaria. These meatworks have been of great assistance to many of the smaller cattle-growers in that country who, thanks to the Bureau of Industry, are now able to get their cattle treated locally. Previously the Townsville meatworks were the nearest, and this necessitated driving the cattle some 200 or 300 miles to the rail at Richmond or Julia Creek.

Three potteries have been assisted by the Bureau of Industry, and various other industries have received aid. Rustproofing Pty. Ltd., the Shark Fisheries Coy., the Everlite Trading Co., Australian Fish, Meal, Oil and Hide Co. Ltd., and Marine Products Pty. Ltd. have all been helped. We sometimes forget that such industries are being conducted. We know nothing about them until we get the report of the Bureau of Industry and see what fine work it is doing. By pursuing this policy, the bureau has been able to place hundreds of men and women in permanent employment. On reading the summary of the report I find that as a result of help from the bureau, 1,250 men were employed last year by Mount Isa Mines Ltd., 216 on the Hornibrook Highway, whilst the other industries that were assisted employed an average of 150 men; so that a total of 1,616 men have been helped to permanent employment by the Bureau of Industry.

At 4.50 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. GLEDSON Several industries have been helped by the bureau without in any way committing the Government to any expenditure. By standing behind them, the bureau has been able to find employment for hundreds of men throughout Queensland during the past twelve months.

In conclusion, I desire again to express appreciation of the wonderful work that is being done by the bureau in the interests of the unemployed.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [4.51 p.m.]: I am very glad to hear the hon. member praising the work performed by the Bureau of Industry, but I find it necessary to contradict him when he gives full credit for the benefits brought about by this bureau to the present Government. I remind him that the system of advancing money to those industries, such as the Cardboard Co., of Queensland, Morris Woollen Mills Pty. Ltd., Hornibrook Highway, and many others was introduced by the Moore Government. The hon. member is not justified in giving full credit to his Government for a system that was inaugurated by the Moore Government.

Resolution 33 (Bureau of Industry) agreed to.

Resolutions 34 to 63, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 64—"Home Secretary's Department—Health"—

Mr. FOLEY (*Normanby*) [4.54 p.m.]: I called "Not formal" to this resolution with the object of suggesting that more extensive work should be carried out in analysing the patent foodstuffs that are offered for sale. Considerable sums of money

are expended in advertising these articles and drawing attention to their alleged vitamin and protein contents, and in stressing their value in maintaining health particularly in small children. The average housewife has to take for granted many of the claims made by their manufacturers.

I know that these patent foods have to comply with the Health Act, but there is no provision for a systematic analysis by the Department of Public Health with the object of publishing the vitamin and protein content, so that the average housewife may be in a position to judge whether she is getting an article that has the food value that is claimed for it. During recent years precautions have been taken by the Department of Agriculture to enable the man on the land to purchase an efficient stock food for the proper maintenance of the health of his stock and to ensure that it complies with the formula set out by the manufacturer. I think the same precaution should be taken in connection with food supplied for consumption by human beings. I have tried to ascertain the food value of some of the patent foods on the market, but I have not been able to obtain this information from any Government department. I have raised this matter in the hope that the Home Secretary may be able to allow his laboratory staff to analyse them with a view to making their food value known.

At 5 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307 and the Sessional Order of 28th August last, I shall now proceed to put the resolutions under discussion and the resolutions not already agreed to by the House.

Resolution 64 (Home Secretary's Department—Health) agreed to.

Resolutions 65 to 74, both inclusive, agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. Hanson, Buranda, in the chair.*)

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [5.2 p.m.]: I move—

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1935-1936, a further sum not exceeding £5,118,150 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1935-1936, a further sum not exceeding £3,477,356 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

"(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1935-1936, a further sum not exceeding £2,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1934-1935, a supplementary sum not exceeding £520,797 12s. 3d. be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

"(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1934-1935, a supplementary sum not exceeding £667,686 5s. 10d. be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

"(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1934-1935, a supplementary sum not exceeding £578,001 6s. be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a sum not exceeding £1,800,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a sum not exceeding £1,200,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

"(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a sum not exceeding £750,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account."

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [5.4 p.m.]: I thought the Treasurer, who has just returned from a meeting of the Loan Council, would have given us some information on that subject. It is rather amusing to recall the statements made by the Treasurer as to the meeting of the Loan Council in 1931 about star chamber methods and meetings behind closed doors, conferences from which no information was given to the public who were vitally interested, and so on. At that time a summary—not a verbatim report—of the meetings of the Loan Council was issued. This report disclosed the resolutions that were discussed and carried, and gave a summary of the reasons given for or against them. This was disseminated for the benefit of Parliaments. In that respect the hon. gentleman has fallen from grace.

The TREASURER: We get that a few days after the Loan Council meeting.

Mr. MOORE: We did not get them.

The TREASURER: No, you never used to give the information. As a matter of fact, your Treasurer refused to let me see the minutes of the meeting of the Loan Council. That is what you refer to. You never made them available at all, not one of them.

Mr. MOORE: If the Treasurer would have a little patience he would know just what I am referring to. What he says is all moonshine; it will not go down here.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The TREASURER: You cannot get away with that either. I never had access to any information that you received.

Mr. MOORE: I will make my speech in my own way and you can make your speech afterwards.

The TREASURER: I will make it; do not worry about that.

Mr. MOORE: I am not going to have any interruption from the Treasurer, whether he is in charge of the Chamber or not.

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*

What I was about to say was that we used to get a summary of the report that was used on every occasion that a debate occurred.

The TREASURER: You kept it to yourself.

Mr. MOORE: No, it was filed in the library of this Parliament.

The TREASURER: It never was.

Mr. MOORE: The last time I made a speech on the matter the Treasurer objected because I had gone to the library for one of the reports I used.

The TREASURER: You cannot get away with that kind of stuff. What you refer to is the report of the Premiers' Conference and not the Loan Council.

Mr. MOORE: No, the Loan Council. We always got them.

The TREASURER: You know the old saying that half a lie is the worst form of lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: We did have information given to us in the form of a summary of the proceedings, which was distributed and filed for the benefit of Parliaments. They were filed—I had several of them.

The TREASURER: You may have kept them.

Mr. MOORE: They were filed and kept here, and anybody had the right to see them.

The TREASURER: You tried to keep other things, too.

Mr. MOORE: The Treasurer seems to be in a nasty temper. He has made all sorts of unpleasant insinuations. I could do the same if I so desired.

The TREASURER: You withheld the opinion of counsel, Mr. Hart.

Mr. MOORE: I did not handle the matter.

The TREASURER: Your Attorney-General did.

Mr. MOORE: It went to the department where it was used. The suggestion that I tried to withhold things is ridiculous.

The TREASURER: I had to demand its return to the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member is anxious to divert the people's attention from a Loan Council meeting, where all sorts of things were discussed and decisions were arrived at, but about which no information is being given to the people, although absurd statements are made in the Southern Press about what did occur. If I cared to go through the papers in the Chief Secretary's office in order to see what happened years before—muckraking—trying to discover something—probably I should discover that papers had been taken from the files. Surely the position of a Premier is big enough not to bother with that sort of thing.

The TREASURER: You even introduced a special regulation in order to have a look at private members' incomes.

Mr. MOORE: We are interested in the financial position.

The TREASURER: You went through Under-Secretary's private income tax papers.

Mr. MOORE: We are interested in the financial position. The Treasurer has been down to a Loan Council meeting that was going to ask for a certain loan, but the figure has been reduced. It is no use the Treasurer looking round at hon. members

behind him for applause, and thinking he has done something wonderful in not giving the information.

The TREASURER: I will give information when I deem it proper to do so.

Mr. MOORE: The people are anxious to know the position, because it is of great importance to Queensland. When the Treasurer went down a loan of £10,000,000 was to be floated. There were suggestions that there was to be discussion on the question of issuing further Treasury bills. We have heard nothing, but we have learned by the Press that the amount of the loan to be floated is less than the amount anticipated—it is to be £7,500,000—and I am anxious to know, and the people are anxious to know, what the position is. We are to-day appropriating moneys as though the original amount was going to be secured. It may be secured in one or more further loans at a later date, but after all this Committee is being asked to appropriate a sum of money from the Loan Fund Account based on the resolution carried at the previous Loan Council meeting before there was any reduction in the amount of the loan that was to be raised. It seems to me that we are entitled to know what the position is.

The Government are budgeting this year for an increase of £597,762 in the deficit—a decrease of £243,211 in revenue (in spite of a transfer of £100,000 from Unemployment Relief Tax Fund), and an increase of £354,550 in expenditure. The Government are also budgeting for a decrease of £685,700 in loan expenditure (the elections being over), in spite of their repeated assurances that prosperity, more purchasing power, better business, cure of unemployment, and so on, come from a policy of increasing development and employment on public works. Let us look at these figures—

FINANCIAL RETURNS FOR FIRST FOUR MONTHS.

— —	1934-35.	1935-36.	Movement.
	£	£	£
Consolidated Revenue —			
Receipts ..	4,347,404	4,298,127	— 49,277
Expenditure ..	4,488,265	4,942,142	+ 453,877
Deficit ..	140,861	644,015	+ 503,154
Loan Expenditure	1,413,684	1,611,179	+ 247,495

In spite of the fact that we have budgeted for a decreased loan expenditure for the financial year of £685,700 the Unemployment Relief Fund expenditure for the first four months of this year is £563,217 as compared with £538,811 for the first four months of 1934-35, or an increase of £24,406.

Mr. POWER: More liberal conditions.

Mr. MOORE: It is not the more liberal conditions, because as is shown by the "Economic News," there has been an increase in the number of unemployed. The estimated increase in the expenditure for the full year has during four months been exceeded by £99,327. Taking into consideration that the unforeseen expenditure for 1934-35 amounted to £1,766,485, one wonders as to the value of budgeting and making appropriations through Parliament. For one year the amount is more than double that of any year of the previous ten. This in itself demonstrates the small control Parliament has over the expenditure.

Mr. POWER: When you were in government you had record deficits.

Mr. MOORE: I am referring to unforeseen expenditure. Probably the hon. member does not know the difference.

Mr. POWER: I do.

Mr. MOORE: If you do, it would be some evidence of your knowledge if you kept silent.

Mr. POWER: I am not letting you get away with that.

Mr. MOORE: I am quoting from the Auditor-General's report from which it will be seen that the unforeseen expenditure was—

	£
From revenue	520,797
Trust Fund	667,586
Loan Fund	578,001
Total	£1,766,485

Unforeseen expenditure is expenditure not passed by Parliament. This was incurred during an election year! More than five-sixths of the estimated increase in the deficit of this year has taken place in the first four months! The loan expenditure from November to June, inclusive, in 1934-35, was £3,372,016, while this year, unless the estimated amount is exceeded, it will be at most £2,436,821, a decrease of £933,295.

The Loan Council has not indicated that money is plentiful. There is a big demand for it by industry. In fact, most of the trouble has been that Governments have continually pressed for larger and larger amounts of loan money, thus forcing up the rates of interest to industry. That is recognised by every authority as not being for the benefit of the community or in the best interests of the establishment or expansion of industry. There is a limit to the amount of money available for investment, and when Governments go on the money market and take a great portion of the available money there is so much less for the expansion of trade and industry. In addition, the rates of interest are forced up and this makes the position more difficult.

According to the "Economic News," at the present time over 8,000 people are entirely dependent upon the continued expenditure of loan money. The position is not being improved in any way, and it appears to me that it should be reviewed from the point of view of the establishment and expansion of industry and the absorption of labour in these channels. If more and more people are to be absorbed by a continuance of Government loan expenditure, greater demands will have to be made on the loan market. It would be the aim to avoid that as far as possible and have the greatest amount of money available at the lowest rate of interest for the development of industry. This would be better for the State inasmuch as the more industry expands the greater the revenue that comes to the Government by way of taxation.

Mr. FOLEY: What would you have done had there been no loan programme? There would not have been any extension of industry.

Mr. MOORE: I might as well ask: What would have happened if there had been no Premiers' Plan, because we should not have been able to obtain loan money? There must come a period in the history of the

Mr. Moore.]

State when we must stop borrowing to provide employment. We borrowed during times of depression, to tide over a difficult period, but there must come a time when the Government will have to stimulate private industry in order that they may get out of the position of having to continue to borrow money to find employment.

The TREASURER: As industry improves, there should be a tapering off of loan expenditure.

Mr. MOORE: That is so. And before industry can improve, conditions must be provided that will enable it to do so. It appears to me that we have reached the stage where there is a demand for a large proportion of the money that is available for investment, for the development of the country and the expansion of industry, and that now is the time when the Government should curtail their demands for large sums of the loan money that is available, because by not doing so they force up the rates of interest to those people who want to expand industry.

Mr. FOLEY: The outside price level is also a big factor that must be considered.

Mr. MOORE: I am not denying that. I am suggesting that as there is a big demand for money to develop private industry it would appear that we have reached the stage where the Government must curtail the expenditure of loan money merely for the purpose of providing employment—money that is not used for the development of productive industry.

Let us compare the expenditure on unemployment relief during the first four months of 1932-33 with that for the same period in 1935-36. In the first four months of 1932-33 £588,725 was expended from loan money, and for the corresponding period this year £1,661,179, or an increase of £1,072,454. The expenditure from the Unemployment Relief Fund for the same period in 1932-33 was £475,458, and in the first four months of 1935-36 £563,217, or an increase of £87,759. When one sees an increase in loan expenditure of £1,072,454 for the four months of this year over the corresponding period in 1932-33, one expects that there would not be a correspondingly large increase in the expenditure of money from the Unemployment Relief Fund. Yet, that is exactly what is happening, and it seems to me that we have reached the position where we are not getting the number of people absorbed in industry that we ought. The Government are adopting all sorts of methods with a view to giving employment, but I am not sure that the country as a whole is getting a fair deal even from that.

On the last page of the Auditor-General's report we find a table of the loans and subsidies to local bodies. The first local body on that list is the Brisbane City Council, which received £97,159 1s. 11d. by way of loan and £361,661 2s. in subsidies. The total amount of loans to the City Councils is £187,473 18s. 3d., and by way of subsidies £440,682 9s. In the towns, comprising Bowen, Coolangatta, Dalby, Gladstone, Roma, Southport, and Warwick the total loans amounted to £46,327 19s. and the subsidies to £47,874. Then the table deals with shire councils, the bodies that are doing work in the country, outside of the metropolitan and town areas. There is quite a

[Mr. Moore.

different story to tell there! The loans to shire councils amounted to £212,561 2s. 9d., and the subsidies to only £176,007 8s. 2d. In the cities and towns the subsidies exceeded the loans; in the shires the loans were greater than the subsidies!

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: There is a bigger percentage of unemployed in the cities than there is in the rural districts.

Mr. MOORE: I quite understand what is being done, but I am attacking the injustice of the method. There are many places in the country where work is urgently required to be done, but it is quite impossible to get it done. When one realises that in the cities relief work is being carried out in the improvement of school and church grounds and that this source of labour is not available in the country, one naturally expects that there would be a favourable balancing effect in favour of the country, in that it would enjoy a bigger subsidy on loans. The country people are handicapped in two ways—they have to pay unemployment relief tax and they are unable to obtain the same amount of help as the city people in the way of subsidies.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Take it on a population basis. The hon. gentleman would find—

Mr. MOORE: I would not find anything of the sort. The hon. gentleman can consider the question in whatever way he likes—the country districts, unfortunately, are getting a very raw deal.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: There is not the same percentage of unemployed in the country.

Mr. MOORE: I quite understand that, because the policy that is pursued by the Minister is attracting people away from the country to the cities. A tremendous amount of money is being expended in the cities and the people in the country are leaving their jobs to engage in relief work in the cities, with the hope eventually of being employed on Government loan works. They are giving up the work that they have been in the habit of doing in the country so as to become eligible for relief work in the cities. They consider that the city work is easier than the work that they have been doing in the country.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is a ridiculous statement.

Mr. MOORE: It is true.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that workers in the country are leaving full-time jobs to engage in intermittent relief work in the city?

Mr. MOORE: With the chance of eventually being employed on loan works. Men who were formerly engaged in working small areas of country are leaving them to come to the city to engage in relief work, where the hours of labour are fixed. The Minister knows that they are doing that.

Mr. FOLEY: I represent a farming area and I do not know of one such case.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: It is the policy of the Government to give help to farmers so that they may remain on their holdings, and they are doing it.

Mr. MOORE: Some are doing it, but others are not. They may be remaining on

their holdings in cotton areas but there are any numbers of farmers close to Brisbane who are giving up their farms to do relief work in the city.

The Auditor-General points out in his report that in the past year the revenue of the Brisbane harbour increased by £22,103 and working expenses were reduced by £5,988. An increase of 25 per cent. in the rate of dues was imposed on 1st September, 1933. The total receipts of the board amounted to £124,099, but £31,025 was secured purely as the result of the increase in the rate of dues. Who has to pay this increase in the rate dues? The people who ship their products overseas, and the people who purchase goods in this State. This increase in dues is really another tax on the same people who provide the taxable income of the State. The Auditor-General also points out that the taxation per head of the population is now £6 2s. 2d. All these increased taxes make it more and more difficult for industry to expand.

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

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) [5.28 p.m.]: I rise particularly to reply to the wild assertions made by the Leader of the Opposition at the commencement of his speech. He became very indignant, threw out a challenge, and definitely asserted that while he was Premier of the State the minutes of the Loan Council meetings were filed in the Parliamentary Library, and he made the further statement that since he had been Leader of the Opposition he had been able to quote from them. Munchausen and de Rougemont are mere amateurs compared with the member of Parliament who is prepared to make such false assertions. Never at any time and under any circumstances have the minutes of the Loan Council meetings been tabled in the Parliamentary Library—I am stating facts that can be confirmed by anyone who cares to take the trouble to check them. I challenge any hon. member to go into the Parliamentary Library and produce a file of minutes of Loan Council meetings that were held while the Moore Government were in power.

The only document that is tabled, either in this House or in the library, is the report of the meetings of Premiers' Conferences properly convened by the Commonwealth Prime Minister, or convened with the concurrence of other Premiers by the Premier of New South Wales—the senior State. Do hon. members recollect the period when the Moore Government adopted a similar course to that the hon. gentleman is following at the present time? When the Leader of the Opposition, the then Premier, and his Treasurer went South they usually made statements on their return to Brisbane that were of a very doleful character and resulted in discouraging the people and deepening the depression. The depression that existed was economic and it was also psychological. The statements made by the then Premier were such that even people who had money were afraid to buy a new hat, a shirt, or anything else if they could possibly do without it. It was because of this fact that the depression deepened and difficulty was piled on difficulty, making the position of the people worse. I again challenge any hon. member to produce the file of the reports of the

meetings of the Loan Council from the table of the library in this House during the period when the Leader of the Opposition was in power. It cannot be done. That statement is false; it has not a scintilla of foundation in fact.

The Leader of the Opposition said that he has been able to quote from the minutes of the Loan Council meetings while he has been Leader of the Opposition. He resented my interjection that if he had been able to do that he must have taken papers from his department. He then suggested that he would not do anything of that nature, and that he had never pried into the affairs of a private member or individual. Is it not a fact that the hon. gentleman was responsible for the issue of a regulation under the Income Tax Acts that enabled the Treasurer to call on the Taxation Office to furnish the file on any hon. member or any individual? Did he not go further than that? Did his Government not take power to instruct any employee of the Government in the Taxation Office to report to the Treasurer any information he obtained whilst examining the affairs of any company, firm, or individual? Yet he has the audacity to say that his Government never in any instance dealt with files, or went into the past history of any individual! Hon. members opposite know that that regulation was passed. I moved in this Chamber for the disallowance of the regulation and every hon. member in this Committee who was then a supporter of the Moore Government voted for its confirmation. It was the most dastardly form of espionage ever instituted by a Government.

Mr. RUSSELL: Why not knock it on the head now?

The TREASURER: The hon. member for Hamilton knows that that is the case.

Mr. RUSSELL: Why have you continued it?

The TREASURER: I have not continued it. The regulation was confirmed by this Parliament when the hon. member and other members of his party voted for it. Under that regulation I could send for the income tax file of the hon. member for Hamilton.

Mr. KANE: It would be a nice story!

Mr. RUSSELL: I am not ashamed of it.

The TREASURER: I have never used that power or authority, but I do know members of the Moore Government who did so.

Mr. MOORE: Members of my Government?

The TREASURER: Yes, members of the Moore Government who used it.

Mr. MOORE: I never heard of it.

The TREASURER: If the hon. member did not know what was taking place he evidently was not master of his own household.

Mr. MOORE: I never heard of one. The only person who had authority under the regulation to call for information was the Treasurer.

The TREASURER: Or any person acting for him or on his behalf. The Acting Treasurer had the same power.

Mr. MOORE: There never was an Acting Treasurer.

The TREASURER: Of course there was. If the Treasurer was outside the State an Acting Treasurer was appointed. You passed the word round—do not forget that.

Mr. MOORE: Passed round what word?

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.].

The TREASURER: Anything you thought you knew. That was all revealed in the debate that took place in this Chamber on the matter. I challenged the then Treasurer to place my income tax file on the table of the House, provided Ministers in his Government did the same thing.

I repeat again that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition is entirely without foundation. Not at any time have the minutes of the Loan Council been either tabled in this House or in the library, and if the hon. gentleman is able to quote from the minutes of a Loan Council then he has in his possession papers that belong to the Government and the State archives, and not to any individual.

The hon. gentleman also dealt with the question of unforeseen expenditure. He intimated that that expenditure had not been authorised by Parliament at all. Everyone in this Chamber knows that every financial year there is unforeseen expenditure; provision is made under the laws of the State and under the Standing Orders of Parliament for Supplementary Estimates to be tabled in Parliament for the unforeseen expenditure. Unforeseen expenditure is incurred by every Government, and I would advise the hon. gentleman, before he gets excited about these things, to have a look at the Supplementary Estimates and the unforeseen expenditure of his own Government. Every year his own Treasurer had unforeseen expenditure, and every year Supplementary Estimates were brought before the House. I have never known an occasion, and I do not think an occasion can be found, when no unforeseen expenditure was incurred by a Government since Queensland became a State. So there is nothing at all in that contention.

The hon. gentleman, however, was most interesting when he was dealing with the loan expenditure, and loan raisings and their effect on industry and employment. There is no doubt in my mind that the commencement of the recovery in Queensland dates from the time when Governments agreed, and were able, to provide for expenditure by Governments and local authorities on public works.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: What evidence can be adduced to the contrary? We know the hon. gentleman had a higher deficit during his last financial year than the amount he spent on public works. We know that his Government had funds available, and we know he allowed those funds to be used by other States. The hon. gentleman did not do that as a matter of policy; he argued the Loan Council forced him to do so. Nothing, of course, is further from the truth. Where an allocation has been made the money remains the property of the State; and those funds were the property of this State. The real facts, which can be brought out into bold belief are these: that what the Leader of the Opposition now advocates he and other Governments tried to do. His Government reduced wages and social services and cut down public works to a minimum, all on the plea of the endeavour to balance the Budget and place the State on a sound financial basis. What were the results? We know that while the hon. gentleman practised those economies unemployment increased. There was greater unemployment during that period than in

any other in the history of this State; there was a direct relation between the hon. gentleman's economy cuts in public works and the volume of unemployment. To the extent that he cut wages and reduced public expenditure—both directly by the State and indirectly by the local authorities and other borrowers from the Government—to that extent business depression deepened, and to that extent unemployment increased. There is no doubt at all that those are the facts and that that was the direct result of his policy. The Government changed that policy in 1932, and initiated a public works policy that has been carried on up to the present time, and has been a benefit to all the States of the Commonwealth. Will anyone seriously assert that the improvement that has taken place in private industry has not been the result of the inspiration of the renewed confidence brought about by the existing policies of Governments?

Business depends entirely on the spending power of the community. If there are large bodies of people with little or no spending power, then the amount of business done in the community is reduced, but if, on the other hand, the spending power of the people is increased, the volume of business in every direction is proportionately increased. A sum of £10 spent in wages on public works circulates through every avenue, and gives benefit to an extent that cannot actually be calculated. It is the old, old story of "The Circulating Sovereign"; it is as true to-day as when the pamphlet was issued. A circulation of funds benefits all sections of the community.

And what is wrong with putting unemployed men to work for the development of the State? What is wrong with making use of capital that would otherwise be unemployed? Our policy, I repeat again, is to make use of capital that otherwise would be unemployed, and to put to work labour that would be otherwise unemployed. That is the policy not only of this Government but of the majority of those represented on the Loan Council. We intend to put it into effect to the full extent of our ability.

It is true, of course, that as industry recovers and expands there should be a tapering off of Government expenditure. In the first Budget statement of this Government I asserted that during a period of depression public works must be initiated to give a counterpoise to unemployment. As industry generally increases in volume and as price levels improve there should obviously be a tapering off of that expenditure, and under normal conditions—I will go so far as to say—the yearly payments and sales over the counter would be enough, or nearly enough to meet Government loan requirements. We are better circumstanced in that respect than any other State. It must also be borne in mind that whereas the loan programme for the State for the current year is £4,100,000, it does not follow that the increase to the national debt will be that amount. We borrow less new money than almost any of the mainland States, and that is due to the financial policy that has been pursued in this State for many years. We have more repayments than any other State. The Commonwealth Savings Bank Agreement gives us a proportion of its investments. There are other institutions that make investments in Government

LHon. W. Forgan Smith.

stock. Therefore the amount of loan money that Queensland requires from the market for public works is well under £2,000,000 this year. That is not an undue amount for any State to borrow, having regard to the development of its industries.

It is very amusing to hear the direful cries from hon. members opposite of possible disaster. These are the people who condemn a policy that enables us to provide for the economic defence of our own kith and kin. They condemn it as being unsound and wasteful, nevertheless the same people will find unlimited funds for the purpose of destroying life. It is better to save than it is to destroy. We are preventing the people from being demoralised and degraded. We are raising their standards in every possible way, and up to date the plan we have adopted has been the best that has yet been suggested as a means of dealing with any of these problems.

The hon. member endeavoured also to suggest that the incidence of subsidies to local authorities was unfair. He suggests that the figures he used—assuming for the moment they are correct—justify a conclusion that there has been an unfair allocation of these funds. Nothing could be further from the truth. The facts in relation to loans and subsidies have been placed on the table of this Assembly every session. It will be found that all districts of the State have participated in Government expenditure and that the allocation has been fair and just. It will be remembered that when this Government first came into power we invited local authorities to co-operate with us in providing employment. We encouraged them to submit plans for public works that if sound in themselves would give the greatest amount of employment. We were not in a position to force local authorities to put forward propositions, but those local authorities that did submit schemes were very fairly dealt with—not on the basis of the electorate concerned, but on the basis, first of all, of the answers to the questions: was the work of itself a sound proposition and what was the volume of employment that would be given. That has been the determining factor during the period this Government have been in power. We know that the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition is based on the well-known psychological trait of character that people are prone to accuse others of being guilty of the meannesses they practise themselves. No hon. member opposite can put forward any facts to sustain a case that shire councils have been treated unfairly in the loan policy of the State.

It is obvious, however, that we cannot continue indefinitely to subsidise local authorities on a 50 per cent. basis, and this year there has been an alteration in the policy. We subsidise on the basis of the wages that are involved in any scheme placed before us. All the promises that have been made in reference to previous loans will be carried out, but applications as from the 1st July last will be dealt with on the basis of the amount of labour that will be employed and the general wages bill of the scheme. No hard and fast rule is laid down, and outback places and country districts have received favourable consideration at all times. Of course, it is obvious and natural that large works can be carried out in the cities. The city councils have to undertake transport work, such as trams, supply electricity, and provide water supply and sewer-

age facilities. All such works are carried out in the cities because of the greater population there and because they can afford to do so. So that it is only natural that in the large centres such large works will be commenced. I deprecate any attempt to pit country against town. In the economy of this Government and in the policy of this party we have regard at all times to the best interests of the whole community.

The decisions of the Loan Council were expressed very fully in the statement I gave to the Press immediately upon my return to Brisbane. That statement has been published in all the Brisbane newspapers and I presume, also, in the provincial Press. The public are entitled to know the decisions of the council. It has been suggested that various sums of money were refused. It is true that the proposal submitted by the various Governments in the first instance was for a loan of £10,000,000. The Commonwealth Bank Board, however, which is our adviser on these matters, recommended that we go on the market for £7,500,000. It is not true that it refused to underwrite another loan. Having regard to all the circumstances of the market and the needs of the various Governments, we agreed to go on the market for £7,500,000. So far as that is concerned, it will enable the Queensland Government to carry out its policy for a considerable period ahead. It is on account of the programme decided upon in June of this year. The requirements for the remainder of the financial year, and for the carry over into next financial year will be dealt with at the next Loan Council meeting.

Governments do not always spend their full appropriations. A meeting of the Loan Council will be held next year, when the financial position of Governments will be known in greater detail. Very often it is found that less money is required from the loan market to meet the Governments' programme to the end of the financial year than was anticipated. For example, the Toowoomba City Council submitted a proposal to the Government in connection with a water supply scheme and more than a year ago I agreed to a loan-subsidy for this purpose. A survey had to be made of the watershed from which the water was to be obtained and plans and specifications had to be prepared. I agreed that the money would be available to the council as required—the policy adopted in connection with many other proposals. I have found that local authorities show a great deal more zeal in approaching the Treasurer for a loan than they exhibit after they have been authorised to go ahead with the work. I realise that plans and specifications have to be prepared, that very often tenders have to be called, and that a fair amount of time is required to do preliminary work in connection with large water supply and sewerage schemes, but even after allowing for all those factors, I have discovered that local authorities display less zeal in proceeding with the works than they do in approaching the Treasurer for his approval. Consequently, in Queensland there is a considerable carry-over of funds into each new financial year.

I have no doubt at all that the new loan of £7,500,000 will be a distinct success, but it is well to note that interest rates have hardened. One has only to check up the market values of various issues of Government stock to observe that tendency.

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

There is a greater demand for investment in private industry than there was some time ago, but that is all to the advantage of the State. It is pleasing to notice that companies are expanding their enterprises and providing employment for more and more people. That is in keeping with the gradual building up of the economic fabric of the nation. Private enterprise should be encouraged, and it is gratifying to know that there is a greater demand for finance by private undertakings to-day than a year or so ago. I am not putting forward a plea for higher interest rates. About a year ago the Commonwealth Government were able to raise the first loan at 3 per cent. But surely no one ever believed that Governments would be able to continue to raise loans at that rate. To find another 3 per cent. loan one would have to go back to 1901 when the Queensland Government borrowed just under £1,000,000 at that rate. I am not advocating or justifying increased rates of interest, but one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that as the demand for money by private undertakings increase interest rates must harden.

Everybody knows that no Government could continue indefinitely to finance local authority works to the extent of half the cost. Consequently, we have initiated a policy of reduced subsidies this financial year with a view of tapering off as recovery takes place. We have, in addition, reduced the rate of interest chargeable to local authorities by 1 per cent. This materially helps their general finance. There can be no doubt that local authorities afford a very fruitful field for the performance of useful work in unemployment schemes. That was one of the matters discussed at the Loan Council, and the Federal Government are prepared to help to some extent by assisting to pay the interest on approved local authority works. The Federal Government placed £100,000 on the Estimates for this financial year for that purpose. There is no cut and dried scheme in connection with the matter, and the decision was that the States could make application for help on behalf of local authorities, at the same time specifying the class of work to be done. Obviously, as I pointed out at the Loan Council, it is necessary to obtain continuity of policy. It would be grossly unfair to encourage local authorities to incur a large amount of capital expenditure if the relief in the payment of interest offered by the Federal Government was only for an indefinite period. Local authorities are helped very considerably by the Government, but we are looking into the general ramifications of local authority work throughout the State, and we find a growing tendency to lean on the Government in the carrying out of works that are essentially their function. The unemployment relief scheme, initiated by the Moore Government and continued up to the present day, enables local authorities to secure an abundance of labour. There has been a tendency right from the beginning for local authorities to do work by means of relief labour that in normal circumstances would be done by men whom they directly employed and who enjoyed continuity of work. It is true that local authorities throughout the State are carrying out with relief labour permanent works that are the normal duties of local authorities. That cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, because each arm

of government must carry its own responsibility. If there is one thing that is as bad as unemployment itself it is casual employment. Casual employment has a very bad effect on the individual, apart altogether from the standard of living. We should make an endeavour to provide continuity of employment and discontinue casual labour as much as possible.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his efforts to set town against country and town against city, quoted the subsidies made available to local bodies. He cited the figures that are to be found on page 328 of the report of the Auditor-General, giving the total figures of loans and subsidies to city councils and town councils respectively. Those figures pretty well balanced. He finally sought to show that shire councils had received less in subsidy than they had obtained by loan. There is an obvious explanation, and the Leader of the Opposition understands it. Where the loan in this table of figures is less than the subsidy, it is due to the fact that local authorities within the cities have the right to borrow themselves. If hon. members look at the columns on the top of the page they will find that the Brisbane City Council borrowed £97,159 1s. 11d. from the Government and obtained subsidies of £351,551 2s. The Leader of the Opposition endeavoured to show from those figures that the Government gave what might be termed the "most favoured nation clause" to the city as against the country, whereas the real facts are that the Brisbane City Council has the right to borrow money itself, and that it exercised that right. The same applies to other cities within the State. The Mackay City Council, the Townsville City Council, and many other authorities have power to borrow directly. Quite recently we finalised certain loans to the Brisbane City Council amounting in all to about £500,000. That means that it will borrow £500,000 this financial year, and get a subsidy in addition from the Government. The loan granted by the Government will be a very small one. That is the obvious explanation of those figures.

MR. GODFREY MORGAN: Do you say that if a local authority borrows from outside sources it gets a larger subsidy than if it borrows from the Government?

THE TREASURER: No, I do not say that; I say that accounts for the apparent disparity in the figures in the Auditor-General's report. For example, we agreed to allow the Toowoomba City Council up to £200,000 for its water supply scheme. If it can borrow £100,000 from a financial institution that does not prevent it from getting a subsidy from the Government, the result being that in the table the hon. gentleman quoted it would appear as receiving no loan money but £100,000 in subsidy. That is the explanation. The cities do not get any more favourable treatment than the shires.

In that regard I ought to mention that there is a gentleman's agreement between the various Governments that any local authority that borrows money on the open market can only do so subject to the control of the State Treasurer, who shall decide whether it shall be allowed to borrow the money or not. His decision is based on the terms and conditions of the loan and the question whether the time is favourable. Obviously

[Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

it would be wrong, having regard to the policy of the Loan Council and the Financial Agreement, to allow local authorities to enter into competition with Governments for loan funds and so raise the interest rate. So the arrangement that has been made and has been in operation for some time is that local authorities shall not be allowed to borrow on the open market without the authority of the State Treasurer and then only at such time and under such terms and conditions as he approves. Furthermore, if the amount is in excess of £100,000, it is subject to the approval of the chairman of the Loan Council.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Does that affect your borrowing as a State? Supposing the Brisbane City Council borrowed £1,000,000, does that affect the amount the State would get from the Loan Council?

The TREASURER: No; but quite obviously it does affect it to the extent that as it is able to obtain accommodation itself the loan programme we put forward is reduced. If I, as Treasurer, undertook to finance entirely all local authorities, then it would mean augmentation of the amount I should receive. To the extent that certain local authorities are able to make their own arrangements, our own loan programme is reduced, but it is not in any way increased; and the Loan Council protects the Brisbane City Council when borrowing in the way I have mentioned.

Satisfactory arrangements have also been finalised to finance the construction of the Jubilee Bridge to its completion on terms extending over the period of construction, funds to be raised at the rate of £100,000 per quarter. That also was subject to the ratification of the Loan Council and very satisfactory arrangements have been made.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Where do you propose to borrow the money from—the Commonwealth Bank?

The TREASURER: No, from a financial institution. The matter will be dealt with by the Governor in Council to-morrow, and I do not desire to anticipate the decision there.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [7.10 p.m.]: I think the Leader of the Opposition has discharged his obvious duty in calling attention to the financial condition of the State. All the indications point to the fact that the money market is much harder. It has been alleged that there is a definite demand on the part of private enterprise for available funds, and that is a good sign; but it indicates the need for caution in handling Government finance. Although the Treasurer is satisfied with his own allocation, it must be disappointing in the extreme that the interest rate has been considerably increased. It is apparent that interest rates on future loans will be raised, and that may be reflected in higher taxation. All these matters must be taken into consideration by every Treasurer.

I think that while we have idle money in the country it should be utilised. If private enterprise cannot utilise the money then its use for the financing of public works may be justified. I am surprised that the Treasurer should reiterate some of the statements he made during the election campaign.

The TREASURER: Have you seen any of the Loan Council minutes?

Mr. RUSSELL: I think I have.

The TREASURER: Have you?

Mr. RUSSELL: I am not sure.

The TREASURER: Who showed them to you?

Mr. RUSSELL: I was not a member of the Moore Cabinet and therefore did not have access to papers that the Ministers may have had in their possession.

The TREASURER: You never saw them in the library?

Mr. RUSSELL: As a matter of fact I never inquired. Our library is somewhat defective as regards the supply of necessary materials for the use of members. There is no reason why all these documents should not be made available to members. I make a point of obtaining direct as many Commonwealth documents as possible. The demand by hon. members for them is so great that even if they were available in the library there is the possibility of not being able to procure them when one wanted them.

The Treasurer said that the depression was both economic and psychological, and that the doleful statements of the Moore-Barnes Government were also a contributing factor to the degree of the depression. That is an idle statement to make; it cannot be proved. If one remembers the circumstances that led up to the depression one must admit that it was primarily brought about by the tremendous fall in world prices. That was certainly aggravated in Australia by the unstatesmanlike handling of the situation by the Scullin Government. We know that in 1929, owing to the depression, which had just started, and owing to the fact that the Labour Party then in administration in the Commonwealth Government, were unable to meet the situation, things generally got into a very parlous state indeed. We have only to remember that Australian bonds that had been quoted at £98 in September, 1929, fell away to £79 5s. in June, 1931. It was not until the Premiers' Plan was adopted in June, 1931, that Australian bonds commenced to increase in value. Confidence was created and we were able to float loans for the relief of unemployment. The Treasurer would have us believe that the genesis of the improvement that has taken place was due to the Loan Council meeting held in July, 1932, at which he attended for the first time. By that time loan money had been made available—I think it was first available in April, 1932—owing to the restoration of confidence brought about by the dismissal of the Scullin Administration in the Commonwealth Government and of Mr. Lang in New South Wales. Mr. Scullin himself strongly objected to Mr. Lang's attempt to default in payment to bondholders. This had caused a tremendous flutter in financial circles in London and Australian securities fell away to a very low level. Although Mr. Scullin was prepared to meet the situation he could not get the support of his colleagues. There was a restoration of public confidence on the advent of the Lyons Administration, who put into effect a policy of reconstruction and brought about the adoption of the Premiers' Plan, which was subscribed to by every State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. McLEAN: That is not correct.

Mr. RUSSELL: You try to disprove it if you can. The ability of the Loan Council to get money was solely due to the operation

Mr. Russell.]

of the Premiers' Plan. In April, 1932, it was decided to raise a loan of £2,400,000 for the immediate relief of unemployment. Queensland's share in this first public loan for the relief of unemployment was £620,000, a greater sum than the present Treasurer was able to raise at the first Loan Council meeting he attended in June of the same year. He would now have us believe that the genesis of the present improvement was due to the amendment he moved at that conference.

Mr. KING: That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL: I am surprised the hon. member should be so fatuous as to believe such a fable. At that conference the Prime Minister, Mr. Lyons, moved—

"That this conference affirms its adherence to the Premiers' Plan, and undertakes to meet interest obligations, and to continue progressively to reduce budget deficits."

It will be found that the Premier of Queensland tried to amend that by striking out a very important part of that clause, but after a good deal of discussion it was agreed to allow his amendment to be tacked on to the original motion. That amendment read—

"And conduct public policy with a view to reviving industry so as to restore normal employment to our citizens who now have neither work nor wages."

The very thing that had been done right from April, 1932, when the first public loan was floated, and when all the Premiers decided that a public loan should be floated for the relief of unemployment! The conference in July, 1932, merely carried out the procedure that had been followed at the earlier conference. Why, therefore, does the Treasurer say that the amendment that he boasts about was the genesis of the improvement that has taken place? Improvement had taken place long before the Labour Government obtained office; confidence had been restored long before the Moore Government's exodus in 1932. It is interesting to hear the Treasurer telling that fable. It may be all right to tell it to his followers in Mackay, but in this Committee surely hon. members are sensible enough to see through it.

Another fable continually repeated by the hon. gentleman and adopted as the parrot cry of his supporters is that the Moore Government lent money to the other States when our own people were starving.

Mr. H. WILLIAMS: That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL: The hon. member says it is true. What are the facts? When the Moore Government took office in 1929, as will be noticed from the Auditor-General's report, two loans had already been made by Mr. McCormack to two Southern States. One had been repaid and the other was owing—South Australia still owed £250,000. When the Moore Government took office in 1929 there was a cash balance of about £4,000,000 in the Treasury, and as it is customary for every Government to husband their resources and spread the loan money over as long a period as is possible, it was decided, at the instigation of the Loan Council, to lend some of this money to the other States at short call. That money instead of lying idle

in the bank, earned £104,769 in interest, which was added to the available loan balance. The States to which loans were made were—

	£
South Australia	500,000
Victoria	250,000
New South Wales	750,000
Western Australia	100,000

Those loans were repaid on the following dates:—

Victoria	31 October, 1930
New South Wales	30th April, 1930
Western Australia	11th July, 1930
South Australia	5th January, 1931

All that money was repaid in ample time, and the Moore Government had the use of it during the remainder of their term. In addition, that money earned interest amounting to £104,769, which was also available for the relief of unemployment and other purposes. It is about time that the Treasurer dropped that fable about lending money to other States when our own people were starving. We merely followed the practice of a very eminent Labour Leader, Mr. McCormack, who saw the necessity while he had the funds at his disposal, of placing that money at profit, and I am surprised that hon. members on the Government side should believe there is anything in this fable that is often repeated by the hon. gentleman.

Mention has been made of the regulation that the Moore Government embodied in an amendment of the Income Tax Acts. I do not think that that regulation was availed of on a single occasion. It was put there for a purpose, and if the Moore Government did wrong in passing that regulation, why have the present Government not abolished it?

If the Moore Government committed such a heinous crime, why do the present Government perpetuate it? The Treasurer stated that he was prepared to place his income tax return on the table. I am prepared to place mine on the table. I have nothing to be ashamed of. I will let him have a look at it. I do not mind—not a bit. The hon. member for East Toowoomba interjected that it might be interesting reading. I resent the imputation that he makes in that remark and he ought to be ashamed of himself for saying it.

The Treasurer said that we are keener on organising for the destruction of human life than for the economic welfare of the people, but I throw that imputation back in his teeth as being absolutely untrue. We are just as keen for the preservation of peace as the hon. gentleman professes to be. At any rate, we do not blow hot and cold as his party has done of late. So long as we are members of the League of Nations it is our duty to carry out its policy, but the Labour Party has two policies in that regard—it wants to be in the League of Nations and it does not want to be in it. It must decide to be either in or out. I do not think that there is any section of the community that has any idea of going to war over Abyssinia. We know the horrors of war and I think the whole British Empire is united to resist war-like aggression by any country; and it is only by adhering to the League of Nations that we can prevent a holocaust similar to

[Mr. Russell.

that which occurred in 1914-1918. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to throw that accusation in our teeth; I throw it back at them as being absolutely untrue and malicious.

Mr. WATERS: You know it is a fact.

Mr. RUSSELL: The hon. member is only a humbug. The Treasurer stated that the indications were that private companies were showing an inclination to invest more money in this State in private enterprise. We should encourage them to the utmost, but while this State has to bear such a heavy load of taxation and there is in operation the most vindictive income tax law in Australia there is very little encouragement to these companies to extend their operations here. We have noticed in the Press of late that arguments have proceeded in the Southern States concerning the tax levied by Queensland on profits made by Southern companies in this State. That is one of the biggest bugbears affecting trading companies in Australia and the Victorian companies have already threatened retaliation. If we insist on taxing their profits unduly the Victorian and other companies will retaliate. So soon as an extra tax is imposed on profits made by the sale of Queensland goods in the Southern States, so soon will the boot be on the other foot. We have not shown any desire to encourage the operations of limited liability companies in this State, because we have in operation the most iniquitous and most vindictive company tax, probably, in the world.

The Treasurer also stated that the Moore Government had piled up enormous deficits, but what are the actual figures? The total deficits amassed by the Moore Administration were £3,640,409, whereas the deficits amassed by the present Administration during their three years of office was £3,247,586, or only £400,000 less than the deficits of the Moore Government. When one takes into consideration the more prosperous times that were enjoyed by the present Administration, the amount of money that they abstracted from the Main Roads Fund, and the amount of £286,000 contributed by the Commonwealth Government last year the deficit of the present Administration last year was actually over £1,000,000. Taking all those factors into consideration the deficits amassed by the present Government were greater than those amassed by the Moore Administration.

I hope that the Treasurer will be a little fairer in his denunciation of the Opposition. He must bear in mind that he is not talking to a Mackay audience and that he is not on the soap box giving vent to pedagogic utterances. When the Treasurer is sensible we are prepared to listen to him, but we are not going to put up with his hectoring and bullying.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Rockhampton*) [7.28 p.m.]: I should like to reply briefly to the remarks by the hon. member for Hamilton and the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Hamilton certainly made an extensive review; he surveyed mankind from China to Peru. He dealt with all manner of subjects extending his observations from Camooweal to Abyssinia, but he was unable to justify the record of the Moore Government, and he was unable to damage the record of the Labour Administration.

The hon. member was at great pains to show that the economic trouble in Australia

was caused by the Scullin Administration, but nothing could be further from the truth. The trouble in Australia developed before the Scullin Government obtained control of the Commonwealth Treasury bench. Even a paper like the Sydney "Bulletin" said that it stood to the credit of the Scullin Administration that they had saved Australia from disaster. Before the Scullin Administration took charge the Bruce-Page Government had been responsible for developing an unfavourable Australian trade balance, amounting to £60,000,000 over a period of six years.

Australia was drifting to insolvency at the rate of £10,000,000 per annum when the Scullin Government took charge of the Commonwealth. It was because of that huge adverse trade balance and the fact that we were rushing to the brink of insolvency that the Bruce-Page Administration were defeated and the Scullin Administration returned to office. The position was appalling because of the lack of ability, the conservative policy and the want of vision and courage of the Tory Party in the Commonwealth sphere. The position was appallingly bad, not only in Australia but in other parts of the world also. The anti-Labour parties throughout the world, and the anti-Labour Party in Australia in particular, were responsible for those world conditions that are producing such an appalling effect on the world to-day. I recently read a book written by the Right Hon. W. M. Hughes, ex-Minister for Health and Repatriation in the Federal anti-Labour Cabinet, in which he lays it down that the cause of war to-day is economic injustice, the fight for markets, and the struggles of boodlers. That is the striking indictment of an ex-Leader of the anti-Labour Party in Australia and one who has just been forced out of the Federal Cabinet by the Lyons anti-Labour Administration. According to this shining light of the anti-Labour Party in Australia the trouble in the world to-day is not due to Labour administration but to economic injustice, the greed of the boodler, the sweater and exploiter who, to-day, unfortunately, dominate the world!

Not only were there great deficits in Australia before the Scullin Government took charge of the Federal Treasury, but our credit not only in Australia but also overseas was destroyed. Therefore, the Scullin Government came into office with an awful position confronting them. They directed their attention to the economic and financial rehabilitation of the Commonwealth, and to their splendid work in that direction tribute was paid by the anti-Labour journals of Australia. Australia, which was rapidly drifting to insolvency, was quickly turned again to solvency, and an unfavourable trade balance was converted into a favourable one by the Scullin Government. To-day there is increased employment in the Commonwealth—notwithstanding interference with the tariff by the Lyons Administration—as a result of the protectionist policy of the Scullin Government. Much of that beneficial protection remains and the Scullin Government are responsible for it. It is idle for the hon. member for Hamilton and his colleagues to try to traduce Labour for sins of their own creation. As Emerson said—

"Our opinion of others is but a reflex of our own character."

Mr. Lacombe.]

Hon. members who attack the policy of Labour should bear that dictum in mind.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Was not Mr. Lang in power in New South Wales?

Mr. LARCOMBE: That is only a side issue. We are not dealing with Langism, but with Labourism versus anti-Labourism, and Scullinism versus Lyonism, as it were. If we discuss the question from that logical viewpoint we shall find that Australia to-day has much for which to thank the Scullin Administration. Our troubles in Australia commenced to vanish when the Scullin Administration put into effect their financial policy, which included a saving of £6,000,000 a year in the interest paid on Government loans. They relieved the people of Australia of direct taxation to that amount. It is ridiculous for hon. members opposite to attribute the troubles of Australia to the Scullin Administration. They remained discreetly silent as to the blundering record of the Bruce-Page Administration who were fast destroying the credit of Australia, when they were fortunately for Australia defeated at the polls. No mention is made by hon. members opposite of the remarks of Mr. S. M. Bruce, the financial profligate of Australia, who so roundly condemned the Moore Administration. He said that the Moore Administration were drifting towards insolvency and if there was not a change there would not be any Federal Government or loan money for them.

Mr. WALKER: He never said anything of the sort.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I have briefly quoted the remarks of Mr. Bruce. He castigated the Moore Administration severely for their extravagance and inability to balance their Budget, and for their Budget Estimates brought down in this Parliament.

The hon. member for Hamilton referred to the increase in the rate of interest and endeavoured to show that the policy of Labour in some degree was responsible for it. That is an argument unsupported by actual experience. If we go back to 1914 we find that in Queensland the average rate of interest was the highest of all the mainland States of the Commonwealth, and when Labour left office in 1929 the rate was the lowest of all the mainland States. What a wonderful result! Before the depression had properly set in and after fifteen years of Labour government, the average rate of interest was reduced from the highest to the lowest of all the States in the Commonwealth! Those are facts.

Mr. NIMMO: That is not true.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LARCOMBE: The interjection is not true. Let the hon. member read the Commonwealth statistics and make the comparison himself.

Mr. NIMMO: I have them here.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LARCOMBE: He has not got the figures there. Let the hon. member look at the average rates of interest since 1914.

Mr. NIMMO: The hon. member knows very well the interest rate was the same in every State in the Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Oxley must obey my call to order.

Mr. LARCOMBE: I am speaking of the period from 1914 to 1929. The hon. member for Oxley knows quite well that the Loan Council was not in existence for a great part of the period from 1914 to 1929, and there was therefore no uniformity in the rate of interest. We know that the better conditions prevailing are partly responsible for the rising rate of interest as there is a greater demand for money; but we also know it is a melancholy fact that there is a great money ring, organised by the big powerful interests in the Australian financial and banking circle, that is able to dictate its policy. Although the statement made by the Premier of Tasmania that £6,000,000 worth of bonds were unloaded on the Australian market recently may not be quite accurate, we know there is a "bulling" and "bearing" of the money market, and that the rate of interest rises and falls largely at the discretion of that great powerful money monopoly that exists in Australia and other parts of the world. We know that Labour fought strenuously for banking and financial reform, and that it was defeated on that policy; but until that policy is put into operation in Australia and other parts of the world there is little hope for a substantial and permanent reduction in the rate of interest.

Mr. MAXWELL: God help the country if you got control!

Mr. LARCOMBE: I was a member of the Labour Cabinet in this State between 1919 and 1929, and during that period a state of prosperity prevailed, which was largely due to the work of Labour Administrations. The hon. member for Toowong was supporting a Government between 1929 and 1932 that almost destroyed Queensland financially, economically, and otherwise. (Opposition interruption.) During that period there was record unemployment and record deficits, an appalling reduction in factory output and primary production. All those regrettable events in our financial, economic, and national life took place during a period when the hon. member for Toowong—who I believe is at heart a critic of the policy of his own party, but is too loyal to criticise it openly—supported the Moore Government. No doubt in caucus he has very severely castigated his own leaders.

The Leader of the Opposition was apparently annoyed and disconcerted because the financial estimates of the Government were not being borne out during the portion of the financial year that has elapsed. Every hon. member in this Chamber and every student of Government finance knows that one cannot take a period of three or four months and estimate how the revenue will work out for the twelve months' period. The figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition are not a substantial guide for the year's transactions. During certain quarters revenue flows in much more freely than during other quarters, and the expenditure is greater in some quarters than it is in others. If the hon. member for Aubigny wants a little information on the matter of the dislocation of Budget Estimates, let him look up the financial tables during the time he was in control of this State, and he will find there was a difference of approximately £1,500,000, between the actual and the estimated loan expenditure. That

[Mr. Larcombe.

is the record of the critics of the Labour Government, yet they have the temerity to complain that the present Estimates are not in accord with principles of good government and sound finance. The ability of Labour Governments as financial administrators is demonstrated by the fact that even papers like the Brisbane "Telegraph" stated that after nine years of Labour Government we had reached a rate of expenditure that was commensurate with the needs of the State, and any sudden reduction would be disastrous to Queensland.

We find hon. members opposite criticising the loan policy of the Government week after week, month after month, and session after session, notwithstanding the fact that during the recess the Brisbane "Telegraph," and the Brisbane "Courier-Mail," too, supported the policy of raising loans in the manner followed by the Queensland Government. The "Courier-Mail" pertinently asked the critics to suggest an alternative. The raising of loans may not be the most admirable form of financing the State, but last year the "Courier-Mail" asked what the opponents of the policy had to offer in its place? That is the question we, too, ask. What is the alternative? Hon. members continually harp upon the evil of loan expenditure. Queensland has tried their policy of deflation and no loan expenditure. It almost ruined the State.

To prove that the loan policy of the present Government is neither injurious to the State nor unsound, one has only to look at page 42 of the Treasurer's table. One will there find a statement showing the annual payments of interest on the public debt of Queensland, the net amount derived from loan works and services, and the actual charge of the debt on the revenue from 1925-1926 to 1934-1935. The percentage of actual charge on revenue in 1931-32 was 18.21 and 1934-35 only 12.41, a difference of almost 6 per cent. Hon. members opposite persist in asserting that the loan policy of the present Government is injurious to the State. The facts and the figures are against them, and they are only beating the air and raising a party political argument.

The hon. member for Hamilton says that if Labour's argument is sound then by increasing further loan expenditure we should increase our prosperity. That is obviously reducing it to the ridiculous. There is a limit. There is a policy of moderation in human and financial economy. Because the policy pursued by the present Government is sound and satisfactory, it does not necessarily follow that doubling the loan expenditure would double the advantages. The reverse would be the effect. On a previous occasion I quoted the analogy that because a certain amount of food nourished the human body it did not follow that one should gorge oneself to death. That is a *reductio ad absurdum* argument. (Opposition interjection.)

It is rather amusing to find that the party that was known in the past in Queensland as the "Borrow, Boom, and Burst Party" is now the critic of the loan policy of the present Government. We know that it is merely a case of political strategy. We know there is something psychological in its attack. Opposition members as a Government failed miserably and they now desire to delude the people of Queensland into

believing that the present Government are spending loan money unsatisfactorily at too high a rate. Taking into consideration the facts—the production, the revenue, and the conditions generally in the State—our loan expenditure is reasonable. It was their party when in power in the past that piled up enormously the public debt of Queensland. It had control of this State for over fifty years. In 1914 Queensland was known as the slave State of the Commonwealth—that was the opprobrious designation applied to Queensland by the people in the other States. By a sound financial policy the Labour Party have raised Queensland from being the slave State to the proud position of the State with the highest standard of living in Australia.

Hon. members opposite consistently ignore the asset side of the balance sheet of the State. If they take the trouble to look up page 29 of the Treasurer's tables they will see how the money was expended and realise the splendid assets that have accrued. Of course there have been some failures. The State of Queensland to-day is a credit to Labour Governments and a credit to its people, and this is in no small measure due to the wise expenditure of loan money. We know there have been failures and mistakes, but is not that characteristic of human nature and of both Labour and anti-Labour Governments? But the percentage of inaccuracy and error has been less under Labour Governments than under any other form of Government in this State.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Did your Government not lend money to other States?

MR. LARCOMBE: I will tell the hon. member the fundamental difference between the lending of money to other States by the McCormack Government and by the Moore Government. It is true that the McCormack Government lent money to other States, but under what conditions? They were prosperous conditions—record production, record income, the lowest unemployment in the Commonwealth. When the Moore Government went into office between 1929 and 1932 they did not have those conditions. They did not control the splendid funds that the McCormack Government did. They dissipated that money when they sent it to other States. They closed down on the farmers who required advances. They closed down public works. They retrenched. That is the fundamental difference between the Moore policy and that of the Labour Government. The Labour Government only lent surplus funds when Queensland was prosperous; whereas on the other hand the Moore Government deliberately lent that money to other States when they were closing down public works and when the State was approaching, according to the Federal Treasurer, the point of bankruptcy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Are not the Government doing the same to-day?

MR. LARCOMBE: No. The arguments of hon. members opposite are mutually destructive. The hon. member for Oxley complained that certain school buildings were not being erected in his electorate, that loan money was not being spent, yet only a few days previously he was complaining that too much loan money was being spent. The hon. member for Hamilton a few days ago in this Chamber advocated the electrification of Queensland railways. That may be a

Mr. Larcombe.]

desirable objective, but it will cost many millions of pounds. Side by side with a castigation of the Government for the expenditure of loan money, the hon. member for Hamilton quietly and coolly advocated the expenditure of many millions of pounds on the electrification of the Queensland railways!

In view of those inconsistencies, I feel certain that the people of Queensland will not be misled. The object of the attack of hon. members opposite is obvious. It is simply to conceal the fact that the Moore Administration were responsible for the appalling record that it had, and to try to divert credit from the present Administration for the splendid work that is being done. Honestly, the present Government have done wonderful work in raising Queensland from the mire of financial insolvency to a reasonable degree of prosperity. Every week and every month we find an improvement in the position, culminating in the very creditable figures published recently by the Commonwealth Statistician showing that not only has there been a £5,500,000 increase in the wealth production of Queensland under the present Labour Government, but that the wealth production of Queensland per head is now higher than that in any other State of the Commonwealth.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) [7.51 p.m.]: I think it might be as well to say a word in reply to one or two statements made by the hon. member for Hamilton. On more than one occasion during his speech he stated that the Treasurer had made stupid statements during the election campaign, and when he eventually got to those stupid statements they were something to the effect that the Treasurer had caused an alteration in the financial policy of the States throughout the Commonwealth in July, 1932. The hon. member for Hamilton read the minutes of the meeting of the Loan Council in that month, and a careful perusal of those minutes will lead one to the conclusion that when the Premiers were assembled Mr. Lyons rose at the head of the table, and, making a dramatic gesture to all of them, asked them to place their hands upon their hearts and pledge themselves to continue the financial policy that was known as the Premiers' Plan. It was at that point that the Premier of Queensland objected and said it was time that the plan was converted from one of dismissing men and restricting employment to one of putting men into employment, and giving further employment. The hon. member for Hamilton says, "That was the plan agreed upon in April." How could it have been the plan agreed upon in April when it took the Premier of Queensland two days to convince Mr. Lyons and the rest of the Premiers of the Commonwealth that it was not the plan agreed upon in April? The Queensland Premier's amendment could have been disposed of in the twinkling of an eye if Mr. Lyons had said, "But we have already agreed to that." But they fought the amendment for two days, which shows that it was not the plan agreed upon in April.

The fact was that the Moore Government's policy was to restrict employment, to throw people out of work, to cut down expenditure as much as possible; in their infantile conception of financial matters they were following the rule of the man who had got

his horse down to living upon one straw a day—when, of course, the horse died. They practically had Queensland down to that very level. It is futile for the hon. member for Hamilton to say that that was the policy and that any policy introduced by the Labour Premier of Queensland in July was merely one of following the policy laid down in April. Had that policy been laid down in April there would have been no need for the Queensland Premier to move his amendment, which it took him some days to get through.

To show that that was the correct policy I need only remind hon. members that it has been followed ever since. The only real Country Party Premier in Australia, Mr. Dunstan, of Victoria, has also adopted the Queensland plan, and is attempting to follow it. Since then the Commonwealth Government have attempted to follow the plan, and the latest convert is the Baldwin Government in England, who have put forward the election promise that they will spend £65,000,000 in public works during the next three years. These men are wise men, and they can see the advantage of a good policy. They are not blind leaders of the blind. They are prepared to accept a decent policy.

The hon. member for Hamilton stated that the deficits amassed by the present Government during a period of three years were practically equal to the deficits amassed by the Moore Government, and added that if we took into consideration the money taken from the Main Roads Fund by the present Government, their deficits would exceed those of the Moore Government, but he forgot to say—I am not allowed to say that he conveniently forgot, because that might be improper, but I can say that he forgot—that his Government took £700,000 from trust funds without the authority of Parliament. There is this difference between the two lots of deficits: the Moore Government were returned to power when economic conditions were fairly satisfactory, but their deficits grew and grew and grew until they reached the magnificent total of over £3,000,000, including one of over £2,000,000. That deficit of over £2,000,000 has been brought down to about £500,000 by the present Government, and that is just the difference.

The hon. member also attempted to justify the action of the Moore Government in lending money to the Southern States, but it was a poor justification. He hoped that it would get through by reason of the fact that time had wiped away many memories. It reminds me of the old story of the man who was chased by a bull and was just able to get through the fence in time. He was extremely thankful, but after he had got along the road for half a mile he said to himself, "If I had turned round and dodged the bull I should have got on much better." After he had gone another half-mile he believed that he had dodged the bull, and after going another mile or so he was firmly convinced that he had chased the bull across the paddock. That is exactly the position that is taken up by the hon. member for Hamilton. He knows that his Government sent money to the Southern States and practically ruined Queensland, but he has now convinced himself, after a period of three years, that his Government did the right thing—that not only did they not send money down South,

[*Mr. Larcombe.*]

but they went down South and got money for Queensland. I have never seen the true position reversed in such a wonderful way as it has been done by that hon. member.

Mr. WALKER: Tell us where his statement was wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I have done so. The policy was framed in July, after the Queensland Premier had moved an amendment and the matter had been debated for two days. That is where the hon. member for Hamilton is wrong.

Let me remind the hon. member of one or two other statements. I quote now not from a paper favourable to Labour administration in Queensland, but from the "Australasian Insurance and Banking Record" for October, 1935, at page 882. It sets out figures showing the movement in Savings Bank deposits in the various States in September, 1934, and September, 1935. In New South Wales the deposits dropped by £3,395,000, and in Victoria by £4,675,000. But the increases in Savings Bank deposits in Queensland in September, 1935, as compared with September, 1934, were £824,000. Queensland led all the States of the Commonwealth in the matter of an increase in Savings Bank deposits!

Mr. NIMMO: You know why that is?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Of course I do. Does the hon. member for Oxley think I do not know? It is due to the fact that the people in Queensland have money to put into the Savings Bank. It is due to the fact that the workers in Queensland are putting their savings into the Savings Bank and have not been compelled to draw on their Savings Bank deposits as the workers in New South Wales and Victoria have done. The reason is that Queenslanders have the money to spare to save while the people under Nationalist Governments in New South Wales and Victoria have not the money to save up for a rainy day.

At 8 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Under the provisions of the Sessional Orders agreed to by the House on 28th August the period for the discussion of the Bill on all stages is limited to 8 o'clock p.m.

Question—"That the resolutions (*Mr. Smith's motion*) be agreed to"—put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to certain resolutions and asked leave to sit again.

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

RECEPTION AND ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

On the motion of the Treasurer (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*), the resolutions were received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL, No. 3.

ALL STAGES.

A Bill, founded on the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced, and passed through all stages without amendment or debate.

The House adjourned at 8.8 p.m.