KANAKA LABOUR.

No history of sugar would be complete without an account of the kanaka labour, which meant so much to the sugar growers of the sixties and seventies, and which left a bar sinister across the political records of Queensland. When Robert Towns started cotton-growing on Townsvale plantation on the Logan River in 1863, there was a scarcity of white labour, and a serious doubt of the industry being able to pay white men's wages. So Towns decided to import a lot of Polynesians from the South Sea Islands, and he engaged a man named Ross Lewin to take charge of the undertaking. Lewin had been years among some of the islands and knew the islanders, their customs and language, and he got the first sixty kanakas from the islands of Tanna, Malicolo, Erromanga, and Sandwich. Towns gave Lewin two documents, one an agreement to pay the islanders ten shillings per month, provide good food, good camps, and return to their islands in twelve months. The other was addressed to any mission, explaining the object of Lewin's visit and offering a guarantee that the recruits would be properly cared for. It is quite certain that those pioneer kanakas were carefully recruited and honestly cared for on the voyage. It is equally certain that they were well fed and housed on the plantation on the Logan. They slept in a large weatherboard building, roofed with grass. It was sixty by forty feet, in two rooms with bunks and blankets and a wide verandah; but after a few months the men preferred to have separate huts for the different tribes.

In 1864 the Logan grew 38,700 lb. of cotton, and in 1866 it increased to 189,630 lb., or 612 bales of clean cotton, of which 267 bales came off Townsvale plantation. In 1867 there came unpleasant reports from the islands regarding the non-return of kanakas who had gone to Queensland and Fiji, and were kept three years instead of one, and Captain Luce of H.M.S. "Esk," reported in April the loss of several ships and the murder of a number of Europeans. An enquiry showed that up to April, 1867, there had been 382 men recruited for Queensland and seventy-eight returned. A number of the kanakas preferred to remain for two or three years instead of going back. Governor Sir George Bowen went to the Logan and inspected 160 islanders on Townsvale plantation, all well fed and contented, most of them having been engaged for three years. He was surprised to find a steam plough at work there, under the direction of an English engineer. Daily prizes were given to the champion cotton-pickers, the prizes being knives, belts, buckles, beads, and tobacco. In 1868 Governor Belmore, of New South Wales, reported complaints against the recruiting on the islands, and in February of that year he received a petition, signed by eight missionaries, praying for an enquiry into the manner in which natives were being recruited in the New Hebrides. This petition contained serious charges, and a unanimous opinion that the system of obtaining Polynesian labour recalled the worst days of the slave trade. The answer to these charges was the passing by the Queensland Parliament of an Act, imposing stringent conditions and regulations, and the following scale of supplies:—Beef or mutton (or 2 lb. of fish), 1 lb.; bread or flour, 1 lb.; molasses or sugar, 5 oz.; vegetables, rice, or maize meal, 2 oz.; salt, 2 oz.; soap, 4 oz.; and tobacco, 1½ oz.

Those islanders brought with them from their seagirt homes, a lot of tara plants (Colocasia Macrorhiza), and grew them on the Logan, at Nerang, Maryborough, Mackay and the Herbert. The kanakas of the first years were all picked men, and those from Tanna especially, were described as "splendid looking fellows, tall, muscular, and wonderfully strong." This quality was not maintained in after years. The best men did not return to Queensland, and the recruiting vessels had to take what they could get. When the captains or recruiting agent made terms with the chiefs, those astute warriors were careful not to send the best men. They wanted their picked fighting men at home.

In August, 1863, nearly four years after the establishment of responsible government, Captain Robert Towns landed from the schooner 'Don Juan' the first consignment of kanakas, who played so large a part in subsequent years in the development of the sugar industry. Originally imported here for the purpose of cotton cultivation in the Logan district, it was not long before Captain, the Honourable Louis Hope, M.L.C., followed suit, and applied this class of labour to sugarcane cultivation at Cleveland, and from this small beginning the practice of indenting Polynesian labour grew into a vast and flourishing system, until the sugar lands of the North practically produced their crops wholly by its aid. The advent of this, perhaps, the least objectionable class of black labour, in time led, as it undoubtedly did, to the division of political parties, to bitter political strife, to acute personal differences among our leading politicians, to numerous social evils of varying kinds, and to the shocking tragedy of murder, rape, kidnapping, and all the violence attendant upon all forms of black slavery. So large a part did this trade play in legislation and administration, extending over a long period of years, that the subject could not be overlooked in the political history of the State. The whole trade was a blight upon our social and political life, yet the kanaka was a peaceable, law-abiding, kindly disposed savage, responsive to any act of benevolence, suited to the work for which he was imported, moderately industrious, faithful to those who gained his confidence, and with no particular ambitions in regard to inter-marriage with the white race. That was the early kanaka. His more modern prototype was often under the influence of
"civilization," a truculent savage, addicted to gambling, and frequently to drink—until in some of our northern coastal towns, he was becoming so great a social menace, that the advent of Federation, under whose laws he was returned to his native land, was, if for no other reason, an undisguised blessing.

Among the earlier experimenters in Polynesian labour was the Acclimatization Society at Bowen Park, opposite the General Hospital. There a gang of twelve or more kanakas were continuously employed for some years. Doubtless, it was the acute shortage of labour in

the early sixties, which gave rise to the idea of introducing island labour. In those days, there were visions of Queensland becoming a great cotton-growing country, and the prospect of successful cotton-growing without plentiful and cheap labour was not over bright. The experiment later on of Louis Hope, with sugar-growing, gave further impetus to the movement, which, in spite of opposition at the early stages, attained larger and and still greater dimensions. It is a significant fact that the opposition to the importation of Pacific Islanders

labour trade were encouraged to redouble their efforts, and by increased immigration of the black man root him more firmly in Northern Australia, and make his final elimination more difficult. Between 1863 and 1868 there was a steady flow both inwards and outwards of this class of labour, undertaken apparently with the full sanction of the Government, though, strange as it may seem, there was no attempt whatever either to regulate recruiting, or in any way to control the employers of Polynesians.
It was in the year 1868 that the Queensland Parliament first legislated upon this important phase of our social life, but only after repeated attempts to call public attention to the growing abuses of the trade. There was more than a grave suspicion that the earlier years of this trade in human beings were years of tragedy to the subject races, and that a large proportion of our coloured labour was brought here under evil circumstances. On March 4, 1868, "An Act to Regulate and Control the Introduction and Treatment of Polynesian Labourers" was passed and assented to, the preamble of which declared:

"Whereas many persons have deemed it desirable and necessary in order to enable them to carry out "their operations in tropical and semi-tropical agriculture, "culture to introduce to the colony Polynesian "labourers; And whereas it is necessary for the prevention of abuses and for securing the labourers "proper treatment and protection as well as for securing to the employer the due fulfilment by the "immigrant of his agreement that an Act should be "passed for the control of such immigration."

This Act provided for the importation of labour under regulations, the appointment of inspectors, the issuing of licences to import, with a guarantee to return the labourer to his home on the expiration of his agreement. Masters of labour vessels were under a bond to comply with imperative regulations regarding the number carried on any vessel, their rationing, non-supply of intoxicants, and other matters. Uncomfortable suggestions were being made at this time in regard to the details of the traffic; much correspondence appeared in the press on the subject, and both the local and Imperial Parliaments were approached with a view to stopping the trade entirely, or severely controlling it. It can readily be understood how the abuses connected with such a trade might naturally become the battle-cry of a political party. Indeed, that is just what they did become. From 1859 to 1868 the real and only rulers of the country were the planters and squatters, and the assertion of their self-interests became so aggressively pronounced, that there sprang up a well-organised opposition, with "Anti-Black Labour" as its rallying cry.

That the agitation against this class of labour had assumed large proportions, and that there were crying evils associated with it, is made quite evident by the fact that on June 27, 1872, an Imperial Act was assented to, having for its object "The Prevention and Punishment of Criminal Outrages upon Natives of the Islands in the Pacific Ocean." There was no disguise about this law, for it was entitled shortly, "The Kidnapping Act of 1872," and for the offence of kidnapping the colonial courts were authorised to impose "the highest punishment, other than capital punishment, awarded for any felony by the law of the colony in which such offender shall be tried." This Act was amended in August, 1875, under the title of "The Pacific Islanders Protection Act," and further drastic provisions were enacted, which one would have thought deterrent enough for all practical purposes. Locally, the importation of islanders into Queensland was governed under the 1868 law up to 1880, when Thomas McIlwraith, having come into office for the first time, passed in the latter year a law which repealed the Act of 1868, re-enacted a number of its provisions with important alterations, and made the departure of appointing "Government Agents" to accompany each recruiting vessel to the islands. The Polynesian Labourers Act Amendment Bills, introduced by Miles and Douglas in 1877 and 1878 respectively, had only reached their second reading stage, and in the meantime there had been continuous agitations, either for repression or regulation of the traffic. In those years, Samuel Griffith, who afterwards took so prominent a part in the crusade against the trade, and black labour employers, was a member of the Douglas Ministry as Attorney-General. Prior to the introduction of the above-mentioned Bills by Miles and Douglas, there had been a select committee appointed by the Legislative Assembly in 1876 to inquire into "the general question of Polynesian Labour."

Turn now to the 1880 Act. The age of recruits was limited. Masters of vessels were under a heavy bond to return the islanders to their proper islands; medical comforts were provided for the immigrants; the ration and dress allowance was increased; the number of passengers was limited; wages were protected; store accounts were not to be deducted from wages; the care and treatment of the sick were stringently provided for; employers had to maintain hospitals; and licences to employ islanders were only to be granted to those engaged in tropical or semi-tropical agriculture, defined to mean the cultivation of sugar-cane, cotton, tea, coffee, rice, spices, or other tropical or semi-tropical productions, or fruits. A perusal of this Act does not convey the impression that the Government of Queensland in 1880 was a consenting party to a slave trade, nor does any sane person believe that it was. In 1884, during the Griffith régime, the Pacific Island Labourers Act was amended. "Tropical or semi-tropical agriculture" was defined as meaning, "field work" in connection with the cultivation of sugar-cane, cotton, tea, coffee, rice, spices, or other tropical or semi-tropical productions or fruits, and did not include the business of engineers, engine-drivers, engine-fitters, blacksmiths, wheelwrights, farriers, sugar boilers, carpenters, sawyers,splitters, fencers, bullock-drivers or mechanics, grooms or coachmen, horse driving or carting (except in field work) or domestic or household service.
Shortly before the Griffith Government came into office the attention of recruiters had been directed to New Guinea, and the two islands of New Britain and New Ireland, lying north-west of New Guinea, as well as some of the smaller islands in the vicinity. It was not a suitable recruiting ground, for the natives in many instances were unhealthy, undesirable as labourers, and the mortality amongst them was very great. Early in 1884 recruiting was being carried on in the Louisiade Group, though the New Guinea mainland at that time had not been exploited. Recruiting at this period had been prohibited in New Britain and New Ireland, and in June, 1884, the prohibition was extended to the New Guinea mainland. In the meantime, however, information gradually began to leak out with regard to the transactions of those in charge of certain vessels, which left the Queensland coast during 1884. Those vessels were the “Hopeful,” “Ceara,” “Lizzie,” “Sybil,” “Forest King,” and “Heath.” The Government appointed a commission to investigate the charges made, and they carried out their inquiries on the spot, in addition to examining 500 islanders in Queensland, and the conclusion of the commissioners was that none of the islanders understood the nature of their engagements. The lamentable occurrences in connection with the voyages of the “Hopeful” were the subject of investigation by the supreme court, and the condign punishment of death sentences and capital punishment was meted out to offenders proved guilty of murder and kidnapping. The capital sentences were not carried out. The foregoing leads up shortly to the legislation of 1885. The islanders having been forcibly brought here, every instinct of humanity dictated that they should be set free and returned to their homes. With this object in view Samuel Griffith passed in August, 1885, “An Act to Make Provision for the Assessment and Payment of Compensation to certain Employers of Pacific Island Labourers, who have been returned to their native islands by order of the Governor-in-Council.”

Under this Act a district court judge with two assessors investigated the claims for compensation; there were strict limitations put upon the nature of the claims that could be made, and on the certificate of the judge compensation was payable out of any moneys appropriated by Parliament for that purpose. But a very much more important Act relating to Pacific Island labour was passed by Samuel Griffith in November, 1885. The eleventh and last section of this Act provided:—

“After the thirty-first day of December, One thousand eight hundred and ninety, no licence to introduce Islanders shall be granted.”

There were other important amendments of the 1880 to 1884 Acts increasing the capitation fee to be paid by employers to £1, and dealing with the money of deceased islanders. Furthermore, under the Act of 1884, certain exemptions had been granted to islanders who had been resident in the State for a continuous period of five years, and this was continued; but the day had come when, after twenty-one years of Polynesian immigration, Parliament definitely decided that it would have no more of a trade that had given rise to scandals without end, and had been the source of more political, party and personal differences, than any other subject that had cropped up during our political history. Five years was a good long notice to give the planter, and would easily have enabled him to adjust his requirements to the new conditions. There was naturally bitter controversy over the proposed abolition, but it had been definitely agreed upon as a part of the State policy, and it was futile to try to resist the great political sweep of the country, which Samuel Griffith had made at so recent a date. Who could have foretold, even with intimate knowledge of the great fighting qualities of the planter class, that this momentous decision, would, within a few short years, be reversed? The importation of kanakas had to cease in December, 1890, but the islanders brought in up to that date would be on a three-years’ engagement, and thus eight full years were given in which those interested in the sugar industry could make arrangements for a suitable substitute. The Pacific Island Labourers Acts, 1880 to 1885, were amended again in 1886 by Samuel Griffith, who was still in office. The definition of “Pacific Islander” was amended to include a “native not of European extraction, of any island in the Pacific Ocean, which was not on the eighteenth day of November One thousand eight hundred and eighty, within Her Majesty’s Dominions, or within the jurisdiction of any civilized power.” That amendment was necessary, because of the acquisition of territory in the Pacific by civilized powers, the intention being that the islanders should come within the protection of the law.

The next move in the history of this question came in 1892. Two Governments, led by Thomas McIlwraith and B. D. Morehead respectively, had intervened between June, 1888, and August, 1890, at which latter date Samuel Griffith again came into power, in combination with his one-time political foe, Thomas McIlwraith. Many things had happened between those dates; many influences had been at work, and in April, 1892, Samuel Griffith came to Parliament with, and passed a proposal to repeal the provision of the 1885 Act putting an end to the importation of Pacific Islanders. When one looks back and thinks of how he attained the very pinnacle of his political fame largely by means of the high stand he took in his effort to prevent the good name of Queensland being besmirched by the sordid surroundings of a doubtful trade, one wonders...
what malign influences were brought to bear to make such a man recant such great ideals, after spending the best years of his political life in cleaning an Augean stable. No wonder, that between the years 1892 and 1901 Parliament preserved an ominous silence in regard to the question of Polynesian labour. It had hurt itself by its astounding inconsistency and want of continuity of purpose, and when the first Commonwealth Government came into power and the islanders were unceremoniously bundled out of Queensland, exemption being given to those who were exempted under Section 11 of the Queensland Act 47, Vic. No. 12, on the ground of continuous residence for not less than five years, before the first day of September One thousand eight hundred and eighty-four, there was no very profound regret that from Queensland at least had been removed for ever a fertile source of political contention, and an unattractive phase of the Queensland labour system in sugar-growing.

LEGISLATION.

No single Australian industry has received so much attention from the National and State Legislatures as has sugar-growing. This has been largely due to the determination of the people to preserve the racial purity of the Continent, and therefore to prohibit the further importation and employment of coloured aliens for work on the canefields and at the mills. This necessitated the payment of a bounty to growers employing white labour, and the exclusion of cheaply produced foreign sugar. On the other hand, the consummation of Federation had opened the markets of the other States to the Queensland producers, and undoubtedly sugar-growing has been one of the industries to benefit immediately and greatly from the Federal Constitution. The following is a list of the various Acts passed to deal with the perplexing labour problems surrounding the sugar business and with other phases of that interest:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title of Act</th>
<th>Date of Royal Assent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>1. The Pacific Islanders Protection Act, 1872</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Pacific Islanders Protection Act, 1875</td>
<td>1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Pacific Island Labourers Act Amendment Act, 1884</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880 Amendment Act of 1885</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880 Amendment Act of 1886</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. The Pacific Island Labourers (Extension) Act of 1892</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. The Sugar Growers Act of 1913</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. The Sugar Cultivation Act of 1913</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. The Sugar Growers' Act, 1910</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Sugar Bounty Act, 1905-12</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Sugar Bounty Abolition Act, 1912</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Sugar Excise Repeal Act, 1912</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Acts.

1. The Pacific Island Labourers Act, 1901 1901
2. Excise Tariff Act, 1902 1902
3. Sugar Rebate Abolition Act, 1903 1903
4. Sugar Bounty Act, 1903 1903
5. Sugar Bounty Act, 1906 1906
6. Excise Tariff Act, 1905 1905
7. Excise Tariff (Amendment), 1906 1906
8. Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1901-6 1906
9. Sugar Bounty Act, 1905-10 1910
10. Excise (Sugar) Act, 1910 1910
11. Sugar Bounty Act, 1905-12 1912
12. Sugar Bounty Abolition Act, 1912 1912
13. Sugar Excise Repeal Act, 1912 1912

*The proclamation in regard to the repeal of these Acts was issued on July 26, 1915.

There was never at any time any doubt about the temper of the people in regard to the employment of cheap coloured labour, and one of the earliest matters to be dealt with by the first National Parliament was that of the kanakas being used on the canefields. In 1901 both Houses passed an Act providing that no Pacific Islander should enter Australia after March, 1904, and that none should enter before that date except under special licence provided for in the Act, and that no agreement involving the employment in Australia of coloured labour should remain in force after 1904. The Act also stipulated for the deportation of kanakas to their homes. The greater number of the blacks were sent out of the Commonwealth, but in 1906 the Pacific Island Labourers Act was passed by the National Legislature, and some of the blacks have been permitted to remain, something like 2,000 of them now being in Queensland still engaged in cane-growing, some having holdings of their own.

Before the creation of the Commonwealth Queensland sugar was subject to a duty of £6 per ton on entry into Victoria and £3 per ton on entry into New South Wales or South Australia. The consummation of Federation abolished all such fiscal imposts as between State and State, and in 1902 the Commonwealth Parliament passed the Excise Tariff Act, which gave to the sugar growers of Queensland a protective duty of £6 per ton against all foreign cane sugar. The same measure also provided for an excise of £3 per ton to be collected on locally-grown sugar, but of this amount a rebate of £2 per ton was allowed on sugar grown by white labour. The rebate on the excise was known as the sugar bounty.

The Federal Parliament in 1903 passed the Sugar Rebate Abolition Act and the Sugar Bounty Act. The amounts respectively of the excise and rebate were not altered. Two years later another Bounty Act and Excise Tariff Act were adopted. The Bounty Act raised the bounty tax from 4s. to 6s. per ton on cane yielding not less than 10 per cent. of commercial sugar. Under this legislation the excise was increased, as from 1907, to £4 per ton. The Excise (Sugar) Act of 1910 provided for the continuance indefinitely of the existing excise on locally-produced sugar.
In 1912 the National Legislature passed a law going considerably further than any previous Act in the matter of protecting workers in the sugar industry. This measure is known as the Sugar Bounty Act, 1905-12. It vests in the Federal Minister power to make application to the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, or any Judge of a Federal State Court, or any person or persons constituting a State Industrial Authority, for a declaration as to what wages and conditions of employment are fair and reasonable for labour performed in the production of sugar. The Minister is endowed with power to withhold payment of the bounty to any employers not complying with the conditions laid down as fair and reasonable by the authority applied to.

Further legislation was passed later in the same year by both the Federal and State Parliaments, acting in agreement with one another. The Federal measures were the Sugar Excise Repeal Act and the Sugar Bounty Abolition Act. They were passed conditionally on the Queensland Parliament adopting legislation abolishing coloured labour from employment in the sugar industry. The Denham Government, then in power in the State House, passed the State Sugar Cultivation Act of 1913. This was approved of by the Fisher (Federal) Government.

An inordinate number of special permits had been granted to coloured men to work on the canefields. This was regarded as a breach of trust, and the Ryan Government proceeded to cancel the permits, protesting that the prosperity of the industry rested on the goodwill of the people of the other States, who had sanctioned the £6 per ton duty, but who would soon throw the growers open to competition from duty-free, imported sugar if the national policy of the preservation of a racial purity was flouted by the Queensland Government and those engaged in the industry.

About a year after the outbreak of the great
European War, at the commencement of August, 1914, a serious position arose in connection with the sugar industry, and it resulted in drastic action being taken by both State and Federal Parliaments. Owing to dry weather at a critical time in the growth of the crop, a big shortage in local supplies coincided with a period of great difficulty in obtaining outside supplies at normal prices. It was alleged by the Federal Attorney-General (Mr. W. M. Hughes) that large financial interests wilfully contributed to produce this shortage, and that the Government, on behalf of the people, was justified in stepping in and taking charge of the position. The allegations of Mr. Hughes were indignantly denied by those against whom they had been levelled, but the National and Queensland Parliaments both passed legislation under which the latter commandeered the whole of the 1914 crop for distribution by the Federal Government. This was provided for by the Sugar Acquisition Act, which also embodied the temporary nationalization of the mills and refineries. This placed the industry in the hands of the Government from the time of the raw product leaving the hands of the primary producer until the finished product reached the retailer. Parliament passed the proposals as a war measure.

A further important measure, passed by the Queensland Parliament during the 1915 session was the Cane Price Boards Act. For a great many years discontent had centred round the prices paid to growers for their product. This was greatly accentuated by the State Industrial Court during 1914 having awarded an increase of wages to the employés working in the industry. The whole of this additional expense fell on the shoulders of the farmers, who were unable to pass it on to the mills, the latter frequently holding a monopoly over the product of a single district, and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company holding a practical monopoly over the mill-owners, dependent, as most of them were, on the refineries of the larger corporation for dealing with the output. Owing to the nature of the article, sugar-cane cannot be profitably carried long distances to mills for crushing. The farmer must therefore send his product to that buyer with whom he is connected by some means of transport. The mills gather cane from the surrounding country by tramway systems, and the growers were necessarily compelled to accept the price fixed by the mill, as practical competition rarely existed. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of public money had been spent by successive Governments in aiding the establishment of co-operatively owned mills (known as Central Mills). To some extent this expenditure alleviated the position. However the Central Mills were still dependent on the monopolized refineries for treating their product.

The Cane Price Boards Act provides for cane prices being fixed by boards on which representation is given to the growers and to the mill-owners, with a chairman appointed by the Governor-in-Council. Provision is made for each district to have its board, basing decisions on local conditions; while the right of appeal is held to a Central Board appointed for the whole of Queensland and constituted on the same principle as are the local bodies. This measure constitutes a quite new departure in legislation. Other Australian Acts provide for prices to be fixed by boards, but sugar-cane is the first product to be dealt with in this way by a board on which both producers and purchasers are directly represented. The system adopted is analogous to that underlying the system of wages boards, which are constituted by representatives of employés and employers in equal number, with a Government-appointed chairman to give a casting-vote in cases where an agreement cannot be arrived at between the parties.

Under the repealed Bounty Act the Australian sugar-growing districts were divided into four parts. The lines of demarcation are interesting as illustrating the varying degrees of productivity for growing this crop on the coast. The districts were defined as follows:—

"No. 1.—All that portion of Queensland north of the 19th degree of South latitude, embracing Ingham (Herbert River), Cardwell, Tully River, Liverpool Creek, Innisfail (Johnstone River), Mourilyan, Daraji, Babinda Creek, Aloomba, Mulgrave, Cairns, Atherton, Port Douglas, Daintree River, Bloomfield River, and Bailey Creek, Northern Queensland. In this district it was calculated that it took eight tons of cane to make a ton of sugar; therefore the bounty was fixed at 7s. 6d. per ton.

"No. 2.—All that portion of Queensland south of the 19th degree of South latitude and north of the 23rd degree South latitude, embracing Townsville, Ayr (Lower Burdekin), Bowen, Proserpine, and Mackay, Northern Queensland. As about eight and a half tons of cane were required to make a ton of sugar in this district the bounty was assessed at 7s. per ton.

"No. 3.—All that portion of Queensland south of the 23rd degree South latitude and north of the 26th degree South latitude, embracing Yeppoon (Central Queensland), Gladstone, Baffle Creek, Bundaberg, Childers, Gin Gin, Maryborough, Biggenden, Gayndah, and Tiaro, Southern Queensland. Nearly nine and one-fifth tons of cane were necessary to produce a ton of sugar in this district, and as a result the bounty paid was 6s. 6d. per ton."
"No. 4.—All that portion of Queensland south of the 26th degree of South latitude to the border of New South Wales, embracing Gympie, Yandina, Maroochy River, Nambour, Boonah, Rosewood, Marburg, Southport, Nerang, Logan, Southern Queensland, and New South Wales. The sugar content of the cane in this district was calculated at 10 to 1, consequently the bounty was fixed at 6s. per ton.

During the operation of the Acts constituting the excise tax, import duties, and bounty, from 1901 to 1913, the Commonwealth revenue received from the sugar industry in import duty, £3,050,609, and excise, £6,191,570; whilst the sum of £3,750,312 was paid in bounty to growers employing white labour. The net gain to the revenue was therefore £5,491,867.

The appended figures show the bounty payments in the four sugar districts up to the end of 1912, and the ratio of the white-grown sugar to the total production:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>White-grown Cane</th>
<th>Bounty Payments</th>
<th>Black-grown Cane</th>
<th>Ratio of White-grown Sugar to Total Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>297,489</td>
<td>111,554</td>
<td>36,854</td>
<td>88.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>273,374</td>
<td>95,318</td>
<td>15,270</td>
<td>94.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>319,186</td>
<td>100,890</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td>99.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>50,301</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>940,350</td>
<td>325,821</td>
<td>53,862</td>
<td>94.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Australian Sugar Producers' Association Limited was founded in 1907, and the fundamental principle upon which the organization is based is that of unity amongst the different sections of producers in the industry. It is regarded as essential that there should be one central association representative of the industry as a whole, and able to speak with one voice on its behalf. The objective of the Association is to embrace every sugar farm and every sugar mill throughout Australia. In contrast with this ideal some people advocate the formation of two separate associations, one for the growers and the other for the millers, with possibly some sort of a joint committee to act as a connecting link between the two when their joint interests were threatened. Such a scheme, however, is contrary to all modern ideas of efficient organization. A spirit of harmonious co-operation is only possible where men are permanently members of the one body, and inasmuch as the sugar industry is constantly being assailed by powerful interests from outside, it is essential that there should be such unity within its own ranks, and that there should be one solid association able to speak with authority on behalf of all its interests.

It may be as well to define here the attitude and policy of the A.S.P.A. regarding the relation between the miller and grower. More particularly since the advent of the Cane Price legislation there is absolutely no reason why they cannot combine in one association for their common benefit. Outside the one possible point of difference—the price to be paid for cane—their interests are practically identical. The position is well set forth in the following words:

"The millowner has placed his prosperity in the hands of the growers. The market which has been created by the millowner is at the grower's disposal. The grower depends, it is true, upon the mill to take his cane, but the mill depends no less upon him to grow the cane. The one man cannot exist without the other, and both are essential to the success of the industry in which they are mutually interested. The mill must pay, or the market of the growers is gone. Cane-growing must pay, or the mill is stopped. This inherent inter-dependence constitutes the strength of the position and is the safeguard of both parties to the bargain."

At any A.S.P.A. Council Meeting the growers' representatives are always in an overwhelming majority as against those of the millers, and there has never been anything to prevent the Association turning itself into a purely growers' institution, if it had been thought desirable to do so. Such a proposition, in fact, was put to a definite test in 1916 at an A.S.P.A. Council Meeting, when there were present 27 delegates, 15 of whom were purely growers, seven were central mill growers, and five were manufacturers, but only two (the mover and seconder of the motion) voted in favour of the proposed change. The growers hold, and always have held, by far the largest influence and greatest power in the Association, and the fact that the constitution has remained practically unaltered since its inception is the best proof that the growers are satisfied with it.

It has been stated in the past by its opponents that the A.S.P.A. was opposed to the system of Cane Price legislation. Probably this impression arose in some of the Southern districts owing to the strong desire of the Northern growers to obtain the right to make agreements for a term of years with their mills. Their efforts in this direction were not favoured by the Minister of the day, and the A.S.P.A. supported the Northern view. The Act has since been amended, to permit of the making of agreements, and there is therefore no room now for difference between the different sections of growers on this point. The policy of the Association has been all in favour of the principle of the Cane Price legislation, its efforts having been directed rather towards making the Act a workable proposition on a fair and equitable basis. As proof of this attitude reference may be made to the resolution proposed by the A.S.P.A. representatives at the Growers' Conference summoned by the Queensland Government so far back as March, 1917. This resolution was as follows:

"That the sole control of the sugar industry be handed over to the Commonwealth during the period of the war, conditional upon the relations between the miller and the grower being regulated by a State Tribunal, preferably the Cane Prices Board."

Reference may also be made to the efforts by the A.S.P.A. to provide a practical scheme for the equitable payment for cane. Under the auspices of the Association a special committee of six sugar chemists was arranged in 1915, with the result that they recommended the scheme now known as "The Relative Percentage System." This scheme was largely the work of a former Vice-President of the Association—Dr. Reed—and the Association adopted it. It is now in successful operation at three of the largest Northern mills. Mr. C. H. O'Brien, then one of the chemists above-mentioned, and now the technologist on the Central Cane Prices Board, has been recently nominated by the A.S.P.A. to proceed to South Africa at the request of the South African growers, who wish to be informed of our Queensland experiences as to Cane Price legislation and other matters.

Among the practical achievements of the Association the following may be enumerated: