

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 1932**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER, 1932.**

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

**QUESTIONS.**

POLICE PATROL WORK, DALBY DISTRICT.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*), for Mr. SPARKES (*Dalby*), asked the Home Secretary—

"1. What amount has been paid for patrol work in the Dalby police district for the past financial year?"

"2. What is the estimated mileage patrolled in the same district during that period?"

"3. What amount was paid during the years 1918, 1919, and 1920 for patrol work in the Dalby police district?"

"4. What was the estimated mileage patrolled during these years?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) replied—

"1. Six shillings and sixpence (6s. 6d.).  
"2. 1,579 miles.

"3. All vouchers for that period were destroyed by fire and water at the time of the explosion at the premises of the Police Department in the year 1927.

"4. 1918, 4,227 miles; 1919, 2,239 miles; and 1920, 2,662 miles. In these years there was no police station at Cecil Plains, and all mounted patrols for that division were performed from Dalby Police Station."

**ACTION IN RE SEDITIOUS SPEECHES AND LITERATURE.**

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Premier—

"1. Does the Government propose taking any action against the persons responsible for the seditious speeches delivered outside and inside the Trades Hall on Monday evening, in connection with the celebration of the establishment of Soviet Russia?"

"2. Is any action being taken to prevent the publication of seditious literature, such as the numerous placards pasted on the Victoria and Grey Street bridges?"

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) replied—

"1. I am not aware of the nature of the speeches delivered by the hon. member's friends on Monday last.

"2. I understand prosecutions have already taken place in regard to the posting of placards on Victoria and Grey Street bridges."

**TRUST AND LOAN FUND RECEIPTS AND PUBLIC CASH BALANCES TO 31ST OCTOBER.**

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. For the present financial year, what was the total amount of the receipts to 31st October of (a) the Trust Funds, (b) the Loan Fund?"

"2. What was the net cash balance of all funds at 31st October, including the amount on extended deposit?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) replied—

"1. (a) £1,697,885; (b) £709,145.

"2. £543,904."

**SUGGESTED FREE RAILWAY CARRIAGE OF PERSONS TRAVELLING IN SEARCH OF EMPLOYMENT.**

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

"1. Does he remember the occasion on which he and the present Ministers for Transport and Public Works waited upon the late Premier (Mr. Moore) and urged that suitable trucks should be attached to trains for the free carriage of persons travelling in search of employment?"

"2. What has convinced him that such action is now impracticable?"

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) replied—

"1. Yes, he remembers that the then Premier was not prepared to assist these unfortunate youths, nor was he prepared to discontinue the inhuman practice compelling them to walk from police station to police station to qualify for 6s. worth of rations.

"2. The same necessity does not now arise to provide transport facilities for these youths as the present Government allows them 6s. worth of rations in one week and a day's work in the following week to enable them to remain in the wholesome environment of their own homes."

**PAPER.**

The following paper was laid on the table:—

By-law No. 289 under Section 134 of "The Railways Acts, 1914-1929."

**SUPPLY.**

SEVENTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY.

**RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.**

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Hanson, *Buranda*) presented the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply yesterday.

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

"That the resolutions, as reported, be now received."

Question put and passed.

## ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

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

“That the resolutions be now agreed to.”

And hon. members indicating a desire to discuss Resolution 11, and Resolutions 53 to 59, both inclusive,

Resolutions 1 to 10, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 11—“*Department of Public Works—Buildings*”—

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [10.37 a.m.]: I desire to take this opportunity of saying how very much workers' dwellings have been appreciated by the public, and what a splendid asset they have been to the community generally, especially as compared with workers' homes. When the Workers' Dwellings Bill was first introduced in this Parliament, it was strongly opposed by the Labour Party.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: On the ground that they wanted a better measure.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to raise a plea like that now that this legislation has been such a success. In an earlier stage of the proceedings in this Parliament the Secretary for Public Lands said that, if I had ammunition to use in support of a statement similar to that which I then made, I would not hesitate to use it. I intend to use that ammunition in this instance. At page 387 of “*Hansard*” for 1908, the Hon. W. Lennon, a prominent member of the Labour Party, said—

“This Bill is designated a Workmen's Dwellings Bill, with a smoothness which is worthy of praise to people who desire to delude the workers of Queensland as far as possible, and make them believe that this is the real Democratic Party in Queensland. I think the Bill would be better named were it designated ‘A Land Shark Encouragement Bill.’”

Further on, he said—

“It appears to me that the Bill will not benefit the workers at all; it will benefit another class of people entirely.”

That only goes to show that the statement I originally made was correct. It was stated by hon. members belonging to the Labour Party at the time that it was not according to the policy of that party that that should be done. Certainly I have vindicated the stand I took at an earlier stage of the proceedings by showing that this is one of the activities which hon. members opposite now want to take credit for although they bitterly opposed it in the past.

Resolution 11—(Department of Public Works—Buildings)—agreed to.

Resolutions 12 to 57, both inclusive, agreed to.

Resolution 58—“*Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—Chief Office*”—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [10.41 a.m.]: I desire to ask the Premier for some information regarding the Agent-General for the State. At various Premiers' Conferences a suggestion has been made to do away with the direct representation of the States and submerge the representation of the States in that of the Commonwealth—in Australia House. All the reports we have had from

the late Agent-General and from the Acting Agent-General—who, by the way, appears to be carrying out his duties most efficiently—rather strengthen the view that the position of the Queensland office is an exceptionally favourable one—more favourable to Queensland than if it were submerged in Australia House. The advantages of a separate representation for Queensland are very great. Although there may not be exactly the same amount of work as previously owing to the present financial position, the information which we have points to the fact that it would be a mistaken policy for Queensland to give up the Agent-General's office and the lease of the present building. The latter is situated most centrally, and is in an excellent position for advertising purposes. Thousands of people passing the windows of the office can view the products of Queensland. It is an excellent advertising medium in every way.

Suggestions have been put forward that economy might be effected by combining the offices of the various State Agents-General in Australia House, and two or three of the States have tentatively agreed to that course.

The PREMIER: It is very tentative.

Mr. MOORE: Western Australia is evidently opposed to any change, but South Australia, Tasmania, and Victoria—under the late Premier, at any rate—seemed to be of the opinion that the abolition of the office would have no vital effect on those States. But they are in a different position to Queensland; and, as a matter of fact, some of these States have their offices in Australia House. Queensland is in a particularly fortunate position both with regard to the location of its office in London and so far as the officers themselves are concerned. Many people are attracted by the excellent display of Queensland products in the windows of the office in London. Furthermore, it has a great influence on the investment of capital in Queensland. The officers associated with the Queensland Agency-General are men who have been intimately acquainted and connected with the business affairs and the development of the State, and are able to give all necessary information to inquirers. It seems to me that it would be a retrograde step. It might mean a small amount of economy, but the cost of the Agent-General's office is not a great factor in the economic position of Queensland. If we abolish the office as a separate entity, it might have a very large and indirect bearing on the prosperity of Queensland, on the business done with Queensland, and in regard to people who want to invest in Queensland. The late Agent-General had a large number of interviews and applications from people who were considering the investment of money in mining enterprises in Queensland; and, from his knowledge of the State and his intimate knowledge also of business transactions in this State, he was able to give very useful information to these people. In one or two cases a large amount of capital was invested in the State which possibly would not have come to Queensland if it had not been for the adequate representation we had as a separate State.

There have been several discussions on the subject at the various Premiers' Conferences which I attended, at which it was

*Mr. Moore.]*

stated that the time for separate representation of the different States was past, and that Australia was looked at as a whole; but outlying States like Queensland and Western Australia generally suffer when Australia is looked at as a whole. The individual requirements of Queensland and the individual possibilities of this State for investment and migration, and the information that the Agent-General for Queensland is able to give, is of infinitely more importance than the amount of money that it actually costs at the present time for the upkeep of the office. There is no sum put down on the Estimates for the Agent-General. I am not objecting to that, because I recognise that at the present time economies are essential; and we know that Mr. Pike, from his associations with Queensland, the knowledge gained by him from travelling throughout the State, and his intimate connection with the various Governments, is able to give very useful information to anyone desiring information in regard to Queensland. Everything goes to show that Queensland has received a good deal of assistance through the Agent-General. When the late Agent-General was in London, the State saved a good deal of money from his efforts in connection with finance, and it would be a mistake to sacrifice this office merely because at the present time Queensland is going through a depression the same as the rest of the world. It would be infinitely better to continue an office that has proved of immense advantage to the State in the past, although possibly there is not the same number of indents going forward for Government purposes, and not the same necessity for an Agent-General in regard to financial matters, inasmuch as financial matters now are arranged through the Loan Council and the Commonwealth Bank.

We also recognise that in that connection Queensland sacrificed a considerable amount of money that was being made available by the Bank of England. When the Loan Council took over the State debts and the question of the conversion of Queensland loans arose, all arrangements had to be made through the Commonwealth Bank, which was practically made the sole financial channel through which Australia was to conduct its loan obligations. I think Queensland was a sufferer from that arrangement. It might only have been temporary, and might not have made any difference in the long run; but it deprived us of the opportunity of securing a certain amount of loan money which would have been useful at the time. On future occasions it will be possible for the Agent-General to render financial service to Queensland.

I would like to know from the Premier whether the question came up again at the last Premiers' Conference—I believe it was set down for discussion—and whether any conclusion was arrived at; and also whether the other States were agreeable to doing away with their Agents-General.

We have a fairly long lease of the office in the Strand, and I think it has been recognised by all visitors who go from here that our office in London is in a wonderful position and is a great advantage to the State. Several hon. members who have been here and have gone to the office have pointed out the advantage to Queensland of having separate representation there. Apparently

the Government do not intend immediately to appoint an Agent-General; but that is perhaps only temporary owing to the discussion which took place at the last Premiers' Conference and pending further discussion at the next conference.

There has been a great deal of talk about overlapping. Such overlapping between the Commonwealth and States has meant a great expense to Queensland in many matters, particularly in regard to health. That was a favourite topic of the late Premier of Victoria, who was always bringing up the question of overlapping in various departments. In some of them it was done away with, and that meant that Queensland had to shoulder greater expense than she previously did.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [10.53 a.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition has raised a very important question, and one that I gladly take the opportunity of declaring the Government's policy upon. I say very definitely that the present Government are opposed to the abolition of the Agent-General's office and to the merging of Queensland's representation in Australia House. On a cursory investigation of the position some people may agree to the proposition that one representation, and that in Australia House, should be enough; but the Commonwealth of Australia is one Commonwealth, and Queensland's interests might not be served by having a departmental officer in Australia House subject to the High Commissioner for the Commonwealth. Anyone who knows the position of Queensland or Western Australia must realise that we are so situated in relation not only to the Commonwealth but to conditions overseas that it is essential that we should have our own representative in London. Queensland is a State that is capable of more development than any other part of the Commonwealth. It offers opportunity for investment, and in countless different ways its problems are peculiar to itself. Furthermore, if Queensland had only a part of the representation of the Commonwealth, it is doubtful whether we would get the care and consideration in London that Queensland, by virtue of its circumstances, requires.

Take, for example, the experience of the past in regard to certain things. I have found—and no doubt the Leader of the Opposition has found—that, if Queensland is submerged in the Commonwealth, little or no recognition is given to it, and there have been some very hard experiences in that connection in recent months.

Take, for instance, the recent Ottawa Conference. The Commonwealth Government entirely controlled the representation there. For weeks and perhaps months beforehand the delegation which the Commonwealth sent overseas conferred with business interests in the Southern cities; but little or no regard was given to any representations that Queensland desired to make; and no representative from Queensland was allowed to form a part of the official delegation. I may say that these matters were all arranged before the present Government came into power. The Government of which the hon. member for Aubigny was Premier arranged that Mr. Pike should be a sort of liaison officer to the delegation, so that he would be able

[*Mr. Moore.*

to give Mr. Bruce or Mr. Gullett information upon any matter affecting Queensland's interests; but, apart from that, there was no official representation of Queensland, and Queensland's interests were very largely submerged in the general interests of the delegation. Take, for example, the beef cattle industry. Queensland is supreme in the production of cattle in Australia. Any question of the export trade in beef is very largely a Queensland question; yet the beef cattle industry was represented by Mr. Angliss, a Victorian representative, although certainly he has large interests in Queensland. I take the view, however, that direct representation should have been given to Queensland in that connection.

Then, in regard to the sugar industry, it was not until I took the matter up very strenuously with the Commonwealth Government that they asked, on behalf of Queensland, that the same concession that had been given to South Africa should be given to Queensland sugar. In the British Finance Act of 1926 an import duty was imposed by the British Government upon Dominion sugar, which, however, receives a rebate of a certain amount per cwt. That lasts for a period of approximately four years from the present time. The South African Government asked that South Africa should be placed on the same basis as a Crown colony, and we also asked that that be done; but the British Government refused to give concessions to the Dominions which they gave to the Crown colonies such as Jamaica and the West Indies generally. They pointed out that they had obligations to the Crown colonies which did not exist with respect to the Dominions, and that, if they did not give such trade assistance, they would be obliged to give some financial concession in the relief of unemployment. That request, therefore, was not agreed to; but the South African Union was able to obtain an agreement to the effect that, during the currency of the Ottawa Agreement, the price would be stabilised. The Australian delegation did not ask for that treatment; and it was not until I took the matter up with the Commonwealth Prime Minister that representations were made to that end. I am glad to say that they were successful and the provisions of that agreement apply to Queensland as well as to other parts of the Dominions.

It may not appear to be a very big thing, but those who understand it realise its importance, because there was a period about three years ago when the British Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to abolish the rebate on Dominion sugar altogether. That rebate is worth approximately £500,000 a year to Queensland exporters of sugar—not £1,000,000, as has been stated on two occasions at least by the Commonwealth Prime Minister. We are, moreover, faced with the necessity this year of diverting a considerable portion of our sugar to Canada, this being one of the results of the concession to Crown colonies; and this fact affects our position generally.

All these things indicate that Queensland's interests are not the same as the interests of other parts of Australia, and that if we were submerged in Australia House, our representations might not get the consideration they deserve.

Mr. WIENHOLT: All this is a very good speech against the Loan Council.

The PREMIER: It may be. Evidently the hon. member does not like the Loan Council. I have batted on a pretty sticky wicket there myself before to-day, and I may have to do so again. But we are not discussing the Loan Council at the present time. The Loan Council is now a part of the Australian Constitution, and can be altered only by the expressed opinion of the required majority of the people. I hope that I can rely upon the assistance of the hon. member in any effort that I feel disposed to make either to reform the Loan Council or to alter its policy. Most of the industries of Queensland are export industries capable of further development; and wonderful opportunities abound for the establishment of new industries. In these circumstances it is essential that the office of the Agent-General should be retained.

The Department of Agriculture has prepared a very fine exhibit of Queensland-grown tobacco leaf for display in the office of the Agent-General in London. We must seek an export market for our tobacco, and there is no reason why such a market should not be located and developed, particularly if the present import duty on foreign leaf remains. We should endeavour to create a market through the agency of the Agent-General's office in London, operating in close association with those interested in the manufacture of tobacco.

There are large areas of undeveloped land in North Queensland capable of development, but they require a considerable amount of capital for the purpose. The requisite amount of capital may not be available to the Government; but it might be possible to have certain developmental projects financed from London; and the Agent-General would be required to interest himself in the negotiations that would ensue.

The question of the abolition or otherwise of Agent-Generals in London was placed on the agenda paper of the Premiers' Conference held in July last; but nothing was done. Apparently the Premiers of Australia did not desire to have a full debate on the subject. I intimated very definitely that Queensland was not prepared to have the Queensland Agent-General's office submerged in Australia House. This question will have to be considered on its merits, if the Australian Constitution is altered either in the direction of unification or by the creation of more States; but, whilst Queensland remains a Sovereign State and accepts the responsibilities of that sovereignty, and by virtue of its large area, its variety of soil, climate, and general trade interests and conditions, it is essential that the London office should remain unimpaired. I have frequently met people who have transacted business with that office; and not only citizens of Queensland, but also citizens of the other States, have always spoken in the highest possible terms of the services that the office has always been prepared to render. It is claimed that the Queensland office displays probably more initiative and gives more real service than could be expected if the duties were to be assumed at Australia House. The latter agency is usually regarded as a kind of social centre from whence certain diplomatic relations with Great Britain and other countries are initiated, but the Queensland office is the appropriate office to transact all the real things that count.

*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]*

Mr. Pike has acted in the capacity of Acting Agent-General ever since the resignation of Sir Edward Macartney. He has carried out his duties attachable to that office in an admirable way. I have received nothing but the best reports of the manner in which he is carrying out his duties. During his presence at Ottawa he kept Queensland's interests to the front in every possible way, and under very trying and difficult circumstances. Through his agency I was kept in close touch with all the proceedings at Ottawa, and with what has transpired since. He is carrying out his job in an admirable fashion, with credit to himself and the State. It is fitting that not only should the present office be continued, but also the existing arrangement.

Resolution 58—"Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—Chief Office"—agreed to.

Resolution 59—"Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—Balance of Estimates"—

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [11.6 a.m.]: I wish to draw attention to the following vote:—"Miscellaneous Services"—Life Passes over Australian Railways to ex-Ministers, £3,000." This vote is £450 in excess of the appropriation granted last year. I have continually advocated on the public platform that certain economies and reforms in Parliament should be adopted; and I have no intention to get up on the platform outside and not bring the matter forward in this Parliament. I could not advocate economy for outside without taking the same stand for inside Parliament. I know that I am not in a particularly strong position, being alone upon this bench, but I intend later on to move an amendment as a test vote.

I also advocate that the same percentage which was deducted from public service salaries and others should be deducted from our own salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Do I understand that the hon. member intends dealing with railway passes granted over Queensland railways to ex-members?

Mr. WIENHOLT: I am dealing with the vote for life passes over Australian railways to ex-Ministers, which is to be found under the heading of "Miscellaneous Services." This policy of giving life passes to ex-Ministers is one which has never been agreed to by Parliament except in so far as voting the appropriation; it has been done by Cabinet minute. I am not attacking this vote in any party spirit, because I believe that it has been agreed to by both Liberal and Labour Governments. It is very nice indeed for the various Premiers to go down to Southern conferences and agree that ex-Cabinet Ministers shall be granted free railway passes for life; but the people are called upon to foot the bill in the shape of increased taxation. This privilege has been in vogue for many years. It might be said that conditions have changed, for, unfortunately, they have changed for the worse in Australia. But the one reason why these passes should not be allowed to continue is because the principle is utterly wrong and unsound. Only yesterday the Leader of the Opposition made a most pertinent remark on the discussion going on. He said, "Why should a member of Parliament be treated any different from any other person?" I accept that statement of the hon. gentleman yesterday, and on that ground I believe that this practice of granting railway passes to

ex-Cabinet Ministers is wrong. I admire anyone who has the talent to reach ministerial rank. I have been a good many years in parliamentary life, and I think I am further away from being a Minister than I was twenty odd years ago. Whilst I admire anyone who can come in and on his first election to Parliament be appointed to the high position of a Minister, I do not believe that he should, after leaving Parliament, for the rest of his life be given the right to travel free on the railways, including sleepers and parlour car seats, from one end of Australia to the other. That seems unsound in principle. It may be said that it is only a question of bookkeeping. That is not sound either, because, if you grant free railway life passes to all ex-Ministers, it means that there will be that much less railway revenue every time one of these ex-Ministers travels and does not pay the ordinary fare. I believe the whole outlook is most grave, and I can see no outlet for the unemployed in the near future as things are going. Last year we were over £2,000,000 behind, and this year the Treasurer is budgeting for a deficit of £1,500,000, and very large sums of loan money are being spent as well. We should set an example here. It is an example which would be appreciated by the public outside. If hon. members support my action, it means that ex-Ministers will have to pay their railway fares in Queensland and when they go outside Queensland, and ex-Ministers from other States will have to pay their fares when travelling in Queensland just like the ordinary citizen, as I believe every member of Parliament should be once he has vacated his seat in Parliament.

As a test of the feeling of hon. members, and as a recommendation to the Treasurer that life passes to ex-Ministers over Australian railways should not be granted, I move—

"That the item—'£83,789—Balance of Premier and Chief Secretary's Department Estimates'—be reduced by £3,000."

There being no seconder, the amendment lapsed.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [11.13 a.m.]: When the Moore Government came into office, they went most carefully into the question of free railway passes. Considerable abuse was found to exist in this direction, and the Moore Government decided to cut out thousands of these passes that had been issued by previous Labour Governments. I am sorry to say that information at my disposal leads me to believe that some of these passes are again being issued by the present Government, although, perhaps, not to the same extent as formerly.

When I was Secretary for Railways I also discovered that the Railway Department was called upon to meet the whole cost of the free railway passes granted to members of Parliament, their wives, etc. I decided that, if free passes were to be issued, the Railway Department should not be made to bear the cost, but that it should come out of the consolidated revenue. The result was, the Commissioner went into the matter fully, and decided that £75 per annum was a fair amount to charge the consolidated revenue for the pass for a member of Parliament, £50 a year for his wife, and so on with regard to other passes. The total amount

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

of over £12,000 was then defrayed by the Chief Secretary's Department instead of being made a charge against the Railway Department as previously. Instead of the Railway Department being asked to carry these thousands of "dead heads," to-day the department is not carrying one solitary "dead head." The Chief Secretary's Department pays for even the Premier's pass; and the passes granted to departmental officers are made a charge against the different departments. When the Moore Government went out of office, no free railway passes were issued by the Railway Department. There is a system of issuing what are called "white" passes. The Premier always has had the right to issue these passes, and I understand the Commissioner for Railways and the Secretary for Railways have a similar privilege, although I do not remember issuing more than three white passes during the three years I was Secretary for Railways. Although hundreds of applications were made to me for free passes, on every occasion I referred the applicant to the Chief Secretary's Department or to some other department, knowing that, if they issued the passes, the cost would come out of the revenue of those departments and not be a charge against the railways. That is the practice I followed during the period I was Secretary for Railways. I was determined that the Railway Department would be paid for the work it did for other departments, and that it would pay for any work performed for it by other departments. I adopted the policy of "pay and be paid." I am told that during the last three months the system of indiscriminately issuing white passes is being again reverted to, and that certain religious bodies and others are getting these passes. I have received that information, but whether it is true or not I do not know. The Premier should go into the matter fully, and, if found to be correct, it ought to be stopped, because I look upon the system as political bribery.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must use parliamentary language. To preface the word "bribery" by the word "political" does not bring it within the scope of parliamentary privilege.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I think I am right in saying that, if the privilege is being abused, it is being abused for political purposes and in order to curry favour. That is what I endeavoured to stop during the time I was Secretary for Railways.

The PREMIER: What religious organisations are you referring to?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: There are several of them. All the same, it has come to my knowledge that the old practice of issuing passes indiscriminately on the railways, which was in vogue when the Labour Party were in power from 1914 to 1929, is being revived.

The PREMIER: You say so.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I have it on good authority; but I cannot prove it unless I have an opportunity of going into the matter in the Railway Department; and naturally I have no information in that direction. I am drawing the Minister's attention to the fact that I have information that the old practice which was in vogue during the fourteen years of Labour Government is again being revived. They knew the

system: was in operation, and that tens of thousands of people had free passes on the railways during that period.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The point I want to make is that it was a wrong and improper thing to do, and that the Railway Department had a right to be paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: In what respect am I out of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have mentioned to the hon. member that this is not a matter which is appropriate to the discussion.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: May I not refer to the fact that free passes were issued by the previous Labour Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, so far as they are applicable to ex-Ministers and have been given for that specific purpose.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: At any rate, I have drawn attention to this matter and made my protest. I hope the Premier will go very carefully into the matter.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) [11.22 a.m.]: In reply in the first place to the hon. member for Fassfern, the vote in this connection is on the same basis as in previous years; and it is due to an interstate arrangement of many years standing. The slight increase in the vote is due to the fact that certain ex-Ministers who have complied with the conditions which apply all over Australia come under this scheme. Apart altogether from that, the position remains the same so far as ex-Ministers and ex-members of Parliament are concerned. As the hon. member for Murilla pointed out, the cost of these passes is now borne by the Chief Secretary's Department, and the Railway Department is credited with the assessed value of the use of the railways.

The other railway passes provided under this vote are railway concessions to public servants on recreation leave. The amount provided for in the Estimates is less than last year; but it is due to conditions that have obtained for many years past. Certain public servants, on their annual or extended leave, get railway privileges such as reduced rates for travelling, and that is charged against the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. MOORE: School teachers get them.

The PREMIER: It applies to public servants generally. It has been in operation for quite a lengthy period. On former occasions it was, I understand, charged to the respective departments concerned; but now it is a definite charge against the Chief Secretary's Department, and the Railway Department is credited with the amount. After all, it is only a bookkeeping entry—a debit against one department and a credit to another; no actual cash changes hands as between the two departments; but it is perhaps a proper thing to assess the value of these concessions and debit the Chief Secretary's Department with them.

The general statement made by the hon. member for Murilla about free passes is in accordance with the usual expressions of opinion by that hon. member. He proceeds to say that a thing is a fact, and then he says he does not know whether it is a fact

*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]*

or not; but it is absolutely false to say that thousands of passes were issued indiscriminately in the past.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I have the figures in my bag.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has got a lot of figures. He used the railways to the fullest possible extent when he had the opportunity, and, if he wants figures about the railways, we can give him all the figures he wants.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN again interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! This interruption must stop. The hon. member may interject occasionally, but he must not interrupt.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is capable of making quite a number of interjections, and he is not very careful about keeping to the facts.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That is absolutely untrue.

The PREMIER: The position with regard to courtesy passes is as it has been for many years. Certain organisations get them from the Chief Secretary's Department. The Moore Government followed that practice, and we are continuing it. There is no increase in the amount of the vote, and I do not know what the hon. member means when he refers to these organisations. The practice has been followed during the whole period I have been in Parliament. The heads of certain associations get certain courtesy concessions.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That was always in vogue.

The PREMIER: Yes, and there has been no departure from the policy, either by the Moore Government or the present Government. For instance, the head of the Presbyterian church gets a courtesy pass when he goes to a general assembly, and other church dignitaries equal in standing get similar concessions. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The heads of the churches have what are called yearly passes.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: We do not object to that.

The PREMIER: Then I do not know why the hon. member raised the question, because these are the only passes that are given. In addition, certain other concessions are charged to the Chief Secretary's Department. The Bush Book Club gets certain concessions in sending books and carrying out its activities. The Blind and Deaf and Dumb Association, which is doing an excellent social service among an unfortunate section of the community, also gets passes for its collectors. Passes are granted for any special purpose where social service is involved; and, if hon. members will look at the vote, they will see that there is no alteration compared with previous years.

Mr. MAHER: Would your Ministers be able to issue passes without your knowledge?

The PREMIER: I do not think so. I have not heard of it. As a matter of fact, the Railway Department charges the Chief Secretary's Department for everything it can. The practice which has been followed previously still exists; so that the views expressed by the hon. member in regard to

passes are not based on any sound or solid foundation. Hon. members can rest assured that I am not distributing passes or charging anything to the department unless a very good public purpose is to be served. Any pass granted by the Chief Secretary's Department can be justified in every detail.

Resolution 59 (Balance of Chief Secretary's Department) agreed to.

Resolution 60—"Balance of Executive and Legislative"—agreed to.

Resolution 61—"Department of Labour and Industry"—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [11.28 a.m.]: I desire to refer to the action of the Government in the issue of the Order in Council relating to preference to unionists. In my opinion, that action was ultra vires. Section 57 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, inserted in that statute by the amending Act of 1930, and to be found on page 13010 of the Queensland statutes, reads—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in any other Act or law or rule of law or usage or practice or process of law to the contrary, it is hereby declared that the court (whether constituted by the judge sitting alone or constituted by the judge and two conciliation commissioners) or conciliation commissioner or board shall not have power or jurisdiction to award preference to employees being members of any union or organisation, or to employees not belonging to any union or organisation; and nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act or law or rule of law or usage or practice or process of law shall be construed so as to give the court (whether constituted by the judge sitting alone or constituted by the judge and two conciliation commissioners) or conciliation commissioner or board such power or jurisdiction."

The Act of 1929, which contained the relevant section 64, was amended by an Act passed in 1930. These enactments were practically ignored, and the following was published in the "Government Gazette" of 30th July, 1932—

"Whereas by 'The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts, 1929 to 1931,' it is amongst other things provided that, in addition to and without in any way limiting the powers of the Governor in Council under the said Acts, the Governor in Council is thereby empowered from time to time by Order in Council, to issue such Orders and give such directions and prescribe such matters and things whether in addition to or amendment of or in modification of the said Acts . . ."

Note the three provisions—"amendment of," "addition to," or "modification of." The "Government Gazette" further states—

" . . . or any other Act as will be calculated to give full effect to the objects and purposes of the said Acts, or as will be calculated to safeguard the requirements and well being of the people and secure peace in industry, and that every such Order, direction, and rule shall be obeyed, and that any such Order in Council made or purporting to be made under the said Acts shall be of the same validity as if it were

enacted in and formed part of the said Acts and shall be judicially noticed and shall not be questioned in any proceedings whatever."

It also states—

"Where it is mutually agreed by the parties concerned or considered advisable by the Court or Board that preference be granted either generally or to any particular union or organisation, such preference shall be granted only subject to such conditions as the Court may approve."

**THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:** The court must approve of the preference to be granted.

**MR. MOORE:** I contend that the Order in Council is ultra vires because it is not an "addition to," "amendment of," or "modification of" the Act at all. It is a direct negative. Section 57 of the 1930 Act is very definite. It provides that under no consideration shall preference be granted, and that there can be no amendment, addition, or modification of it. Any amendment, addition, or modification of that section by Order in Council is a direct negative. The Order in Council purports to repeal the whole section—a position that was never contemplated for a moment. There was never any question of there not being peace in industries that applied for preference to unionists. The right to grant preference to unionists has been deliberately conferred because the Government recognised that those opposed to preference to unionists could not challenge the validity of the Order in Council in the High Court because of the expense that would be involved. In addition, they also recognised that, if the High Court ruled that the Order in Council was illegal, the illegality could be immediately rectified by Act of Parliament, and the successful parties in the court would be deprived of the fruits of their victory.

The whole position is absolutely wrong. We are totally opposed to preference to unionists; and our opposition is based upon very sound grounds, particularly in the application of the principle to Government employment. What right have the Government to say that a person must belong to a particular organisation before he can get a job? The Government have the right to impose taxation upon everybody. Why should I be taxed to provide the revenue of a Government which determines that its servants must belong to a particular organisation before they can work for the country? The only basis of employment in the public service should be efficiency, and not that an officer must belong to a particular organisation. If that were right, it would be equally right for the Government to claim that an employee must belong to a particular political organisation before he can secure the right to work.

**THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:** You have said that on a good many occasions.

**MR. MOORE:** I have not. In the 1929 Act we provided that preference could be granted where it was mutually agreed upon; and certain governing sections were put into the Act providing that the union books must be kept open and that certain maximum fees must be charged. The unions could not charge more than a certain maximum fee to individuals seeking to enter their organ-

isations. To-day we find that organisations have closed their books and will not allow individuals to join; and the Government practically condemn these people to a life of starvation because they are unable to secure admittance to an organisation which has been granted preference in an industry by the court.

**MR. MAHER:** And they call this a free country!

**MR. MOORE:** I would like to quote the following letter which appeared in the "Courier" of 29th September last:—

"SIR,—Will you please grant me space to bring the following case to public notice. I have a daughter, twenty-two years of age, who has been out of work for eighteen months, and for whom I am allowed a half-day intermittent work (6s. 9d.) per week. After a long and heartbreaking search for work she was fortunate enough to have offered to her a position in one of the meat shops in George street. In fact she was practically engaged when the manager asked if she was registered. She had to say "No," and he then informed her that if she was registered he would start her at once. So off she went to the Trades Hall, where she was informed that the books were closed, and that she could not accept the position. She is in the Shop Assistants' Union, and paid her dues until we could no longer do so. Now, what I would like to know is: Is the Government in any way sincere in the unemployment question? By allowing my daughter to work my intermittent pay would be reduced, and she would be paying unemployment tax, etc., besides bringing financial aid to a sorely stricken house, where three adults and the mother, an invalid, are existing on 14s. 6d. a week after paying rent.—I am, sir, etc."

I do not believe for an instant that the Order in Council is justifiable or that it can be justified in any way whatever. The section under which that Order in Council was issued was never meant to permit the repeal of an Act of Parliament. It is definitely and specifically set out in the Act of Parliament I have quoted that preference cannot be granted. If the Government wished to grant preference to unionists, the proper course was for them to bring down a Bill and pass it through Parliament; but to do it by Order in Council is quite wrong. Orders in Council are permissible and are specifically provided for even in "The Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916," and they can be issued to allow exemptions from the Arbitration Court altogether. In certain instances that power was used. Orders in Council are permissible when they are for the purpose of carrying out the principles of the Act, or to modify or amend them; but I cannot think for one instant that an Order in Council conferring power upon the court to grant preference to unionists is justified; and I do not think for one moment that, if this act of the Government were tested in court, it would be upheld.

This aspect of the question was raised before the Conciliation Commissioner, Mr. Ferry; but he brushed it lightly on one side, and said that it was a question for the President, and that he would submit it to the President. It is not a question for the President of the court at all; it is a question of jurisdiction. I do not suppose that the

*Mr. Moore.]*

President of the court ever took the slightest cognisance of the remark made by Mr. Ferry. It has nothing to do with him. It would have to do with him if the court had cared to undertake the investigation of it at the time it was raised by Mr. Benjamin; but it was not investigated.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Why did not Mr. Benjamin press the question further?

Mr. MOORE: For the very reason that I have already explained. It would cost about £100 to have the point judicially determined, and immediately it was determined the employers would be faced with the position that, if the court determined in their favour, the Government could bring in an amending Act of Parliament ratifying what had been already done. They would, therefore, lose any advantage they had secured from the court.

At the present time, when we are going through a most difficult period, the granting of preference is absolutely wrong. There are many men to-day who, through force of circumstances, have been unable to keep up their union dues. We have cases coming before us every day where men have had to pay up two and three years' dues which they have not been able to pay before they are allowed by the unions to register for work or to accept work. In many cases the books of the union have been closed. If there is to be preference, then it should be imperative on the part of the Government to insist on the books of the union concerned being kept open to allow any person who desires to join, otherwise the Government are conniving at a system whereby individuals who through no fault of their own are unable to get into an organisation, are to be condemned to idleness. After walking round the country and securing a job, these people are debarred from taking that job because the Government, from motives of political expediency, have proclaimed by an Order in Council that preference to unionists is to be granted. The whole position is absolutely wrong. In a country like this competency to carry out the work and the right to work should be *sine qua non*. It is unthinkable that an individual should be debarred from work because the Government give the right to an organisation to say whether or not that man shall be admitted into the ranks of the organisation. It certainly cannot help the position to-day. It also places the government of the country practically in the hands of some union secretary, who is to have the right to say whether an individual shall or shall not be entitled to earn his living. If a person commits a crime, he goes before a court, and the court may debar him from following his occupation by putting him in gaol; but no union secretary should have the right to say whether a person has the right to work or not. Such a system offers an opportunity for victimisation, which, by the way, is carried on in a most extreme way. It also opens the door to favouritism, which is quite wrong. The whole position is intolerable. Had the Government amended the Act to provide for preference to unionists, then the Opposition would have had an opportunity of publicly discussing the matter and drawing attention to the necessity for the books of the unions to be kept open for intending members, if preference were granted. It is intolerable to think

[Mr. Moore.

that the Order in Council in this instance has been issued in direct opposition to a specific section in an Act of Parliament, which was passed later than the original Act of 1929, in which the conditions that were allowable for preference to unionists were set out. Section 64, under which this Order in Council was issued, was enacted prior to the section in which it is definitely set out that preference cannot be granted.

The Government have abused a privilege. Although it may have been suggested during the election campaign that the policy of the Labour Party was preference to unionists, the proper way to bring it about was by amendment of the Act, and not in the way it has been done now. Hon. members on both sides have had many examples brought before them of the hardships involved to many individuals, who, after succeeding in finding jobs, are not allowed to take them. They are possibly required to stand down and wait their turn, or they are faced with the position that the membership books of the unions are closed, and they are thus debarred from obtaining employment. No Government can justify such a position at any time, particularly at a time like the present. The whole position displays tyranny in the extreme. Surely the power should not be placed in the hands of any outside individual to say whether a free citizen in this country has the right to work or not! Yet that is the power that the Government have handed over to the secretaries of these organisations, who may close their books and say to a worker, "You cannot get a job." I gave an instance where a certain individual was a member of the Shop Assistants' Union, and, when she was offered employment, she was told she had to register in another union. The secretary of that union said, "The books are closed." As a result, that individual was condemned to idleness, as she could not secure another job. It is no use saying that the employer will put on someone else, because in many instances the employer becomes incensed, and says, "If I can't employ the person I want, I will not employ anyone at all." The position is entirely wrong, and it cannot be justified under present conditions. We have always been opposed to it in Parliament, and to bring it in by Order in Council instead of amending the Act is something that the Government are unable to justify.

Mr. R. M. KING (*Logan*) [11.46 a.m.]: I agree entirely with the contention of the Leader of the Opposition that the Order in Council brought in by the Labour Government giving preference to unionists is *ultra vires*. Section 64 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1929 provides—

"In addition to and without in any way limiting the powers of the Governor in Council under this Act, the Governor in Council is hereby empowered from time to time by Order in Council to issue such orders and give such directions and prescribe such matters and things, whether in addition to or amendment of or in modification of this Act or any other Act, as will be calculated to give full effect to the objects and purposes of this Act, or as will be calculated to safeguard the requirements and wellbeing of the people and secure peace in industry."

It will be noticed that the powers are limited to giving "such directions and prescribe such matters and things, whether in addition to or amendment of or in modification of this Act." I say without hesitation that the Government have exceeded the powers they received under that section, and that they have introduced a principle by Order in Council which the section of the Act does not empower them to introduce. Apart from that altogether, supposing they had the power under that section we have the Act passed in 1930, section 10 of which provides—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or in any other Act or law or rule of law or usage or practice or process of law to the contrary, it is hereby declared that the court . . . or Conciliation Commissioner or board shall not have power or jurisdiction to award preference to employees being members of any union or organisation or to employees not belonging to any union or organisation;—"

Now mark these words—

"and nothing contained in this Act or in any other Act or law or rule of law or usage or practice or process of law shall be construed so as to give the court . . . or Conciliation Commissioner or board such power or jurisdiction."

The section also gives limited powers as to preference to returned sailors and soldiers, and preserves the right of the unions to collect fees.

Here we have an Act of Parliament passed in 1929 giving the Governor in Council a limited power to do certain things; and we say that the Government went beyond the power granted by that Act in doing something by Order in Council which they had no power to do. But, even supposing they have that power under that particular Act, we have the subsequent Act, which states that they shall not do it; and the point I wish to make is that in the interpretation of statutes, when a subsequent Act repeals a former Act, it can either be done by implication or by express words. The provision in the Act of 1929 is repealed by express words in the Act of 1930.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: As a matter of fact, you left that power in the old Act.

Mr. R. M. KING: It is not in the 1929 Act. If the power is in the 1929 Act, here we have an express section in the 1930 Act which states that preference cannot be given to unionists. There is no clouding of the issue in any shape or form. There is no necessity to try to arrive at a conclusion by implication; the provision in the Act of 1929 is repealed in express words by section 10 of the Act of 1930. If the Government acted under section 64 of the 1929 Act, thinking they had the power, by Order in Council, to authorise the court to grant preference to unionists, they exceeded their jurisdiction, because section 10 of the 1930 Act expressly forbids them doing so.

Under these circumstances I say that the Industrial Court is wrong in granting preference. As the Secretary for Labour and Industry says, anyone can appeal to a higher tribunal, but it would be futile to do so. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it would cost money, and the whole object would be defeated, because the present Government would deal with the matter by

Act of Parliament. We cannot prevent the Government from giving preference if it is their policy; but they should do it by passing an Act, and not try to exercise under Order in Council a power which does not exist, and which, in addition, is expressly forbidden by Act of Parliament.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [11.53 a.m.]: On 11th October last I submitted a question to the Secretary for Labour and Industry as to whether relief workers, either on intermittent or rotational relief schemes, were compelled to join the Australian Workers' Union or any other union as a condition necessary to securing a job. The Minister replied—

"1. Relief workers, either intermittent or rotational, paid by the Department of Labour are not compelled to become members of a union as a condition necessary to secure a job.

"2. I have no knowledge of the union organisers worrying any man on these jobs."

When I asked the question, I had certain information before me, and I have secured further information on the point since. I would like to read the following letter received from a rotational worker at Bundaberg, dated 30th October last:—

"In regard to a statement made in Parliament re rotational relief work by Mr. M. P. Hynes (Minister for Labour and Industry) to Mr. Maher, that relief workers were not compelled to take union tickets to obtain the jobs, I would kindly ask you if you would ask Mr. Hynes to explain his statement, as I have been working on a rotational relief job here. We get eight weeks' work under the relief scheme at full time, and are compelled to take tickets, for which we have to sign an order to have it stopped out of our wages.

"In the face of Mr. Hynes's statement, I think we are not entitled to take that ticket, and you would do myself and many others a great favour if you would inquire into the statement of Mr. Hynes through the House at the earliest possible date, and ask him to explain it, also if we could get a refund."

To emphasise further that the Australian Workers' Union is very active at the present time in canvassing relief workers to take out tickets, I quote the following advertisement which appeared in the Gympie "Truth" on Monday, 10th October, 1932:—

"Widgee Shire employees are notified to renew their 1932-33 Australian Workers' Union tickets. Tickets procurable at "Truth" office."

That is signed by "H. Boland, organiser." A considerable number of the shire workers are relief workers; so that the union has come out into the open by inserting this advertisement calling upon the men to take out union tickets.

There is a relief job in the area of the Beaudesert Shire Council, and an organiser of the Australian Workers' Union named Perrett has been on that job on different occasions, and numbers of men have responded to his request to join the union, whilst others have refused. He informed them that the Australian Workers' Union had power, under the local authorities' award, to compel the men to join the union within one month; otherwise their places

*Mr. Maher.]*

would be taken and unionists put on. I am told by men working on the job that Mr. Perrett used a good deal of bounce, and told the relief workers that they must take out tickets or get off the job. I have here evidence as to the method that is adopted. It appears that the Australian Workers' Union is using the local authorities as collecting agencies in order to get the money from the workers. Apparently it has little faith in the relief workers taking tickets by normal means, so the organiser produces an order or assignment form, which reads something like this—

“To Shire Clerk.

“Please pay Australian Workers' Union the sum of £1 5s. on my behalf, the receipt of the said A.W.U. for such amount shall be good and sufficient discharge.”

Then follows the signature.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is done for the convenience of the employees.

Mr. MAHER: It is for the convenience of the Australian Workers' Union. It is rather extraordinary that we have reached a position in which employers generally, and particularly semi-governmental bodies like local authorities, can be compelled by Industrial Court awards to collect for the Australian Workers' Union the amount involved in the purchase of union tickets.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is done voluntarily by the shire authorities.

Mr. MAHER: That is not so. There is a clause in the local authorities' award reading like this—

“The employer shall, at the request in writing of the Australian Workers' Union, out of the money due to such employee in respect of wages, deduct the yearly contribution of such employee as a member of the said union.”

There is nothing voluntary about that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: It is done at the request of the employee.

Mr. MAHER: Not at all. Request does not enter into it at all. The award makes it imperative that the amount shall be paid when the assignment or order is presented by the organiser and as the worker's wages become available. This is an extraordinary procedure whereby the court is giving directions that employers must act as collecting agencies for the Australian Workers' Union and other unions, a procedure which is illegal and contrary to the principles laid down in the Wages Act. Section 20 of “The Wages Act of 1918” provides—

“Except as hereinafter provided—

(i.) The entire amount of the wages earned by or payable to any worker shall be actually paid to such worker in money, and not otherwise, at intervals of not more than one month if demanded: Provided that in case of the termination of the employment the entire amount of such wages shall be so paid within three days after such termination if demanded;

(ii.) Every payment made to any such worker by his employer or in receipt of any such wages by the delivering to him of goods, or otherwise than in money, is hereby declared illegal and void.”

[Mr. Maher.

Section 27, which emphasises the foregoing, provides—

“In any proceedings against any employer, company, or person—

(a) for the breach of any provision of this Part; or

(b) for the recovery by the worker of money alleged to have been taken, received, deducted, or detained from him in breach of any provision of this Part;

the fact that the worker consented thereto shall not avail in any way as an answer or defence.”

I submit that the Industrial Court in issuing awards on a great number of industrial applications to-day authorising employers to deduct union fees from the wages of employees is acting in direct contravention of “The Wages Act of 1918.” The action of the court is illegal, and the action of the local authorities and the employers who make such deductions is distinctly illegal; and employees are entitled to redress if they care to proceed. It is an extraordinary thing that a great union like the Australian Workers' Union should be reduced to the stratagem of plundering the unfortunate relief workers in the matter of union tickets in the circumstances ruling in Queensland just now. Whatever justification there might have been for its action in roping in employees engaged on full time in industry, I can only say that its action towards the relief workers is entirely wrong. It is unjust, ghoulish, and tyrannous for the Australian Workers' Union or for any other union to pursue the unfortunate relief workers, who secure only eight weeks rotational labour, and compel them to pay a sum of 25s., which is altogether out of proportion to the amount they earn.

Mr. NIMMO: What happens with the money?

Mr. MAHER: That is a very interesting point. What benefits do the relief workers secure in return for the payment of 25s.? The income and expenditure account of the Australian Workers' Union shows a total expenditure of £265,633, of which the following are some of the items:—

	£
Salary to branch secretary ...	870
Branch president, Mr. Fallon	580
District secretaries (6) ...	3,050
Assistants to secretary ...	3,349
Organisers of A.W.U. ...	11,389
Expenses of organisers ...	1,660
Motor car hire ...	5,116
“Worker” dues ...	6,500

The figure for motor car hire really makes the motor car expenses of Labour Ministers look rather mild.

“Australian Labour Party Dues, £1,050.”

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is the item that hurts you.

Mr. MAHER: That is the item which makes unionism a farce. (Interjections.)

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is the cause of your antagonism.

Mr. MAHER: It is diverting legitimate trade union organisation from its lawful avenue of assisting and benefiting its members into a concern for subsidising a political organisation. The balance-sheet of the

Australian Workers' Union also discloses the following items of expenditure:—

	£
"Advance New South Wales Australian Workers' Union	15,000
Head office subsidy	2,669
Loan to Brisbane 'Standard'	15,800

Apparently there are no leaders in the Parliamentary Labour Party of this State showing such affluence as the Leader of the Labour Party in New South Wales, who personally made a loan of £13,700 to the "Labour Daily" in that State.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is being allowed a considerable amount of latitude, but I think he had better remain within the State.

Mr. MAHER: I am grateful for the latitude you have allowed me, Mr. Speaker. Another item of expenditure is—

"Brisbane 'Worker' Loan, £5,500."

The members of the Australian Workers' Union have nothing to show for their subscriptions. The "miscellaneous expenses" of the union are shown at the substantial sum of £8,570. That heading covers a multitude of sins.

Then at the bottom of the balance-sheet, in striking contrast to the lavish expenditure on political parties, motor cars, expenses of organisers and their salaries, we find the little sum of £27 5s. opposite the item "Unemployment Boot Repair Scheme." (Opposition laughter.) That stands out in bold relief against the lavish expenditure of the Australian Workers' Union. It must be a sorry position for any thinking member of the union on looking over the balance-sheet and studying the expenditure, if he asks himself, "Out of the large amount of 25s. per annum which is collected from me, what benefit am I receiving in return? Am I not helping to maintain a great body of men who have little or no regard for my interests?" No effort is made by the union leaders to advance legitimate trade unionism. (Government interruptions.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the debate is allowed to proceed on these lines, it is likely to become acrimonious. It is necessary that the hon. member who has the floor should be allowed to proceed without interruption. If any other hon. member feels that he would like to make a speech, then he is allowed forty minutes in which to do so.

Mr. MAHER: It must be a sorer spectacle still for the unfortunate relief worker to find that, when after six or eight or ten months' idleness he at last is able to secure a rotational job for eight weeks, he is bound hand and foot to become a member of the Australian Workers' Union under the direction of the Industrial Court, which granted that body preference to its members. The organiser of the union does not attempt to collect the price of the ticket from the relief worker, notwithstanding that the organisation has an abundance of money, because a provision has been inserted in the award by the court—quite contrary to the Wages Act—that the employer must collect the amount of the union dues. That is conscription of the worst kind, and it is something that I do not think any reasonable man can justify under any circumstances. I have had scores of complaints from relief workers in my own electorate and in outside centres since I asked my question in Parliament. These

men complain bitterly that they are called upon to pay 25s. for a union ticket which is taken from them in the manner indicated. They are told that, if they do not pay, they will have to leave the job.

There is also the question of arrears. Some of these men in different callings find that during the past few years of the depression they have not been able to maintain their union membership and have fallen into arrears. I have received complaints that the unions are insisting, not only that these men must rejoin the union concerned as a condition precedent to securing employment, but also that they must pay up the whole of their arrears. That is tyrannical; no reasonable man can justify it. The Australian Workers' Union has always been an organisation that most men think has tried to take a constitutional stand, and it has always appealed to me as having a greater percentage of big men than many other trades unions; but I am afraid it has fallen from its high estate and is losing the esteem of many workers when it is prepared to plunder the unfortunate relief worker in the manner I have indicated. I have had other complaints made to me, but have not been able to secure verification of them, as to activities of union organisers amongst the intermittent relief workers. Hon. members will have noted that I have made a distinction so far between rotational relief workers and intermittent relief workers. I have been assured by intermittent relief workers that the union organisers have been worrying them on the job and putting forward proposals that these men should pay for union tickets, costing 25s., at the rate of 1s. per week.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MAHER: As I say, I am not able to bring any evidence to support my statement. The men who are on the job have complained to me, and that is the only information that I can give.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Where are these men on the job?

Mr. MAHER: These men are city workers. I do not know the particular job on which they are working.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: What are their names? How can I make inquiries unless I get particulars?

Mr. MAHER: They have come to me at Parliament House and told me—

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You are a liar!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister knows that the term is unparliamentary, and he must withdraw.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I withdraw.

Mr. MAHER: It is evident that, when the Minister stated in reply to my question that relief workers, either intermittent or rotational, are not compelled to become members of a union as a condition necessary to secure a job, he was entirely wrong; and his statement in Parliament conflicts with the decision of the Industrial Court, which is controlled by the department of which he is the administrative head.

I wish to bring those matters before the notice of the Minister and express the hope that he may use his undoubted influence with

*Mr. Maher.]*

the Australian Workers' Union to see that, if it is going to insist on preference to unionists and on relief workers taking out union tickets, at least the concession should be given to the relief worker that he shall only be required to pay an amount proportionate to the period of his engagement. In other words, if the union ticket costs 25s. and a relief worker secures employment for two months, which is one-sixth of a year, the total amount charged for the union ticket, giving him full benefits of unionism, if any, shall be 4s. 2d.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY (*Kurilpa*) [12.15 p.m.]: I wish to reply to the statement made by the hon. member for Logan that the Order in Council which was issued by the Government is *ultra vires*. The hon. member only read a certain portion of section 64, and I object to any hon. member making statements in this Chamber which have a tendency to mislead hon. members as to the actual position. The reading of that section is very unfair, particularly when it comes from a legal man, when the next section is the one under which the Order in Council was issued by the Government. I will read the section as read by the hon. member for Logan. Section 64 of "The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1929" reads—

"In addition to and without in any way limiting the powers of the Governor in Council under this Act, the Governor in Council is hereby empowered from time to time by Order in Council to issue such orders and give such directions and prescribe such matters and things, whether in addition to or amendment of or in modification of this Act or any other Act, as will be calculated to give full effect to the objects and purposes of this Act."

The hon. member stopped there, and then dealt with section 10 of the Amendment Act of 1930, which absolutely forbids the Industrial Court to grant preference to unionists. If that was the whole section, there would be something in the argument of the hon. gentleman, but the section goes on to say—

"or as will be calculated to safeguard the requirements and well-being of the people and secure peace in industry."

Mr. R. M. KING: I quoted that.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: I am afraid the hon. member did not.

Mr. R. M. KING: I did.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: The section continues—

"And every such order, direction, and rule shall be obeyed. Any such Order in Council made or purporting to be made under this Act shall be of the same validity as if it were enacted in and formed part of this Act, and shall be judicially noticed, and shall not be questioned in any proceedings whatever."

I contend that the words, "or as will be calculated to safeguard the requirements and well-being of the people and secure peace in industry" give to the Governor in Council the right to say what amendments will be in the interests and well-being of the people; and, if the Government of the day feel that preference to unionists is in the interest and well-being of the people, as provided by that section, they are quite within their rights in exercising the rights that the late Government in their wisdom

vested in the Governor in Council. I submit that it is ridiculous for any member to say that an Order in Council made under that section is *ultra vires*.

Mr. R. M. KING: How do you get over section 10 of 1930 Act?

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: Section 10 of the 1930 Act would be of importance only if section 64 of the 1920 Act said what I thought the hon. member said it does say. The first portion of the section definitely states, "as will be calculated to give full effect to the objects and purpose of this Act." Section 10 of the amending Act is certainly deemed to set out one of the objects of the Act; but section 64 goes further than that. It says the Governor in Council can do anything consistent with the objects of the Act, or do anything calculated to safeguard the requirements and well-being of the people. The Order in Council can do either of two things. Firstly, it can do anything consistent with the provisions of the Act and, secondly, it can do anything to modify or amend the Act. Does not the preference clause amend the Act? There is no question about the Order in Council amending the Act, and section 64 gives power to the Governor in Council to amend the Act. On the hon. member's own statement, apart from the wellbeing of the people, the Order in Council can amend the Act. There is no question about that, and I am submitting that it is absolutely futile to argue that section 64 precludes the Governor in Council from bringing in any Order in Council to deal with the matter.

The hon. member for West Moreton saw fit to deal with the question of wages, and quoted certain sections of the Wages Act to show that wages had to be paid in full within three days, and he quoted certain exceptions set out in the Act. I do not intend to tackle that point.

The hon. member mentioned at the same time that there is provision in the local authorities award giving a local authority power to make these deductions. I would point out to the hon. member—and I think the hon. member for Logan and the hon. member for Gympie will agree with me—that where a subsequent Act is passed dealing with a special matter an amendment in that later Act will impliedly delete or amend any general provisions of the law where it is not specifically dealt with. Here we have in the local authorities award a specific section giving power to the local authority to do these things; and I submit that that absolutely repeals or puts an additional exception into the Act to allow of that deduction being made, because of the Industrial Conciliation Act section making it of the same value as a section of the Act. I want further to state that, even taking the hon. member for West Moreton on his own ground, section 28 of the Wages Act of 1918 provides many exceptions whereby contracts between employer and employee can be made. Sub-section (2) of that section states—

"This provision shall not be construed to prevent an employer—

(a) Pursuant to an agreement with a worker, from making any deduction or stoppage from the wages of such worker for or in respect of any of the matters or things in this section hereinafter mentioned;

(b) From advancing to any worker any money to be by him contributed

to any friendly society, life insurance company or association, savings bank, or other society or association whatever, or to any Commonwealth War Loan or War Savings Certificates, or from advancing any money for the relief of the worker or his wife or family in sickness, or from advancing any money to any person by the worker's order, or from advancing to any worker the amount of any steamer, railway, or coach fare, or other travelling expense, or from deducting or contracting to deduct from the wages of the worker any such sum or sums of money advanced as aforesaid."

Mr. MOORE: That refers to moneys that have been advanced.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: These are advances made from the salaries of the person to the society or association concerned. At the same time there is a mandatory provision. I do not think the hon. member for West Moreton is sincere if he puts up the statement that they are precluded because of that provision in the Wages Act from doing what the Local Authorities Act says they can do; but I am submitting that even in the Wages Act itself there is a provision for the employer to deduct the money for the union from the wages.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, if he likes.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: I go further, and say that, in addition to advancing, I think that section would allow the employer, if he wished, to advance the amount payable to the Australian Workers' Union, and to deduct it by weekly payments from the man's salary if he desired the amount to be advanced on his behalf. Many employers do that.

Mr. MOORE: If he wishes.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: Yes. Apart from that, there is a mandatory provision in the local authorities award, but I am arguing on the other ground altogether.

I think I have made clear those few points to hon. members opposite. I have listened with interest to the remarks made by hon. members opposite this morning on the question of preference to unionists. There is no doubt that from one particular point of view the case mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition is a bad case; but, no matter what law is in force, we shall always find anomalies existing under it. I stand foursquare with the policy of this party on preference to unionists, for this reason: We have an apprenticeship system, certainly emasculated to a certain extent by the late Government. We are endeavouring to bring back the true provisions of apprenticeship. We have men in various callings who, after years of study, have become proficient in certain lines of work and are qualified to do it efficiently. In many instances, in the interest of public safety alone, a certain amount of skill in workmen is imperative—for instance, amongst men working on scaffolding, where a skilled tradesman is required for the safety of others, and even to protect the lives of individual members of the community. I contend that it would be scandalous for this Government to say that any man should have the right to go on to any job such as that because the employer thinks fit to select him; and I cannot appreciate the point of view

of hon. members opposite who suggest it. It is not right that a man who has spent time and money, and who has given years of work to a calling, perhaps, at a very low wage, in the hope of getting a better return from a skilled trade, should be frustrated by the doctrine that hon. members opposite would apply.

But let us go further and deal with the question from the point of view of the unskilled man. We have men working in callings where particular skill is not required, but where a certain amount of experience and practice ensures in a workman the ability to do that work better than a man who has not had that experience. A man engaged in such work will become accustomed to it and be capable of competing with his fellows in such work. Hon. members opposite, however, contend that a man who has been doing work in one particular line for, perhaps, a year and is then thrown out of work for a couple of weeks should have the opportunity of securing employment by going over the heads of men in occasional or seasonal work who have not been working practically the whole year round. I consider that is unsound, and that the work in seasonal and occasional occupations is work which men usually engaged in should expect to get. It makes for the wellbeing and security of the State that people should stick to one line of employment, and that criss-crossing from one sphere of employment to another should be prevented. It makes for better results in the industries themselves. Hon. members opposite may say that an employee who has been engaged in a certain capacity in one calling is able to fill a clerical position or a cashier's position in a butcher's shop. It may be all right in that particular instance, where there is a marked similarity between the work of a cashier or a shop assistant in a drapery or grocery store and a cashier in a butcher's shop; but, if the precedent is established or the thin end of the wedge is allowed to enter, the whole principle is in danger, and I, therefore, say that, because of a particular instance such as that, one cannot argue that the general rule is bad. One cannot argue from the particular to the general. We all admit that there are anomalies in the most perfect system, and we should do our best to have them remedied. Hon. members know that there are ways of dealing with them. Cases have come before the Industrial Court in which applications have been made for permission to work employees at less than award rates; and I do not know that the late Government did anything to prevent the exercise of that right. In fact, every bit of legislation they introduced was calculated to smash the unions if they possibly could. Their efforts may have had some effect in that they may have caused the weaker members in the unions' ranks to be prepared to bow their heads to the employer; but the heart of the union movement is as sound to-day as it was when the Moore Government assumed office in 1929. The workers would not be beaten or browbeaten by the late Government, and the union forces in Queensland are stronger to-day because of the test that they underwent. They have men in their ranks to-day who are worth while.

Some hon. members opposite have stated that men have complained to them that

*Mr. P. K. Copley.]*

they were being harassed for their union fees. The men who are complaining to them to-day were amongst the first in the rush to get the better conditions provided by preference to unionists, by Labour legislation generally, and by the advocacy of the unions. They accepted everything that a Labour Government was able to provide. They accepted all the benefits of preference to unionists and all the benefits that a strong industrial force was able to win for them; but the moment a reactionary Government endeavoured to smash the industrial forces they decided that they did not wish to be a party to the struggle on the side of the unionists. Would the men who complained to the hon. member for West Moreton refuse to accept any benefit that unionism could provide for them? Not for one moment! They are prepared to complain and to squeal; but they are also prepared to hold out their hands for the benefits to be derived at the financial expense of the unionists, towards which they are not prepared to contribute a few shillings per annum.

Mr. COSTELLO: How would you describe the industrial conditions to-day?

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: They are in a miserable state of chaos due to the administration of the Moore Government for a period of three years. (Interruption.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already issued a warning about interruption during the course of this debate. I shall not issue any further warning. If an hon. member decides not to play the game, then he will be named, irrespective of his position.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: The industrial conditions were broken down because of the administration of the Moore Government and because of their methods in dealing with preference to unionists and industrial legislation generally. I venture the opinion that, had the late Administration continued in office, the rate of pay to the relief worker would have been the standard prescribed for all sections of the community to-day. There might have been some justification for a fixation of wages at a lower level, if price-fixing had been thoroughly exercised, and if the protection of price-fixing methods had been extended to the community. I do not suggest for one moment that the House should consider the possibility of reducing wages still further. The economic theory of low wages and reduced costs of production has been exploded the world over; and the world is coming to a better realisation of the fact that the prosperity of a country depends upon the wage fund available to the workers.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Nonsense!

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion. Some countries may not be able to maintain a wage standard as high as other countries because of certain peculiar conditions; but the financial geniuses of the world to-day are adopting methods of exchange and other methods with a view to preserving the wage standards and the conditions of living generally in those countries that are able to provide a higher standard than other countries. I, for one, hope that the Government will continue their administration in the way that they have done in the past. There will then be no justification for the hon. member for Sandgate or for any other hon. member to proclaim at the end of three years

that our prophecy did not come to pass. Labour will go forward, and will continue to carry the banner of the people triumphantly.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [12.35 p.m.]: The Industrial Court is costing the people of Queensland a large sum of money, and I do not think they are getting value for that expenditure. If the court went into the facts of the case and did its duty by the workers by investigating all the causes and troubles which industry is suffering from, then some value would be returned to the people for that expenditure. We have the spectacle to-day of certain matters being brought before the court and determined in an off-hand manner. As a matter of fact, the court is becoming a joke. We have men going to a lot of trouble preparing a case for presentation to the court on applications for preference to unionists. They show in no unmistakable manner that, if preference is granted, it will be a very serious thing for the industry concerned. The Commissioner is seated on the bench in iceberg fashion, immovable, and, when all the facts are placed before him, he simply remarks, "Preference is granted."

I received a letter the other day from a man who had appeared before the court and placed all the facts before it. He told me that it was simply a waste of time appearing. It is a tragedy that the State should be saddled with the expenditure for this tribunal when a decision is arrived at before the evidence is heard at all. I had to go to the court recently on the question of preference to unionists. I waited there for a considerable period; but, after witnessing what had happened to those who had preceded me, I considered it to be absolutely useless for me to wait any longer. I, therefore, delegated my task to someone else, and left the court knowing full well that the decision in the matter I was interested in would be exactly the same as it was in the previous cases. Where is preference to unionists going to lead the country and the Government? It will reduce the whole of the workers to abject slavery. They must join a union before they can secure a job; unless they do so, they have no opportunity of securing work in an industry where preference has been granted. I know of industries which have been functioning for years and have quite a good class of employees who have had nothing to do with unions. In quite a number of cases young people are engaged as clerks and have never been members of a union; but, to-day, Caesar has spoken, and they are compelled to toe the mark and join the union.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Don't you think they should contribute to the union which has been instrumental in securing them better conditions?

Mr. NIMMO: The unions to-day are political bodies. As the hon. member for West Moreton pointed out, the funds are not used to benefit the workers, but are used in the interests of certain individuals. The worker is now compelled to go cap in hand to union officials before he can get a job. There is no reward for ability; and no cognisance is given to the fact that one man may be a better workman than another, while, no matter how good a workman a man may be, he is denied the right to a job if the union likes to oppose his application for membership. Within the last three or four weeks

[*Mr. P. K. Copley.*]

I have had at least 100 rings on the telephone from various electors in my electorate, saying, "Surely it is not a law of the land that we must join a union?" These people must join a union, because it is the law of the land. I say advisedly that, although the Government may think that by building up the unions they will establish a fund which will be helpful to them at election time, yet the day will come when they will be very sorry for the position they have created. They are now creating an octopus which will extort blackmail from every worker. We hear a lot of talk about racketeering being practised in industry in the United States of America. Are not the trade unions as constituted to-day putting a racket over every workman in this State? Every workman has had a racket put on him, and, no matter what payments are asked of them, they must pay. In one of the industrial centres in my electorate on a recent Saturday a deputation of working men waited on me, and complained that the charge for union membership was still 28s. a year, the same as when conditions were flourishing. Although the cost of living has come down, union dues are still at the same high figure. I am protesting to-day on behalf of the majority of my electors against this iniquitous tax which is being forced on the people. I had confirmation of the statements made by the hon. member for West Moreton when, last Monday, I was told in Ipswich that union organisers were going amongst the intermittent relief workers and other workers insidiously suggesting that they should become members of the union; otherwise they would have no chance of securing the eight weeks' rotational work. That is an indirect way of making men pay a tax for the sake of the unions.

Mr. GLEDSON: That is an absolute misstatement. The organiser is doing nothing of the sort.

Mr. NIMMO: It is no misstatement. The information was conveyed to me last Monday morning that that was being done in the Ipswich district.

Mr. GLEDSON: Nothing of the sort is being done.

Mr. NIMMO: Let us now analyse what benefits are obtained from membership of a union.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Compare the conditions to-day with conditions which existed before the workers were organised.

Mr. NIMMO: The hon. member for Kurilpa said this morning that low wages are no good; but no wages at all are infinitely worse. If the preference to unionists policy is continued, and the employers are allowed to employ only those who are sent by the unions, we shall become so inefficient that other States and countries will wipe the floor with us when we find ourselves in competition with them. Remember we have free trade within the Commonwealth, and there is no possibility of erecting a trade barrier to prevent Southern goods from coming to Queensland. Preference to unionists is one of the worst ways of leveling all workers down to the lowest grade.

If the unions were made attractive, and if it were an honour to belong to a union, is it not reasonable to think that the unions could manage without preference being granted to them? The unions would then

give service to their members. Instead of that, we have a most anomalous state of affairs. For example, last week a man told me that the secretary of the Federated Clerks' Union called on him and said that, if he did not become a member of the union, he would be dismissed from his employment. That union official was autocratic; he was in control of the industry, and could tell the employer who should be employed, simply because he held the position of union secretary. I ask the Premier if it is right that men who invest their money in industry should have no voice in the selection of the men whom they will employ? To-day we are looking for the investment of capital in industry in Queensland. Do hon. members not think that those who have capital to invest may possibly say, "We will not invest our money in Queensland because we will have no say in the employment of our workers; that will be a matter for the Trades Hall?" The position is intolerable, and even at this eleventh hour it should be remedied.

The hon. member for Kurilpa stated that what has been done is quite legal. That is only the hon. member's opinion. Very eminent legal opinion has been obtained by different employers.

The PREMIER: Who are they?

Mr. NIMMO: The hon. gentleman knows that I will not tell him that; but I will tell him that the opinion of these legal gentlemen is that the present action of the Government is illegal. Eminent counsel have given the opinion that the Government are not acting legally.

The PREMIER: You cannot produce the opinion of eminent counsel to that effect.

Mr. NIMMO: They have advised the employers that it is no use going to law, although there is no doubt that, if they went to law, they would win the case; but, if they did, the Government would immediately put a Bill through Parliament making it legal.

The PREMIER: You cannot produce that opinion.

Mr. NIMMO: If the hon. gentleman is anxious for a copy, I will get him one. Very large sums of money will be collected by the unions of this State as a result of having this power to extort money from the workers in the State. What are those funds used for? If we analyse the balance-sheets of the different unions, we find that the Australian Workers' Union, which collected the enormous amount of £65,633, actually expended only £27 in benefits to the union members. The Amalgamated Foodstuffs Union received in subscriptions £1,610, and the amount paid in salaries was £1,567. Practically the whole of the receipts were disbursed in keeping people in good jobs. The receipts in connection with the Australian Meat Workers' Employees Union amounted to £5,904, and the amount paid in salaries was £3,549.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: What have Waugh and Josephson collected?

Mr. NIMMO: I know nothing about Waugh and Josephson.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Both the interjection and the reply are irrelevant.

Mr. NIMMO: I do not know what the hon. gentleman was insinuating. Certain

*Mr. Nimmo.]*

things are going on in connection with Waugh and Josephson at the present time, and there have been nasty insinuations made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The matter is irrelevant.

Mr. NIMMO: The Brisbane Tramways Union demands substantial payments from its members. The members of that union are in permanent work. The adults pay £3 18s. per annum in fees, and even point boys pay £3 5s. per annum, showing the large sums that are collected from the members of that union.

I should also like to refer to the question of the admission of members to the union. I have referred to this in this Chamber before. There should be some clause in the union rules providing that, if a man obtains a job and is competent to carry on, he should automatically become a member of the union on sending along his subscription. That was in the old Act, but to-day I find the Act is being flagrantly broken. Men who go around looking for a job, say, at the meatworks, are simply told that they are not members of the union, and that other members who are unemployed must be given jobs first. When men who are out of work say they want to pay their fees and to become members of the union, they are told there is no meeting coming on for some time and that there are no vacancies on the books. This is getting down to Russian conditions, and we shall have to stop it in these early stages. Every hon. member knows that we are playing with fire, and that this is a danger which will yet crush the present Government.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The meatworks employees are selected by an official at the abattoir.

Mr. NIMMO: I am going to deal with the apprenticeship question, as well as with the Employers' Federation. The Employers' Federation is composed of a very fine body of men who are trying to create more employment in the State, and, under their auspices, exhibitions of goods manufactured in Queensland are being made throughout the Brisbane and Ipswich areas and other large centres of population. Still there always seems to be a sinister sneer on the part of some hon. members opposite, who ask what the Employers' Federation is doing. Why work up this class hatred amongst the people? The Employers' Federation must provide decent employment for employees in order to exist; and the more work there is for the employees naturally the better it will be for the employers. The employer is not out to exploit the worker, but to try to bring about the best conditions possible. It is all very well to say that certain high wages must be paid, but, if it is impossible for an industry to carry on under those rates, the high wages will go by the board, because there will be no work for the employees. It would have been better for employees to work for a reasonable wage so that the industry concerned could compete with similar industries in the other States. Hon. members opposite must see that until we get industrial conditions throughout Australia on an equitable basis one State cannot compete with another. If one party says that it is going to create a paradise for workers in this State, making it all right for the few who are in employment, while huge numbers are put out of employment by trying to make the condi-

tions here better than they are in the other States, it is going to be very hard on the people concerned.

With regard to the apprenticeship question, the Leader of the Opposition, when in office, made a great effort to give the young people of our State a trade. The Government were then going through a very difficult time, and it was very hard for people to get employment. The position was specially difficult for the young fellows who had reached twenty-one years of age, but had never had an opportunity of learning a trade. That was due to the system inaugurated by the late Labour Government, which kept boys at school until they were sixteen or seventeen years of age, and then laid it down that, unless a boy was apprenticed to a trade at sixteen or seventeen years of age, he could not be apprenticed at all. The Moore Government extended the age, and possibly that is what the hon. member for Kurilpa referred to this morning. I know many young men eighteen or nineteen years of age who started to learn a trade under the regime of the Moore Government, but who, if the Labour Government had continued in office, would have gone through life as labourers.

I hope the Government will do nothing to disturb the legislation which has been put through with regard to the age at which boys can start to learn a trade. Every safeguard should be provided; but young people should be given an opportunity to learn a trade even up to twenty-one or twenty-two years of age. Still, as I have indicated, mere membership of a union does not connote efficiency. Many years ago, when unions first came into being, if a man wanted to become a member of a trade union, he had to demonstrate that he was a first-class tradesman; but all he has to do to-day is to produce his articles to show that he has served his time, when he can become a member of the union. When we employ a man, we want him to be competent. If he is a house painter, for instance, he should be a first-class house painter. We all know very well that there are many men in that trade to whom nobody would give a job after seeing them work. Yet they have union tickets! It is no guarantee that a man is a good tradesman if he says, "I am a member of the painters' union." Recently I saw a man put on to paint a wooden cottage, and, after doing two days' work, he reached the painting of the timber underneath the corrugated iron on a veranda. He was disfiguring the iron with paint, and there was a row, and he was dismissed. He argued that it could not be done without touching the iron; but the next man who came along did it successfully without marking the iron at all. Both men were members of the union, yet one was certainly not a tradesman.

I propose to stick to my guns against preference to unionists; and I say advisedly that the feeling in the country against that principle is growing. Hon. members talk about how much the Government are in favour; but preference to unionists is the rock which will wreck them. They have no hope of escaping it. To change the metaphor, once the people are put into chains, they find those chains getting very irksome, and they will get rid of them at the first chance.

Mr. GAIR: It is a wonder you are not supporting it.

[Mr. Nimmo.]

Mr. NIMMO: All my life I have been on the side of freedom and right. I am not in favour of binding people together by artificial bonds. Tyranny I have no time for; and, so long as I can, I will oppose preference to unionists, and give every employer the right to employ whatever labour he feels is the best for him if he is to get the best results. To every employee I would give the right to work.

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*) [12.58 p.m.]: We shall be in a better position to discuss this vote effectively next session.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You may not be here.

Mr. SIZER: No; we may be over there. To a large extent we are reviewing the work of the late Administration; but many points can be discussed in the light of the events of the few months that have elapsed since the change. Many things provide us with a very good barometer for the future. In spite of all that was said, in the few months they have been in office hon. gentlemen opposite have not brought about that complete restoration of confidence which they promised at the elections, nor have they re-employed the people or brought back prosperity to the State. No one can say that the position has improved. It is worse than when the Government took over—definitely worse—and the outlook is no better than it was. In fact, the permanent outlook is as bad as it ever was. No scheme is proposed by the Government to meet it. They are following the old Labour policy of spending whatever they can get, hoping, Micawber-like, that something will turn up, knowing that principles will have to be jettisoned before this crisis is weathered, but hanging on to them to the last, although they know it must make recovery much slower.

Without making any reflection on the members of the Industrial Court, I contend that they do not seem to have risen to the occasion, or realised sufficiently that there is a crisis in Queensland and Australia. They must recognise sooner or later that this State cannot be placed on a pinnacle apart from other States. The fact that goods can be produced very much more cheaply elsewhere and shipped here for sale—which means that our own people engaged in such manufactures must be unemployed—seems to have been altogether lost sight of by the court.

I regret exceedingly that Mr. Bridgen found it necessary to resign his position as a Conciliation Commissioner of the Industrial Court. He possessed the outlook requisite for a Conciliation Commissioner. I do not know his reason for tendering his resignation. The outlook of the members of the court will have to be changed, and they will have to discontinue the practice of referring applicants to the Federal Arbitration Court when they are dissatisfied with the State court. The Federal arbitration law makes it exceedingly difficult for State applicants to gain access to the Federal court. It appears to me that the State court shirks its responsibilities when it refers applicants to the Federal court with a full knowledge of the difficulties involved. I cannot conceive the motive actuating the members of the State court in this advice tendered to applicants.

The real situation will have to be faced. The industrial outlook and the prospects of permanent employment furnish two very

serious problems, and the policy of the Government has not made the position any easier.

Dealing with the Order in Council under discussion, I have no desire to express a definite legal opinion on the matter; but I do know that the section upon which the Government rely for the validity of their Order in Council was intended to be exercised only in sudden emergencies that might arise during a time of crisis. It was never intended to be utilised with the object of altering the entire tenor of the law. It has never previously been used for that purpose. It was utilised on one occasion when the judge required a slight alteration to provide for the smoother working of the court. If the Order in Council were tested in a court of law it would be found to be illegal; but a successful judgment would be of no avail, because the Government could immediately remedy the position by passing a special Act of Parliament. That is one of the grave weaknesses of the unicameral system of government. If a court decided that the Executive Council had acted illegally, the Government could, under the unicameral system, pass an Act of Parliament depriving a successful litigant of the redress to which he was entitled. A reversion to the bicameral system of government will receive greater consideration from the people if the Government persist in flouting the law by the issue of Orders in Council. It is quite foreign to what was intended by the Act, and is quite illegal.

The merits or demerits of political unionism are a matter of policy. I have no quarrel with the Government if they desire to put it into operation legislatively; but it is undoubtedly bad politics for them to enforce it in the manner they have done. Preference to unionists aims at the principle of individual liberty; and the only effect it has is to clothe a number of men in industrial unions with an authority far beyond their importance in the community, because it enables them to browbeat people into joining their unions and paying fees for which they receive no direct benefit in order that the system of political unionism may be established. To that extent they can elect to rule the country people who do not believe in the policy of the unions or the people concerned. In that respect the principle is bad.

It cannot be argued that unionism is the hallmark of proficiency. Craft unionism to-day is in the same category as unskilled unions. Preference to unionists is merely a political expediency. In times of prosperity, when work is plentiful and industry is thriving, it might be excused to a certain extent although not justified; but in a period of adversity, when employment is irregular, uncertain, and scarce, preference merely places a premium on a man retaining a job, and is inconsistent with reason and justice. Just imagine the situation! A man finds a job. That means that he must compulsorily contribute to a political organisation of else lose his position. That is a position which cannot be regarded with equanimity. An atmosphere creating that state of mind is not justified. I am not particularly pessimistic because we are passing through a period of change. Our Government introduced certain reforms, but for the time they have received a check. The people are looking for better things by

*Mr. Sizer.]*

the changes which the Government are making; but they will not get those better things. The position will become more difficult, and the public will clamour for the removal of the restrictions which are now being placed upon them. A process of evolution is going on. The politicians cannot march too far ahead of the people; and the day will arrive when the people will demand a change. The experience gained to-day is hastening that day, because they now have the opportunity of seeing the effect of the changes that are being made. There is a growing resentment in the community against the restrictions placed on people getting employment. Every year employment is becoming more difficult to obtain; and the restrictions against securing that employment must cease when the public give vent to their resentment. Any Government must fall which fails to recognise that resentment and clings to old traditions and the building up of big political organisations which, when exposed to the light, cannot show any tangible benefit given by them in return, or neglects to assist in overcoming a crisis like the present.

No one can show that the unions have been big enough to adjust themselves to the changed conditions. Their attitude to-day is as narrow as it was in the days of unexampled prosperity. The union leaders still talk with their tongues in their cheeks, advocating things which they know cannot possibly be achieved, and generally shifting the responsibility to someone else. Those things are becoming so apparent that in the not distant future the unions will kill themselves. When one realises that last year the Australian Workers' Union, possibly the greatest industrial organisation in the community, could only give something like £30 by way of unemployment relief to its members out of a wealth totalling hundreds of thousands of pounds, one wonders how long the members will stand that sort of thing. Yet the unions put up the insistent cry to-day, "Pay further toll to the joss!" Nothing is surer than that they will smash themselves. The smash will be brought about, not by this party, but by the people who claim to be the protectors of unionism—the Government of the day and the leaders of the unions.

Contrasting the attitude of these leaders with that of other leaders in other countries, one must lament the fact that they have not risen to the occasion, and led their men intelligently and fearlessly. The view of the average union leader in this country might be expressed in these words, "These are my views. If you don't like them, I will change them. What are your views?" That attitude of mind will get us nowhere. This toll is being extracted under license of Parliament. Ultimately Southern competition will seriously affect the industries of this State. It appeals to people who are solicitous of the welfare of all sections—employers and employees—that, if the Industrial Court, which is there to control the destinies of industry in the State, fails to recognise these points, it is only a matter of time before it will have to be removed as an incubus that is stopping the recovery of the State. We have reached the stage in this crisis when people are prepared for action. They want a way out. Probably when we were the Government of the day the public mind was not so informed; but to-day the people are not so much concerned with

shibboleths; and hon. members on the Government side will realise that the people do not want empty words and sweet-sounding phrases, but actualities—work, progress, and security. So far these things are not forthcoming from the Government of the day. It is a most serious situation.

We talk glibly about people being put back to work, and say that, if industry recovers, unemployment will soon disappear. That is all moonshine, and shows a failure to recognise the fundamentals of the position. For many years past a large number of workers have been engaged in the construction of roads and railways built by loan funds. If industry revives, there is still no place for these people. Furthermore, there is a growing body of young men who have never yet taken their place in industry—young men who have a right to get a foothold in industry. These sections of the community cannot be dealt with by building water-tight compartments around industry and preventing that free expansion which is so necessary for our welfare.

There is no doubt that the industrial views of this State will have to undergo a serious change. I have never been one of those who argue whether 44 hours' work a week or 48 hours a week is the right thing. I do not think the solution lies along those lines at all. I do not think there is enough work in the community at the present time to employ everybody for 48 hours a week. I do not think there is enough work in the community at the present time to employ everybody 44 hours a week. The time has arrived when we shall have to look at the position from another angle, and see whether it is not better to share the work amongst the community and spread the wealth available amongst more people than follow the stereotyped method adopted in the past. We cannot go on having a high nominal rate for some people and a small percentage getting that rate, others nominally getting it, but actually getting a much lower rate by resorting to subterfuge. Men to-day are signing for £3 14s. per week when they are not getting £3 14s. per week. We know that is going on, and no department can stop it; and no department ought to attempt to stop it at the present time. We come down to the next stratum, where men are getting 27s. a week and less. The steps in industry are too great, and methods must be adopted whereby there will be a more even distribution. The industrial authorities must look into the matter, and spread the work over a greater number in order to provide a more even distribution of wealth than is the case at the present time. If we add to the unemployment relief tax, which is now very high, the extra burden of the preference and the toll which the unions will take thereunder, it amounts to an extreme toll taken from the workers by the Government who claim to be their friends. The toll that is placed on top of the unemployment relief tax is a reduction of wages, no matter what hon. members opposite may say, and there is no tangible benefit derived from it. The situation becomes a hundred times worse under the system that prevailed in the past, and will prevail again, where one man had to transfer from one union to another until he got to the position in which he had no fewer than nine union tickets. That system is not going to lead the country out of this great crisis. Under that system the freedom which made this country will be

[Mr. Sizer.

destroyed. Hon. members should get away from the political atmosphere, and think out a solution of the problem. Let us consider the new methods adopted in the selling of goods, and the new methods in industry of eliminating labour, which has all been brought about by the restrictions which have been placed on the use of labour. That is creating a greater problem than ever, and members of Parliament for the metropolitan areas are constantly being approached by shop assistants to see if they can get them in anywhere. Those shop assistants are not getting employment anywhere, and others are going out of employment on account of these restrictions, which, while they may work in times of prosperity, will not work to-day. All the efforts of the Government and the Industrial Court have not made these restrictions workable during this time of extreme difficulty, and ultimately something will have to be done in the way I have indicated.

I know how difficult the problem is for these permanent loan workers who never work anywhere else; and young people who have never been employed will be quite at sea through following the Government's policy, and will not be absorbed in industry. There is no outlook whatever for them, and, having got to this stage, it is time we started to experiment along some other road with a view to improving matters. If I were Secretary for Labour and Industry, I would advocate that the functions of the Industrial Court should be confined to the fixation of wages; that the law of the country should fix the maximum number of hours in industry; all other conditions to be left to the industry itself to determine. Industry should be allowed to solve its own difficulties in its own way.

The idea that we need a court to settle strikes may have worked in the past. Men cannot strike to-day, because the economic situation will not permit of it. Men want permanence in industry; they want to help to revive industry; but they cannot do it under present conditions. During the time I was Minister, my instructions to the department were that they were to keep men in work and not unduly harass people who were trying to keep men in work. I make no apology for having done that. The policy to-day, however, has been reversed.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: To stop men from being sweated.

Mr. SIZER: There is not much sweating to-day. The trouble is that too many people cannot find means to raise the sweat. It is an absurd position when you have half the community in work and the other half out of work, and it is made more difficult for that other half to get work.

I suggest—although I cannot expect the Government to do it, because it is against their policy, but it will have to be done—that the restrictions on industry be lessened, as they are making it impossible for people to find work. I refer particularly to the policy of preference to unionism, which will have a rebound in due course, and the sooner the better. The sooner a new outlook is taken, the better it will be for all concerned.

I would like to hear from the Government the reason, if any, why Mr. Bridgen resigned from the Industrial Court. It is disappointing to me that such an able man found it

expedient to resign soon after taking office. I know that he was enthusiastic, and had visions and ideals in regard to that work.

I would also like some information from the Minister with regard to the training of boys on the University land at St. Lucia. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he go warily in that matter. We established a home at Riverview where boys were effectively trained, according to the report, for about £7 per boy—104 boys being trained for £700—efficiently trained and placed in work. I do not want to throw cold water on the scheme, because it was initiated in my own time; but I strongly suspect that behind the proposed enlargement of the scheme there may be the introduction of another Government institution which will make further inroads on the funds of the community, and will not render the same service to the boys or the community that is being given at Riverview for £7 per head. I quite approve of the scheme being enlarged, but I think that the best way would be to enter into an arrangement for an extension of the scheme at Riverview. That would be infinitely more profitable for the boys and would save money to the community. I have become extremely suspicious, however—especially since I became a Minister—that schemes are sometimes put before a Minister by somebody who has an axe to grind because he wants to make a position for himself or for somebody else. There is a grave danger in normal times; but, when the Government are taking 40 per cent. of the wealth of the community, that sort of thing cannot continue, for the creation of a new department means taking a further toll out of the 60 per cent. which is left. I strongly suggest that, before certain schemes are introduced, the Minister should look to the financial side, and see if, within the existing organisation, there is not the means of carrying out what he wants efficiently and probably at less cost.

I do not propose to discuss relief questions, but I would like to know how the situation is shaping, how the financial side is developing, whether the revenue is up to expectations, and whether the expenditure is being kept within bounds. A cursory view of the situation indicates that the expense is growing very considerably, but I do not want to say this myself—I would like to have an authoritative statement from the Minister. Later we shall have to meet the situation. I do not think that it will be met by the revenue from the unemployment relief tax. I sincerely hope it will. If the Minister and the Government continue at the rate they are going, it certainly will not. I hope that the figures which come before the hon. gentleman daily or at other regular intervals will have the sobering effect which figures usually have, and that he will administer the fund accordingly.

The position is extremely difficult. Soon Parliament will close. Our cash balances will have gone, and we shall then depend upon Treasury bills. Although we may have passed the Budget on paper, we shall yet have to realise its figures. The trouble will come before Parliament meets again; and, if we are not then within the figures placed before us by the Treasurer, the Government will have to meet an extremely difficult situation. They will have reached the position of the individual who goes to his banker and has some very nasty things said to him. If the Government's Estimates are not

*Mr. Sizer.]*

realised, they will be very much overdrawn; and, when they have exhausted their cash balances, they cannot resort to juggling figures from the Loan Fund or anywhere else to the consolidated revenue. What do cash balances mean if there is no cash in the bank? I hope that the Government are shaping a course that will avoid the situation to which I refer, otherwise there are serious difficulties ahead. I should like to be able to be more optimistic, but I cannot see how the Government have improved the situation. I wish that I could see that they had done so, and that there was some ray of hope ahead. Nothing of any consequence can be achieved merely by adopting a negative attitude.

The Minister won his way back to Parliament mainly because of his criticism of the administration of the Department of Labour and Industry. He was one who was most violent in his criticism; but I sympathise with him now that his chickens are coming home to roost. I am sorry that he has had to disagree so violently with His Grace Archbishop Duhig. No one was more pronounced in his opinion than the hon. member when he asserted during the last Parliament that our Government should provide free railway trucks or carriages for the transport of unemployed workers who were in search of employment. He waited upon me and upon other Ministers of the late Government to urge the necessity for action in this direction, and he advanced the very same reasons that are advanced by His Grace Archbishop Duhig to-day. The late Government gave him the answer, and, strange to say, it was the very same answer that the hon. gentleman has given to His Grace; so I rather sympathise with the hon. gentleman in his position.

That is not the only chicken that is coming home to roost. He should always remember that even when in opposition there are some responsibilities to be shouldered, and that the pages of "Hansard" may eventually prove to be frightful reading to him. It might be of benefit to us all later on if some of the "Hansards" were burnt. I warn the hon. gentleman not to quarrel too violently with His Grace, lest His Grace should quote some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman when in opposition, which will probably be to his extreme embarrassment.

There is another phase of the present administration that I cannot help but mention. When the Premier sat in opposition, he was exceedingly wroth about the alleged iniquities of the late Government, and he referred in scathing terms to what he called the industrial outlawry practised by us. Words fail me when I endeavour to describe the attitude of the hon. gentleman on those occasions. He said that we were endeavouring to smash the whole industrial fabric; yet he has allowed that smashed industrial fabric to remain.

The TREASURER: You did a lot of nefarious deeds.

Mr. SIZER: It is said that a person who perpetrates a nefarious deed is an evil person; but it is also said that one who perpetuates the nefarious deed is worse. Hon. members opposite have been in power now for some time, but they have not seen fit to alter the conditions of which they so bitterly complained when they sat on this side. Many of the things that were

done by the previous Government have been accepted by the present Government. The Premier has endeavoured to divert attention from his political inertia by a discussion on bananas and by the utilisation of other smoke screens. Eventually the banana smoke screen must disappear, and the hon. gentleman will be compelled to account directly for his actions. When that time arrives, it will be extremely amusing to behold the side-stepping of the hon. gentleman. It will be amusing to listen to his excuses for failing to do those things which he said he would do, and for doing those things which he said he would not do.

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [2.35 p.m.] I wish to support the contention of the Leader of the Opposition that the Order in Council issued by the Government conferring power on the Industrial Court to grant preference to unionists was illegal. I find that in a previous Act the court had power to grant preference to unionists; but section 57 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1929 only provided for preference to unionists where mutually agreed upon. That provision evidently was not sufficient for the present Government. Section 10 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1930 did away with the power of the court to grant preference to unionists. When the present Government assumed power, they became actuated with the desire to clothe the court with power to grant preference. I do not agree with preference at all; nevertheless, it is the policy of the Government, and they have a perfect right to give effect to their policy by legislative enactments if they desire to do so; but they cannot alter the principle of any Act of Parliament by the issue of an Order in Council. Yet they immediately took upon themselves the right, by Order in Council, to repeal that section of the legislation passed by the Moore Government prohibiting the granting of preference. They had no legislative authority for doing so.

There are many things which the Government can do by Order in Council if they like to take the responsibility of usurping the necessary power. The section under which the Government took to themselves the power of issuing the Order in Council only gave them power to amend, alter, or vary. Most certainly they have looked at that power in the widest sense of the word, and have said to themselves that, if they have power to amend, alter, or vary, they have the right so to amend the Act as to confer upon the court power to grant preference to unionists. They had no such power. We have heard members of the Government say time and again that they do not believe in repealing any Act of Parliament by Order in Council. They have not introduced or given notice of introduction of any Bill to confirm or ratify their action in this case, as they did on a previous occasion. They have practically said to the interested parties, "If you are not satisfied, you can taken the matter to the higher court." The right to do so certainly exists, but, in the event of an appeal, the person aggrieved would be put to a considerable amount of expense and waste of time, for, if the appeal were successful, as I submit it would be, then the Government would bring in a validating Act. That would nullify the success obtained. If there was no political unionism, I could see the force and effect of

[Mr. Sizer.]

trade unionism, and the benefit it would be to the people; but, when trade unionism is converted into political unionism and used as a means of exercising compulsion, regardless of the political opinions of the persons concerned, it is altogether wrong. A great many people do not wish to join a union at all, but are forced to do so in order to get work. These people are legally robbed of the contributions they are forced to make to the union.

Certain exemptions were provided for in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act passed by the Moore Government, but there are no exemptions in the payment of union dues. All dues are fixed at a flat rate. I understand that the Premier does not believe that everyone should be taxed on a flat rate; yet here is such a tax on all those who are forced to join a union. A man is forced to join a union in order to get work; and the union concerned has the power—which has been exercised on many occasions—to close its books and refuse membership to any additional persons. That is preventing men from obtaining work. Moreover, where union dues are in arrears the person concerned is being forced to pay those arrears. That is a particular hardship at the present time. The most extraordinary part is that no exemption or exception is allowed.

The action of the Government is in contravention of "The Wages Act of 1918," the principal object of which was to ensure that every employed person must be paid his wages in full. The following exemptions were provided:—

"(1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate or prejudice the following contracts or transactions, namely:—

(a) Where an employer supplies or contracts to supply to any worker any medicine or medical attendance, or any fuel, materials, tools, appliances, or implements to be used by the worker employed in his trade, labour, or occupation.

(b) Where an employer supplies or contracts to supply any worker who has engaged with him with the necessary outfit and means of support, and materials or tools requisite for commencing or continuing his engagement, to any amount not exceeding in any case the amount of two months' wages to be earned by such worker in such engagement.

(c) Where an employer supplies or contracts to supply to any worker any hay, corn, or other provender to be consumed by any horse, or other beast of burden employed by the worker in his trade, labour, or occupation.

(d) Where an employer demises to any worker the whole or any part of any tenement at any rent to be therein reserved, or allows such worker the use of a tenement as part of his wages or in addition to his wages, or any other allowance or privilege in addition to money wages as a remuneration for his services.

(e) Where such employer supplies or contracts to supply to any worker or his family any foodstuffs.

(f) Where an employer supplies to any worker tobacco or clothing.

(g) Where a deduction from wages or earnings is agreed on at a colliery for providing the wages of a check weighman employed thereat."

This was also provided—

"In any proceedings against any employer, company, or person—

(a) For the breach of any provision of this Part; or

(b) For the recovery by the worker of money alleged to have been taken, received, deducted, or detained from him in breach of any provision of this Part.

"the fact that the worker consented thereto shall not avail in any way as an answer or defence."

Surely that is absolutely definite. Yet we find the unions trying to make employers deduct the amount of dues from the wages of the employees. In some cases that is permitted by mutual agreement, and possibly that might be deemed to come under this provision—

"(a) Pursuant to an agreement with a worker, from making any deduction or stoppage from the wages of such worker for or in respect of any of the matters or things in this section hereinbefore mentioned;

"(b) From advancing to any worker any money to be by him contributed to any friendly society, life insurance company or association, savings bank or other society or association whatever, or to any Commonwealth War Loan or War Savings Certificates, or from advancing any money for the relief of the worker or his wife or family in sickness, or from advancing any money to any person by the worker's order, or from advancing to any worker the amount of any steamer, railway, or coach fare, or other travelling expense, or from deducting or contracting to deduct from the wages of the worker any such sum or sums of money advanced aforesaid."

There is a proviso that no deduction or stoppage shall exceed the amount of such advance. These deductions are only to be made in pursuance of the Act, and the deductions allowed are set out. Nowhere does it say definitely that union fees may be deducted. It may be argued that they come under the words, "or association"; and where the worker has given his written consent, presumably it might be taken as correct. In certain awards that is set out.

The hon. member for Kurilpa quoted an instance in connection with local authorities; but he was not quoting the Local Authorities Act. What he was quoting was the award made in connection with local authority employees; and his argument was that the award had the same force as an Act of Parliament. I submit that, where you have an Act of Parliament such as the Wages Act, you cannot go directly against the sections of that Act. The Industrial Court stretched it considerably when setting out in the award that local authorities or anyone else should deduct the amount of an employee's dues and pay it to the union. If it is done with the consent of the employee, there is some argument that it may be done; but, if it is done without the consent of the employee, it is illegal, and contrary to the Wages Act.

It seems to me that preference to unionists is an absolute farce. It is right enough for the officials of the unions, because their incomes are derived from the fees of those who are forced to join the union. Of course, the argument is that the union provides certain advantages. There is no material advantage, but the employee may get some advantage from the fact that the union is working all the time to force the employer to give higher wages and shorter hours. If unions will not allow those to join who are anxious to do so, they are doing an illegal thing. The union books should be absolutely open, and those who want to join the union and are willing to pay the fees should be allowed to do so. I have known cases where a union gave notice to the employer that he must discharge an employee who was called upon to join the union and pay the dues. In one particular instance, when the matter came before the directors, of whom I was one, we advised the employees to join the union. Naturally, we thought all they had to do was to make application and pay their fees; but, when the application was made, the union calculated what would be a fair and reasonable amount to charge as an admission fee, and in one case £7 10s. was fixed upon as the fee. After that, of course, the other fees had to be paid. Even then, in some cases, they were not willing to allow the applicants to join, even though they paid up. In these cases a great hardship is experienced. In a country like this we should encourage everyone to get work and not try to keep anyone out of work. When people get work, why should the unions practically make a call upon them and force them to pay 25s. from which they get no direct benefit?

This morning the hon. member for West Moreton read out a union balance-sheet, which practically none of the unionists concerned except the paid officials could really support. It contained little more than a list of payments to different secretaries and officials, which were of no direct benefit to the workers. There was only a small sum of £27 which could be said to be of direct benefit to the members of the union.

I hope that the Minister will be able to carry out the intention expressed by the Premier at one time—that is, to restore to the whole of the unemployed workers the full award rate for a full week's work. Unfortunately, that has not been brought about, and the benefit which has been obtained is only the payment of an extra amount, which works out in certain parts of the State at 2s. 6d. per day for the days worked; but there are no extra days' work so far as married men are concerned. We want to see that they get additional work for the remainder of the week. When the Moore Government were in power, they were not in a position to give that extra work. They were quite frank about the matter, saying that it was only relief work, and not a full week's work or salary. It was only regarded as a temporary measure at the time; but it seems to me that it is going to become permanent, which will not be desirable.

A good many of the single men are suffering. Some of them receive one day's work a week and rations every alternate week; but there are cases where single men cannot get either relief work or assistance, on account of the amount of the basic wage being earned by the family; and it is excep-

tionally hard on those families. It takes a man with a wife and two or three children all his time to live on present wages; and, if he has to support a couple of grown-up sons or daughters who cannot get work, it is very hard upon him, and some concession should be made in those cases. The mere fact of the basic wage coming into the house should not be taken into consideration where there is a big family, as the basic wage is then not sufficient to go round, and no member of a family likes to live on the wages of his or her father, brothers, or sisters. I trust that the Minister will be able to make some alteration in the near future and place all single people on the same level.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [2.55 p.m.]: The vote we are discussing I take to be one of the most important that any Parliament has to discuss. We must recognise that to-day unemployment is becoming worse, and the unemployed are at their wits end to know what they can expect from any Government. They are at their wits end to interpret the intentions of any of the leaders throughout Australia. Unemployment is a menace that must be tackled. So far it has not been tackled by the present Government at all. It is very nice for us to have our ideals.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY interjected.

Mr. KENNY: Even the hon. member for Kurilpa, who interjects, has his ideals, only he does not live up to them.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: I object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Any hon. member who indulges in personalities will be asked to resume his seat.

Mr. KENNY: I appreciate your remarks. Mr. Speaker, but, whilst hon. members opposite choose to interject, I will defend myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will resume his seat immediately if he does not obey my call.

Mr. KENNY: We all like to have our ideals. Most of us like to live up to them; but we must recognise that there is something even more priceless, and that is the position of the country we live in. No matter how nice it may be to give further social advantages, they cannot be given if industry cannot pay for them. Our conditions in Queensland depend on world conditions. The products of Queensland, and of Australia, depend upon the markets of the world; and, this being so, we must recognise that to a great extent effect cannot be given to those ideals.

I say definitely that the Leaders of a Government should be the leaders of the people, and the Governments throughout Australia have a duty to the people. It is their job to lead the masses, not to be driven. But the Governments and the leaders of industry to-day are not leading the masses. In politics the tendency is for Governments to ask the people what they require. They bid for their votes, knowing that they are not doing justice to the people to whom they look to follow them.

I say that the duty of any party and of any Government is to tell the people the truth about the finances of the State. We told them that we could not promise them the impossible. We told them that we would do our duty as a Government in the interests of the masses; and that may be

the reason why the Labour Party to-day is in control of the Government benches. We are not concerned about that. It is the job of any leader to lead the masses along the path that is safe. Whether popular or not, it is his duty to tell the masses that they cannot live on promises, and to make plain to them exactly what industry can pay, and that we are depending on industry to put them back to work. It is not the duty of the Government to employ all the unemployed in Queensland or in any other country. That duty rests on the shoulders of industry; but the function of the Government is to relieve industry so that it can absorb the unemployed. The masses throughout Australia to-day are looking for that lead. They are ever ready to grasp at any political straw; but the political straws of the Labour Party are mere empty words that cannot assist in any way to relieve the position. The unfortunate unemployed are justified in accepting all the promises made to them as truthful. They are justified in believing that a political party is endeavouring to improve their position; but, if Governments persist in refusing to honour their promises, an intolerable position will be created. All Governments should be very careful in the promises they make to the people. In his policy speech the Premier promised that, if he were returned to power, he would obtain £2,500,000 of new money for the relief of the unemployed.

Mr. FOLEY: He got £3,000,000.

Mr. KENNY: I shall show just exactly what the Government have received.

The unemployed realise only too well the wretched position in which they have been placed by the economic depression. They could not be blamed for deciding to give their political support to a party that had promised to raise a large sum of money, whereas the other political party could only tell them that the road was hard and that no promise of pecuniary help could be held out to them. These poor, unfortunate people were gulled by promises that were never intended to be fulfilled.

Immediately the Premier returned from his first Loan Council meeting, he informed the people that there was no need to launch the revival loan that he had promised. He said that there was no need for the money; but the unemployed are looking for that money to-day. We have been informed by the Secretary for Labour and Industry that the Government have received £940,000 for the relief of unemployed. The Queensland Government are to receive a sum of £334,000 as their quota of the loan of £8,000,000. That is to be the first instalment of the £940,000. The Government have not yet actually received the cash in respect of the £620,000 which was Queensland's quota of the Commonwealth-States loan. Can we blame the unemployed for giving their political support to a leader who says that, when he is returned to power, he will see that Queensland obtains her share of all the money allocated by the Loan Council? The Premier was loud in his denunciation of the present Leader of the Opposition because the deliberations of the Premiers were held in camera; but the proceedings at the conferences attended by the present Premier have also been of a secret nature. The masses are unable to judge what attitude the hon. gentleman adopted at those gatherings.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is very wide of the subject.

Mr. KENNY: I am endeavouring to deal with the question of unemployment, Mr. Speaker. I have referred to the fact that the sum of £334,000 represents the first instalment of the money which is to be made available to this State for the relief of unemployment. In the meantime the funds of the State are being expended; and, unless we are very careful, we may find it necessary to issue Treasury bills in the near future. That will not relieve the position, nor will it create the confidence so necessary to encourage industry to absorb the unemployed. The Government were returned to power on the strength of their promises to relieve the unemployment position, and they should live up to those promises to-day. They decline to do so, preferring to bow to the dictates of Trades Hall officials. In doing so they are aggravating the wretched position that exists. Industry, which should be encouraged to absorb unemployment, is being hampered by the harassing conditions imposed, which, instead of relieving the position, are only intensifying it.

Mr. FOLEY: Give one illustration.

Mr. KENNY: I could give many illustrations; but one illustration of the harassing conditions placed on industry is the principle of preference to unionists. When any employer goes to the Industrial Court to state his case, he finds that it has been pre-heard. It is useless any employer opposing an application for preference, because he knows beforehand what the result will be. He is only wasting his time in opposing the application.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Do I understand the hon. member is making a reflection on the hearing of these cases by the Industrial Court?

Mr. KENNY: I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, would call it a reflection, but I said that the cases were pre-heard, and no encouragement was given the employers to go to the court.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in proceeding on those lines.

Mr. MAXWELL: He is not dealing with the Supreme Court.

Mr. KENNY: The attitude and policy of the Government is tantamount to refusing the individual the right to work. The position is that, if a man secures a job, he is not allowed to take it until he pays his union dues. If he has been out of work and has been unable to continue the payments of those dues, and manages to get a job, he must pay all those arrears before being allowed to work. Such a policy does not encourage the individual to get off the unemployment market. We do not believe in that policy, and the Government will realise that it is not one in the best interests of the workers themselves.

Mr. GAIR: Do you believe in arbitration?

Mr. KENNY: I believe in arbitration, because I believe it is one of the best methods that can be adopted for the settlement of disputes. I believe in trade unionism in order to conserve the interests of the men industrially; but I do not believe in political unionism under the cloak of trade

*Mr. Kenny.]*

unionism. I do not believe in unionists being conscripted politically, and then being compelled to pay levies for the maintenance of the Labour Daily, and other such matters. We have now reached the point when industry, after being compelled to give preference to unionists, is also compelled to collect the union fees. When the hon. member for West Moreton was speaking, the Minister asked him what industry was concerned. I would refer the Minister to the "Queensland Industrial Gazette" of 24th September, 1932, at page 260, where he will see that the award for the brick and pottery-making industry compels the employers to collect the union fees. Relief workers are also compelled to join a union and pay union fees.

Mr. FUNNELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That statement is not correct. The relief workers are not being compelled to pay union dues.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the point of order raised.

Mr. KENNY: The hon. member for West Moreton read from correspondence, which I have had the opportunity of perusing, and I accept his statement as being true. It is an undesirable state of affairs, because it amounts to a reduction of wages and a reduction in the standard of living of these unfortunate workers. Preference to unionists has not been introduced to encourage industry to absorb the unemployed, but merely as an act of political organisation and to keep union organisers in a job.

That is where the money of the men who are compelled to subscribe to the unions is being expended. The welfare of the masses is a secondary consideration. The masses who are unemployed are used as a stepping-stone to power by many people who are interested in political organisations. While the masses of the people are looking for relief from the Government, the assets of the State are being squandered in ways that are not in the best interests of the people. The political atmosphere is being well looked after. Many men have been appointed to jobs by the present Government, although money is not available for the unemployed of the State. Four ex-members of the Government party have been appointed to positions in the State service, two of them to jobs where they will be harassing industry, and in doing so will be placing more men on the industrial scrap-heap. All this talk of trade unionism in the interests of the workers is mere camouflage. The unemployed are with us in thousands, despite the trade unions. If they were the wonderful asset they claim to be, the trade unions would have relieved the position of the unemployed. Far from being an asset, the trade unions have been converted into a political machine to put the Labour Party into power. No money has been spent by these organisations in the interests of the unemployed. From the balance-sheet of the Australian Workers' Union which was quoted by the hon. member for West Moreton, we glean the interesting, though depressing fact, that of all the money collected by that organisation, only £27 was spent in the relief of the unemployed, and that for boot repairs. No doubt the boots were repaired so that the unemployed might keep on walking, and not be a menace to those officials who are drawing £900 a year from the union.

For some years employers have realised that the harassing conditions demand that

some action be taken by them in self-protection. As a result, employers of labour are combining their concerns, and where two or three organisations formerly existed only one is now functioning. That leads to monopolies, which, in turn, may accentuate the unemployed position. The conditions imposed by the trade unions and political unions have compelled the creation of monopolies; that is not in the best interests of the State. To-day we have an opportunity for individualism to show its worth in extricating the State from the morass in which she finds herself. Unfortunately, the initiative of individuals is nipped in the bud. In Brisbane a number of men took on the work of baking bread in their own backyards to try to keep off the unemployment market. Those men are endeavouring to become an asset to the State instead of a liability; but, instead of being allowed to employ one or two men, they will be passed out again on to the unemployment market. Every Government in Australia to-day should encourage the private individual to come forward and give of his best in order to lift the State out of its difficulties. If monopolies cannot absorb unemployment, then the individual himself should be encouraged, and every restriction should be removed. We know that bread is becoming cheaper to-day; but we have further inspectors appointed to see the conditions under which the bakers are operating, and to see if they can get hold of something to enable them to put the screw on. That is not going to get us out of our difficulties. The less interference we have with industry the sooner are we going to overcome our difficulties. These restrictions may have been all right years ago, when conditions were prosperous, and when we had plenty of loan money to find work for the unemployed; but loan money is not available to-day, and, even if we could borrow, the way the money is being spent to-day it would not overcome our difficulties. It is going to impose a greater burden on the State and on the people who are unemployed to-day. The Government will have to get a new outlook on business altogether. When they get that new outlook, they must help the employers in industry. They cannot expect conditions to improve all at once. We have to compete on the markets of the world, and industry must be given a fair go, and all restrictions removed if we are to be successful in that competition. If that is not done, the onus of absorbing the unemployed will be on the Government. It is not the function of the Government to absorb the whole of the unemployed. That function is on industry; but it is the duty of the Government to see that industry is given an opportunity of absorbing them. When that is done, we shall start on the up grade.

We must also take into consideration the effect the attitude of the Government is having on the young people of the State. When we find men at present employed being cast out of employment, what hope is there for the young people who are growing up year after year? There is no outlook for them. As one speaker pointed out this afternoon, a number of people have been employed on construction works financed from loan money; and, if there is no outlook for those people, what chance have the young people who have never been in employment at all? These people cannot

[Mr. Kenny.]

see any outlook in industry to-day. Hon. members on the Government side condemned this party when they went to the polls for having made young men walk in order to get 6s. worth of rations per week. We were condemned, also, because young men were fined for "jumping the rattler."

Mr. GAIR: They are not required to walk to-day.

Mr. KENNY: You find them "jumping the rattler" still. In yesterday's issue of that educational journal, "The Daily Standard," I find this paragraph—

"RATTLER JUMPERS BEFORE P.M.

"On Goods Train.

"Three young men, one from Victoria and the other two from Tasmania, pleaded guilty in the Police Court, before Mr. J. Stewart Berge, P.M., to-day, to 'jumping the rattler,' on the New South Wales goods train, this morning.

"They were: Lawrence Taylor (19, labourer), Frank Turner (23, labourer), and Allan Turner (18, labourer), and were charged with travelling between Greenbank and Clapham Junction without having paid their fare of 3s.

"The three defendants were caught in a wagon of the New South Wales goods train, which arrived at the station at 5.30 a.m. this morning, explained the prosecutor.

"They admitted that they had boarded the train at Casino (N.S.W.).

"Each was fined 10s., in default forty-eight hours' imprisonment."

The Moore Government were condemned for permitting action to be taken against these young men who "jumped the rattler," but men are still "jumping the rattler."

Mr. GLEDSON: Those are men coming up from New South Wales.

Mr. KENNY: I would ask any member of the Government if instructions have been issued that only men coming from New South Wales should be put into gaol if they "jump the rattler." We know that every day of the week men are still fined for "jumping the rattler."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in dealing with that matter on this resolution.

Mr. KENNY: I was drawn into that by hearing other hon. members discuss the question and by interjections from Government members. It is desirable that some consideration should be given to the position. Unfortunately, single men in Queensland are in a very difficult position. I sympathise with the Minister in the dilemma he finds himself in to-day. We were condemned for our attitude when in power. I say definitely that the provision made for single men is not all that could be desired—6s. one week for rations, and one day's work a fortnight. That is not going to keep a person living in town. A young man is not going to be contented with rations one week and a day's work the next week; he is going to try to get a job.

Mr. GLEDSON: What was your action?

Mr. KENNY: I am not trying to defend our action at all. We gave one day's

rations per week, and I did not apologise for it during the election campaign. I said that, with the finances available, we could not do anything of any value for the young single men at that time, and that all we could do was to encourage industry to absorb the unemployed. But when we asked the young men to walk from place to place, we did more for the young men than the Labour Government. The position to-day is that they still have to walk. There is very little opportunity of getting work in the capital cities, where a great many of them are. More consideration will have to be given to the single men, because, instead of their situation being relieved, it is being intensified by the policy of the present Government. It is very undesirable to aggregate thousands of unemployed men in the capital cities. By doing that we are going to get them into a camp with communist leaders addressing them, to have processions through the cities, and providing difficult work for the police force. The onus is on the Minister in control of this department to bring about some improvement in the position. The policy of the Government must not be hidebound; they cannot carry on the policy that might have been adopted ten or twelve years ago. They must meet changing circumstances; and, in my opinion, there is only one way to do that, and that is by giving industry a fair go, and letting it do the job for the Government.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) [3.24 p.m.]:

The question before the House is one that has created a great amount of interest. We have had opinions from hon. members learned in the law as to the proper course that should have been adopted, and, as with doctors, there is a difference of opinion among them.

In times like the present, when co-operation is essential to put industry on a sound basis, we should give encouragement to people to invest their money. The position, however, has been prejudiced through the attitude of the Government in eliminating a certain section in an Act that was passed by the Moore Government dealing with preference to unionists.

I may be expressing opinions which are unpalatable to some hon. members and other persons; but I repeat the declaration I have always made, that, so long as any man in a British community wants to work, he has the right to work—the right to live. I do not care what a Labour or any other Government may say, or what laws they may make to stop him, if anybody is game to take up the matter, they will not have a leg to stand on. It is the privilege of everybody who lives under the British flag to get work. Yet we are told that, unless men belong to a union, they shall not have the right to work. I believe in trade unions—craft unions—but I do not believe in their being used for political purposes. Their very name conveys what they should be—a union of tradesmen—but to-day they are a union of a big section who have banded themselves together for political purposes, and for political purposes only, and who exercise their influence on the Government, through the legislature, and demand from their legislation providing that, unless everybody joins a union, he shall not have the right to live or work.

I do not propose to express an opinion on the legal position, because, as a layman, I

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

am not competent to do it; but the majority of legal opinions are against the hon. member for Kurilpa. I wish, however, to quote the opinion of a very eminent lawyer, Lord Cave, the Lord Chancellor of England, in 1927—one of the soundest constitutional lawyers Great Britain has ever possessed. When introducing a Trade Disputes Bill, he said—

“No man should be obliged to refuse his work at the dictation of an outside body and against his will, nor should he be compelled to subscribe to political views and support political action against his own will. Any suggestion otherwise was contrary to the fundamentals of the British Constitution.”

We do not need the opinions of hon. members opposite as to the legal position. The fact remains that in a British community every man and woman has the right to work and live; and no party, whatever its policy, has the right to prevent them from accomplishing that object.

It has been said during this debate that certain charges have been levied on unfortunate men who have fallen behind in their payments to the unions. We know very well that numerous men are placed in most unfortunate positions to-day, that staunch unionists have practically eaten up their homes and their furniture because of the bad conditions that have obtained throughout Australia.

At the State Labour Convention held in Brisbane in January, 1932, the following motion proposed by J. C. Valentine, representing the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen, was carried:—

“That legislation be enacted giving absolute preference to unionists, and that, when Labour gets back, the people who dropped out of the unions when the Moore Government abolished preference be forced to pay the whole of the dues for the period during which they had been out of the unions.”

I can quite understand hon. members opposite being willing to accede to the wishes of a convention which frames their policy and generally lays down the legislation that shall be enacted in the interests of a certain class. I propose to remind hon. members opposite of a little passage from Scripture which is quite apropos at the present time. This is taken from 1st Corinthians, chapter x., verse 12.

“Wherefore let him that thinketh that he standeth take heed lest he fall.”

A bombastic attitude is generally regarded as an indication of a weakness of character. Certain leaders of Labour thought are prone to boast of what they can do. The action of the Labour Party in compelling all workers to become members of unions and contribute to Labour papers against their wishes is tyrannical in the extreme. You will probably remember, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. McCormack said that preference to unionists was injurious to the unions. The day is not far distant when some giant will arise in our midst—a giant in mind, though he may be small in stature, who will defy the Labour autocrats who are to-day creating a Labour monopoly. These gentlemen have always professed abhorrence of monopolies. The Leader of the Opposition quoted a letter this morning from the “Courier.” I now

propose to quote this letter which appeared in the “Telegraph” on 3rd October last—

#### “UNION TYRANNY.”

“SIR,—Through the medium of your valuable paper, I should like to submit a few remarks in sympathy with one of your correspondents, signed ‘Faber.’

“What he or she writes is only too true, and only one of dozens of cases. It certainly is tyranny. I know of a man who walked 10 miles to get a job and secured it, too, but had to stand down and take his turn because they had others on the books who, perhaps, had never even bothered to look for work, waiting for someone else who had more grit, perhaps.

“We certainly did have three years’ respite, but what I want to know is, why do the unions become so tyrannical when the Labour Party is in power? And can the Government suppress this sort of thing, especially when one is fighting against such odds? To get a job is really something of a miracle these days. Well, why should not that person have what he or she has striven to get. No doubt, in the case of ‘Faber,’ someone else would be sent along to take that position. I do hope that some abler pen than mine will take this matter up. Unionism was a very fine thing in days gone by, but, like every other system, has become corrupt. However, I trust your correspondent’s daughter will be successful in getting a position, as it is a very sad case indeed. This unjust method does want remedying, and quickly, too.—Yours, etc.

‘SYMPATHY.’”

That is the opinion of another person who exposes the tyranny of unionism. It has been said during the course of this debate that the books of those unions which have secured preference have been closed. That was also true on another occasion. An instance of union tyranny came under my own notice some time ago. I sent out a circular letter in connection with the unemployed returned “diggers” of Toowong. A man had an opportunity of securing a position, and was actually placed in that position; but he was told that, because he did not belong to a union, the individual employing him had rendered himself liable to a penalty and that he had to sack him. The man got into touch with me, and I interviewed a certain gentleman. I told him that I would be quite prepared to pay the union fees of this man. He replied, “The union met last Saturday night, and I am afraid, Mr. Maxwell, that he will have to wait for another month. I said, “What will the man’s wife and children do in the meantime?” He said, “I am sorry; I do not know.” I told him then that the man was going to work, and that he had the right to work.

The Government have been making an appeal to the community to provide work for the unemployed. Last Sunday afternoon the Premier preached a sermon in one of our city pulpits, in which he recommended the people to get together, co-operate, and lend a hand to build up this great State. That is a lot of piffle when judged by the actions of the hon. gentleman. It is all very well to stand up in a church pulpit and say that one believes in a certain thing; but

[Mr. Maxwell.]

an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory. The opportunity is now given to the Leader of the Government to do things. How is it being done? By placing all possible kinds of restrictions on the employers who are endeavouring to carry out their work in every possible way! Does the Premier believe that people are foolish enough to have any faith in him? If the Government want the co-operation and assistance of the people and investors, they can secure it; but it can be secured only by the establishment of a feeling of security and confidence. It will not be brought about by forcing an individual to join a union before he is permitted to earn food for his wife and family.

The Moore Government enacted that, if a man belonged to one union, he should have the right of entry into all unions without the payment of additional fees. The hon. member for West Moreton read the balance sheet of that great industrial organisation, the Australian Workers' Union, which showed that a poor unfortunate section of workers who were down and out received a miserable pittance while all their salaried officers were well paid. That is nothing short of political hypocrisy; and, until Labour develops a broader viewpoint, and shows a desire to help the people, the statement of the Leader of the Government on Sunday afternoon last will prove of no avail, for it is no use him asking the people to get together and then returning to the legislative hall and enacting something which will bring about totally different conditions.

At 3.40 p.m.,

Mr. HANSON (*Buranda*), Chairman of Committees, relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am protesting against the attitude of the Government in this matter. Legal gentlemen have told us certain things concerning the Order in Council; but, as with medical men, there is often a great difference of opinion amongst legal men. I am looking for someone who will be game to take up this question outside, and who will fight the matter in the law courts. Of course, I appreciate the fact that the Government might introduce an amending Bill to remove any doubt that existed. The hon. member for Kurilpa has expressed his opinion, but, with all due respect, the hon. member has not had the practical experience that other men have had in the matter. He views the question from one viewpoint only, and is not in the position of the man who can speak from his experience both as an employer and as an employee. It does not follow that, because a man is a member of a trades union, he is a craftsman. Membership of a union is no guarantee in that respect. That is the difficulty because anybody can be admitted to a union so long as he can pay the union fees.

Mr. FUNNELL: That is not true.

Mr. MAXWELL: I say it is true. I know what I am talking about. It is a well-known fact that individuals are rushing to join unions under compulsion. I intend to move a reduction in this vote as a protest against the action of the Government in hindering industry. They are only sincere in keeping their own jobs. The masses of the people are not one whit better off to-day than they were when

the present Government took office. In that respect my views coincide with those of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, who was honest enough to admit that the condition of affairs has not improved. It is all very well for us who are assured of our bread and water. We are drawing our salaries; but what about the unfortunate men and women who have scarcely got bread? The Government have an opportunity to do the things they promised to do. Unfortunately, the Government have so far failed. That is a matter on which I would have no hesitation in facing the electors. As a protest against the Government's action, I move—

“That the item—‘£100,161—Department of Labour and Industry’—be reduced by £1.”

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): I formally second the amendment.

Mr. FUNNELL (*Brisbane*) [3.45 p.m.]: After listening patiently and attentively to hon. members opposite, I feel ever so much prouder to be a representative of Labour sitting on this side of the Chamber. Hon. members opposite have, clearly shown their hands, and have openly declared war upon the industrial unions and trade unionists of this State and the Commonwealth. Preference to unionists is not the only form of preference that hon. members opposite oppose. It is quite clear that the aim and object of those hon. members in deliberately singling out preference to unionists for attack is to try to discredit the industrial organisations and their officials. It is the function of the industrial organisations at all times to look after the interests of their members; and I am perfectly satisfied that the objection of hon. members opposite is not altogether to workers becoming members of the different industrial organisations. Their opposition to preference to unionists is an attempt to weaken the organisations so that the interests of the workers and the welfare of industry will not be so well looked after as is the case at the present time, and that the industrial awards prescribing the wages and conditions may not be up to the present standard.

Preference to unionists has been a great help to many industries. It will be remembered by hon. members opposite that the workers in the sugar industry, on becoming organised, gave as much, if not more, assistance than the farmers in that industry, to bring about a satisfactory state of affairs in the industry, not only for the benefit of the farmers, but also for the benefit of the workers, who have been largely responsible for maintaining those conditions up to date. It is also a well-known fact that the workers of this State and the Commonwealth pay something like 2d. per lb. more for sugar than they are really entitled to pay, the industry being protected to that extent. The hon. member for Burrum may laugh, but he knows that my statement is correct and quite in accord with his own views. The workers and consumers generally are perfectly satisfied to pay that price, provided that the conditions operating in the industry are maintained, that the workers enjoy in the future the protection they have enjoyed in the past, and that the industry gives employment only to white labour.

I would also like to mention the position in the dairying industry. As is well known, something like 4d. per lb. more is being

*Mr. Funnell.]*

paid for butter than should be the case, simply because the butter industry also receives protection. We know that sugar, butter, and other commodities produced in this country are being sold much cheaper to the workers overseas than to the workers here on account of the preference given in these industries. Why should hon. members opposite, particularly those representing country electorates where these industries are being carried on, raise any objection to the workers in these industries enjoying preference and receiving the benefit of industrial awards? This brings about more satisfactory conditions; and these good conditions have always existed under arbitration and conciliation. The worker knows that he is protected to that extent from the unscrupulous employer who still exists in many industries. We know there is a big percentage of people unemployed; and, if it were not for the Industrial Court awards and agreements, we should find the unscrupulous employer taking advantage of the unfortunate worker. We would then have reasonable employers placed in an unfair position, the conditions in industry would not be fair or reasonable, and the worker would not receive the protection which he is receiving under the Industrial Court awards, on account of which he can pay high prices for commodities that are being produced in the State.

It was quite interesting to listen to the hon. member for Oxley, who is a large shareholder in the Queensland Woollen Mill, opposing preference to unionists. I claim some of the responsibility for the organising of the industrial workers in that industry many years ago. Although those workers have enjoyed fair and reasonable conditions from then onwards, the shareholders in that company have also enjoyed very handsome profits. The hon. member for Oxley has been well rewarded by way of dividends on the shares he holds in the company. The workers in that industry have at all times given satisfaction, industrial peace has obtained, and everything has gone on smoothly and satisfactorily to both employer and employee. A number of other industries could be quoted; and I am perfectly satisfied after many years of experience that in industries where Industrial Court awards and agreements exist everything is more satisfactory to all parties.

The hon. member for Sandgate was fairly interesting; but his remarks in reference to preference to trade unionists are not in accord with the experience of his own father. As a matter of fact, Mr. H. Sizer, senior, who is at present employed in the Department of Public Works, is a financial member of the Carpenters and Joiners' Union, and has been for many years. He has received preference of employment there. He was first appointed in No. 1 district as a carpenter in May, 1930, was re-employed on 16th August, 1930, and has remained in the employ of the department as a carpenter, enjoying Industrial Court award wages and conditions since.

A similar remark can be made in respect of the late Premier, the hon. member for Aubigny. Preference in employment was given to his own son at the abattoirs after they were established. (Opposition interjections.) He may be the boy that was given a chance. That statement is quite true, and, as a matter of fact, my opponent in the Brisbane election, Mr. Mocatta, during the election campaign flaunted from the platform

[Mr. Funnell.

a pay envelope of the hon. member's son to show the electors that he was not an £8 or £9 a week man but only a £4 5s. a week man. Preference was given to the hon. member's own son over the son of every other father of this State; yet we hear hon. members opposite complaining about preference being given to some unionist over some non-unionist!

I strongly advise hon. members opposite to take the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong with a grain of salt. The facts were not stated by the hon. member, and will not bear out what he said. From my experience, I know that industrial unionists are honourable men, who compare favourably with the members of any profession or trade in the State. The legal profession, the medical profession, and others which have their own organisations, enjoy preference of employment. We have had evidence of that fact time after time; and, when such preference is enjoyed by members of other professions, surely it should not be denied to trade unionists!

I give a deliberate denial to the statements of the hon. member for Cook and the hon. member for West Moreton. The truth is that no intermittent or relief worker has been asked to join any organisation, whether it be the Australian Workers' Union or not, whilst engaged on relief work. In order that hon. members opposite—especially the hon. member for West Moreton—may be correctly informed, let me tell them that, when men are engaged upon work for which they receive the award rates of pay and conditions, then and only then does the preference clause apply. I repeat that no intermittent or relief worker has been asked, or will be asked, to join the Australian Workers' Union or any other industrial organisation whilst he remains on that work. If he secures more or less permanent employment and becomes subject to an industrial award, then the law of the land must be observed by the employer. That is only fair and reasonable. Why should any objection be raised to that by the hon. member for West Moreton or any other hon. member opposite?

Mr. MAHER: Have you the authority of the Australian Workers' Union for saying that?

Mr. FUNNELL: The hon. member is not concerned so much about my authority as he is about his desire to attack industrial organisations and industrial leaders with a view to discrediting them and the Government, and denying them some of the credit that is their due. He is endeavouring to do that, whilst at the same time endeavouring to popularise hon. members opposite. The workers on the jobs know the true facts, and they will laugh at the statement of the hon. member. There are quite a number of trade unionists in the West Moreton electorate, and during the next election campaign they will have the opportunity of deciding who shall represent that electorate in the next Parliament. Let the hon. member then speak in the same strain to the trade unionists who may be in attendance at his meetings. Let him do that and not make his statements in this coward's castle, where he is fully protected. Let him make those statements at a public meeting.

Mr. MAHER: I have done that, and they have returned me to Parliament.

Mr. FUNNELL: The bitter remarks of hon. members opposite towards the workers have led to their political downfall. They will have to stand up to their remarks during the next election campaign. The bitterness and the hatred of hon. members opposite towards the industrial working men and women of this State justify our action in allowing the industrial organisations to extend a measure of protection to them in the same way as a farmers' organisation or an organisation of professional men is prepared to protect its members. It is a trade union principle in this State that every Australian worker, either male or female, shall be eligible to join an industrial organisation, provided he or she abides loyally by the principles of the organisation.

Mr. NIMMO: They are forced to join.

Mr. FUNNELL: That is not true. Hon. members opposite are firm adherents of the principle that payment must be made for services rendered. If we ride in a tram or a train, we are prepared to pay for the service rendered. If a worker in industry is able to reap the benefits derived from industrial arbitration and through industrial awards, etc., he should be prepared to pay for the service rendered to him. The workers will be permitted to organise and to register their organisations so long as the Labour Party remains in power.

I am perfectly satisfied that, had the late Government been returned to power in June last, the policy enunciated by the hon. member for Sandgate this afternoon would have been given effect to, and the trade unionists enjoying and working under an industrial award would have lost that privilege. It should be the aim of the Government and hon. members opposite to support the maintenance of those conditions held by our workers. Take, for example, a small business man at Marburg, in the centre of the electorate of the hon. member for West Moreton. Why should he, through the fact that no award was operating, be compelled to give credit to industrial workers because of the low rate of wages operating? Why should an award not operate to enable the worker to earn sufficient to pay his way? The bulk of the credit given throughout the State at the present time is assumed by the small business man in working men's centres. That is the reason why the unfortunate small business man is in the unhappy circumstances he finds himself in to-day.

I would remind hon. members opposite who have been criticising the Australian Workers' Union and its officials that, during the war, some 50,000 of its members enlisted to fight for this country. That fact should not be forgotten, and it cannot be denied. I challenge the hon. member for Toowoong to show from the records of the Master Builders' Federation that a similar percentage of its members went on active service. In fact, I challenge any hon. member opposite representing a similar organisation to quote an instance which exceeds this record. The Australian Workers' Union has been a loyal industrial organisation. Its officials are respected and give good service, not only to its members, but to the State generally. They have rendered invaluable assistance in building up the sugar industry in this State, and will continue their efforts in this direction in order to settle the tropical portions of our State with our own kith and kin.

The policy of the Australian Workers' Union is more or less the policy of the Australian Labour Party. The chief plank of that policy is the settlement of all industrial matters by arbitration and conciliation. Those principles are generally known; and that is the reason why the Australian Workers' Union and its officials have earned the respect of such a large percentage of employers in this country. I have felt compelled to make this statement because of the attack which has been launched by certain hon. members opposite on the Australian Workers' Union. That attack was not fair, and I felt it incumbent upon me to place the true position before hon. members and the public generally. I sincerely believe that the only possible means by which war will be prevented in the future is by the organisation of trade unionism the world over. Trade unions so organised can effectively deal with any agitation for war. I defy any hon. member opposite to contradict my statement. Much suffering and hardship, as well as expense, would be saved to this and other countries if action were taken on the lines I have suggested. No munitions of war could be manufactured if the workers in all countries were properly organised. Certainly, what I have suggested would be in the interests of the world at large.

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) [4.10 p.m.]: This has been one of the most remarkable discussions I have ever listened to in this House. The resolutions contain many important matters that could have been debated to-day with advantage to the House and to the community; but the particular resolution dealing with my department has been singled out to give the die-hard Tories on the other side an opportunity of attacking the Australian Workers' Union particularly for its political activities.

With reference to the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the Order in Council issued for the purpose of enabling the Industrial Court to grant preference to unionists was ultra vires the Act, I am quite satisfied that, if the hon. gentleman expressed his candid opinion, he would confess that it was not so. If his statement is correct, is it not remarkable that the various employers' organisations, with their vast funds, have not tested the matter in the Supreme Court, and, if necessary, in the higher courts? After all, it is a question of jurisdiction.

Mr. MOORE: They are not going to throw their money away for nothing.

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: They know very well that there is power in section 64 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to enable the Government to do what they have done in issuing that Order in Council.

The hon. member for Gympie made the remarkable statement that this particular Order in Council was never ratified. The hon. member took the Government to task for not ratifying it in the same manner as they had ratified other Orders in Council passed by the present Government. It may interest the hon. member to know that the Moore Government amended the Act by an Order in Council under the section referred to, and that the Order in Council was never ratified. I refer to the Order in Council issued on 29th May, 1930, dealing with the

*Hon. M. P. Hynes.]*

fixation of hourly rates in industry. The Act was amended in a vital respect by the issue of the Order in Council to which I have referred; yet members who supported the Moore Government are now castigating the present Government for issuing the Order in Council under discussion.

Mr. MOORE: I am not worrying about that. I am saying that it is illegal.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The people who were appointed under the Act sponsored by the Moore Government say that it is not illegal.

Mr. MOORE: Who says that?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The Conciliation Commissioner.

At 4.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: If there was any question as to the legality of the Order in Council, it should have been tested in the Supreme Court. It is a question of jurisdiction, and that could have been tested in the Supreme Court; and I am quite satisfied that that course would have been pursued by any aggrieved party who disagreed with the decision.

The attack on unions reminds me of some of the speeches made in this Chamber half a century ago.

Mr. MAHER: It is political unionism.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I shall deal with the hon. member later, and prove that he does not look up his facts before making statements in this Chamber. All must realise that organised labour has done a considerable amount of good in the direction of improving the living standards of the mass of the people. It has succeeded in doing away to a large extent with the sweating evil, and has also succeeded in getting a fairer division of the national wealth amongst the people of the community—that is the wealth derived from production. That is something which hon. members opposite should give organised labour credit for doing. I remember the time referred to by the previous speaker when industries in Queensland were black labour industries with black labour conditions; and, owing to the fact that the white workers in the State later became organised and were able to make collective bargains, they were not only able to raise the standard of the workers, but also the standard of their employers. Prior to the advent of unionism, the employers in the sugar industry were living under a very low standard of living; and their standard of living rose automatically with the increase in the standard of living of the employees. The same thing applies to all other industries.

The policy of the previous Government of removing all restrictions on industry had a very adverse effect on the standard of living of the people in Queensland. I heard a remarkable statement made by the ex-Secretary for Labour and Industry, the hon. member for Sandgate, who said that during the time he was Secretary for Labour and Industry he knew of certain employers who were not paying the full award rates, and he also knew of certain employees who were receiving less than the award rates. He

said he could not blame them. In other words, he condoned an offence against his own Act. That is the statement made by a responsible member of the Opposition, who held the responsible position of Secretary for Labour and Industry in the previous Government. An industrial award is the law of the country, and should be obeyed in the same way as other laws have to be obeyed by the citizens of the State. When you have a responsible member who aspired to be Premier of the State—I understand he had his foot right on the top rung of the ladder and nearly deposed the Leader of the Opposition—stating that he condoned these offences, I say he was not qualified to hold that high office.

Mr. MOORE: You condoned offences against the law for years past.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I can assure the hon. member that since I have taken office I have given instructions that every person who commits a breach of an award is to be prosecuted. The man who is prepared to give decent conditions to his employees is up against unfair competition, and the ex-Secretary for Labour and Industry said that he thought that any man was doing a just thing in not carrying out award conditions. Since I have taken office several deputations have waited upon me protesting against the action of certain employees in not observing award conditions, and they asked the department to compel them to observe those conditions. It meant unfair competition, and, if carried on, would mean the extinction of the man who was paying the award rates and observing conditions.

The hon. member for West Moreton made a statement which I gave him an opportunity of correcting. He said that certain employees working for the shire council in his electorate were compelled to take union tickets, and he also read a clause in the local authorities' award to prove that union officials were compelling the council to accept orders and deduct out of wages the amount due for union tickets. When he was making that statement, I said that they only did that at the request of the employees.

Mr. MAHER: I admitted that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The hon. member did not. He said it was not at the request of the employees but of the union. I have a copy here of the local authorities' award which covers shire councils and the Main Roads Commission. Clause 23 of the award states—

“The employer shall, on the request in writing of any employee, pay to the union out of the moneys of such employee in respect of wages the amount of contribution of such employee as a member of the union.”

At the request of the employee!

Mr. MAHER: I admitted that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The hon. member did not; he denied it. He said definitely that he did not admit it.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Minister is distorting my statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member wishes to make a personal explanation, he must obtain permission; but there is no point of order.

[Hon. M. P. Hynes.]

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Hon. members opposite have quoted the Wages Act to prove that it was also illegal for shire councils to deduct money for union contributions from the wages of their employees. The Act does not come into this at all. This is simply a request from an employee to his employer to pay certain people certain sums of money from their wages. That is done every day, not only in connection with union tickets, but with other transactions between employees and other people. I am rather disappointed at the hon. member for West Moreton endeavouring to secure political kudos by making a misstatement or a misinterpretation of the position as he has done to-day.

With reference to compelling people who are working on relief work to take union tickets, the hon. member for West Moreton previously asked me a question in the House which I answered by saying that no persons who are paid by the Director of Labour are obliged to take union tickets. That answer was correct. It will be understood that, under the activities of my department and other departments in the State, there is a great number of people employed on ordinary jobs, on main roads, and railway construction and similar work, which was previously carried out with loan funds. The men who go on to these jobs enjoy the full award rates and conditions which were secured by the expenditure from the funds of such unions as the Australian Workers' Union, whose balance-sheet has been read in connection with this debate. It is only just and proper that those who work on these jobs and enjoy the benefits which have been secured through them by the union should become members of that organisation and contribute to the expenditure incurred in securing and maintaining those decent conditions. That is what preference means—that those who are benefiting by the improved conditions should be obliged to contribute their quota towards the expenditure involved in securing those conditions.

It is extraordinary that hon. members opposite should single out the Australian Workers' Union for attack. All employers—decent employers at any rate—will give the Australian Workers' Union credit for being honest in its transactions and for fighting fairly and in the open. It has the reputation, not only in Queensland but also in the other States, of being an organisation that can be relied upon by every member of the community. Every penny of its funds is spent in the interests of the members of the organisation. Unlike the Employers' Federation and other organisations with which hon. members opposite are associated, every item of expenditure by the Australian Workers' Union is shown openly in its annual balance-sheet audited by a certificated auditor.

With reference to the benefits which the members of the union have secured, I would point out that, first of all, they are entitled to a free copy of the "Worker"—a newspaper which is admitted to be one of the finest journals published in Australia. They are entitled to free legal advice. They have the assistance of a paid organiser or honorary official wherever they are working, in any part of Australia. They can work in numerous industries on one ticket. They do not pay any more than £1 5s. per annum. Their funds are administered by officials who hon.

members opposite allege control the members of the organisation; but any member who can get two other members to nominate him can aspire to the highest office in the organisation and can submit his name to an unfettered plebiscite. There is absolute control in this and most other unions.

Mr. MAHER: The more highly-paid officials are never defeated once they get into such positions.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Because the majority of the members realise the value of the work, and have no reason to change them. Hon. members opposite should remember that the policy of the present Government in giving preference to unionists has been endorsed, not by this Parliament during this session, but at the last election by the people of Queensland—the most democratic endorsement any policy could secure. Everyone who voted for a Labour candidate knew that that candidate stood four square for preference to unionists; and one of the reasons why hon. members on this side were returned to power was because of their adherence to that policy.

It has been suggested that preference to unionists was disallowed by the previous Government on the ground that it involved loss to the employees. I can cite an instance—that of the employees in the meat industry—in which the reverse is the case. Previously the members of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union were engaged under an arrangement made by their union officials. Later they were compelled to go to the bureau of the employers' association. Certain "graft" was going on, and employees were compelled to pay as high as £5 and £10 in order to secure jobs from the emissaries of the employers; and at present a certain person in a very exalted position in the city has been charged with receiving "graft," or compelling some of his employees to pay him handsomely for securing jobs for them. Under the old arrangement the member of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union went to the union official, over whom he had some control, because that official depended upon his support when he went to the ballot annually; and evidently got fairer treatment than he has been getting from the agent of the employer.

The hon. member for Sandgate expressed the opinion that the Order in Council was ultra vires. If it was ultra vires, then the aggrieved parties have the opportunity to test its legality in the Supreme Court.

Mr. SIZER: If the court held that it was ultra vires, the Government would immediately pass an Act of Parliament to rectify the position.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The hon. member also complained that the industrial unions subscribed to the political fighting fund of this party. There is not very much the matter with that. The anti-Labour industrial unions such as the pastoralists' organisation and the Employers' Federation subscribe handsomely to the political funds of hon. members opposite.

Mr. MOORE: No. That is against their constitution.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Nevertheless, they do it. Where did the party opposite get its funds? They could not fight an election campaign

*Hon. M. P. Hynes.]*

on thin air. They had plenty of funds during the election campaign. I repeat that there is nothing very much the matter with that. The workers are justified in subscribing to a political party if they believe that they can secure an amelioration of their conditions by political action. In fact, it is advisable for them to assist a political party that is likely to bring about an improvement of their conditions. The unions were justified in expending a portion of their funds so as to secure the return of the Labour Government. They have secured an improvement in the conditions of the workers. When the Labour Government assumed control, industrial conditions were far from satisfactory; but we have been able to bring about some improvement in the conditions of the great mass of the people of this State. The unions that contributed are satisfied that they have been reimbursed in the better conditions obtained for their members.

There is nothing wrong with preference to unionists. The Labour Party stands four square for preference to unionists. We believe that conditions have been improved by the application of that principle. The Labour Party throughout the world stands for preference to unionists. We know that hon. members opposite give preference to non-unionists, which is a distinctly anti-social act. It is contrary to the best that society in a civilised community can offer to its people. Unionism stands for the improvement of the conditions of the masses of the people. It stands for the uplift of society, whilst preference to anti-unionists has a reverse effect, and means the degradation of the workers and the lowering of their living standards.

Mr. SIZER: The workers are worse off to-day than ever they were in their lives.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: They certainly were worse off during the regime of the Moore Government. A contributing factor to the worsened conditions was the policy of abolishing preference to unionists, together with the removal of all industrial regulations and restrictions. I realise that Queensland, in common with every other State of the Commonwealth, and in common with the rest of the world, has suffered some adverse effects from the world depression; but the position was intensified by the industrial policy pursued by the previous Government. Notwithstanding the criticism that has been levelled against the Government, and notwithstanding the fact that it has been difficult to obtain money since our accession to office; there has been an increased amount of employment provided, relief workers are in receipt of higher rates of pay, and they are able to enjoy other conditions that were not available to them under the previous Government. According to the latest available statistics, there is also a falling off in the number of unemployed. That speaks volumes for Labour administration.

The hon. member for Sandgate referred to a statement made by His Grace Archbishop Duhig in connection with providing railway carriages on trains for the purpose of allowing unemployed youths seeking employment to travel; and he twitted me with the fact that previously I had made the same request. That is substantially correct. I was a member of a deputation which waited on the late Premier, and made several requests regarding unemployed

youths. I remember that we entered a protest against the savage sentences which had been meted out to those who were caught "jumping the rattler." Another request was the discontinuance of the inhuman practice of compelling boys to travel from police station to police station in order to participate in the weekly "hand out" of rations. As an alternative, the deputation asked that, if these boys were compelled to travel from police station to police station—and in some cases in the far West the distance was great making it a physical impossibility for them to cover the distance within a week—some provision should be made by attaching a truck to the trains to enable them to travel. The position to-day is entirely different. The hon. member may laugh, but it is true.

Mr. SIZER: It is too humorous.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: There is nothing humorous about compelling youngsters to leave their homes, become "hoboes" and nomads, and associate with undesirable influences in order to get six shillings worth of rations per week. We gave a definite promise from the hustings that, if returned, we would abolish that system. We did so. As the result of our policy, the youth who previously had to "jump the rattler" in order to get from police station to police station to secure sufficient food to sustain life can live in the favourable environment of his own home and get six shillings worth of rations one week and a day's work the following week. A large number of youths who are now found travelling on trains without tickets have come from over the border.

Mr. SIZER: That was the position previously. Your records will show that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Take the position of a married man with two or three sons who is receiving £3 a week from relief work. It was impossible for him to feed those boys and keep them at home, and, so that they might keep body and soul together, these boys were compelled to go out on the roads and become nomads in order to get six shillings worth of rations per week. We did away with that.

Mr. MAHER: Must a boy in the future leave his home to look for a job?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: If a boy leaves his home and has a reasonable chance of securing a job, then the best possible way for him to reach his destination is by rail. If the hon. member can bring a boy to me who possesses a reasonable chance of securing a job anywhere in Queensland, I will see that he receives a railway pass to take him there.

Mr. MAHER: Must he have the guarantee of a job?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The hon. member knows very well that very few people will secure a job in the country merely by travelling by train or walking through the district. Most employers engage their labour for selections and farms at a labour bureau, which is the place where any intelligent employer applies for his labour. The employer knows there is a big crowd of labour to select from. As a consequence, most of the labour in Queensland is selected through the labour bureaux, either public or private.

Mr. SIZER: Do you give them a pass?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: They get a concession ticket to get on to the job.

Mr. SIZER: We did that, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I know that; but the Moore Government did not give the single men rations so that they could stay at home until such time as they did secure work through the labour bureaux. Nor did the Moore Government give them one day's work per fortnight to enable them to contribute a little to the expenses of their parents' household. By doing the things that I have mentioned, we have removed the necessity for the action that I advocated should be taken by the previous Administration—namely, to provide railway transport facilities for these boys.

Mr. SIZER: We didn't wipe out the ration allowance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will take a hint.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The opinion expressed by the hon. member for Sandgate that there seems to be no hope for the future is indeed a pessimistic one. I think the hope for the future lies in the development of the State by land settlement; and in that direction the Government are taking the necessary steps. Road and transport facilities are being provided, and every encouragement is given in the direction of land settlement, which, I think, is the solution of the present unemployment problem.

I know that the hon. member was also opposed to the Beerburrum settlement, which might be termed something in the nature of an experiment. At any rate, it is something in the direction of taking men away from unproductive work—men who have the hopeless outlook referred to by the hon. member for Sandgate—and giving these men an opportunity to grow tobacco. Notwithstanding the dismal prognostications of the ex-Secretary for Labour and Industry, most of these men will make good.

The other schemes which the Government have embarked upon to absorb relief workers in reproductive work should commend themselves to any unbiassed member of this House. We intend to enforce the industrial awards. The hon. member for Sandgate said that the policy of his Government was the reverse—that, although he knew there were evasions, he permitted them to continue.

Mr. SIZER: To keep people in work.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I can assure the hon. member that we intend to find work for the people and to see that the award rates and conditions are observed. We intend to give to the workers the right to organise that was taken from them.

Mr. SIZER: But you won't give them work.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The fact of there being no work is attributable in a great measure to the policy of the Moore Government.

I quite understand the hon. member for Gympie in his rather bitter attack on unionism. Most of his predecessors took up

the same attitude towards the workers in Gympie, when it was considered a crime to be a member of a union. Hon. members opposite took up the same attitude as was taken by the Tozer family when men like Andrew Fisher were forced out of the mines owing to the policy of the employers in the mining industry at that time. That adversity did some good. It showed the workers that, in order to make any progress in the industrial field, and in order to secure a fair share of the wealth they were producing, it was essential that they should organise. They have done that, and during the time Labour was in power, we gave every assistance to genuine industrial unionists to organise and carry on their domestic affairs without interference. The Moore Government repealed our Act, and substituted an Act which was calculated to smash unionism in the hope that in smashing unionism they would smash the political opposition they would meet on the hustings when they went to the electors to get a verdict. Their action in trying to smash unionism recoiled on their own heads, and as the result of that policy, they now find themselves in the cool shades of opposition. I am satisfied that this attack was launched on this resolution in an attempt to get some political gain out of some of the tarradiddles and propaganda that have been circulated through the Tory press and in this Chamber regarding the action of certain union officials in connection with relief work. I have received only two complaints—one from the hon. member for West Moreton and one from Bundaberg, where the Tory politicians were at the bottom of it—in connection with the attitude of various industrial unionists towards unionists' organisers. Decent men realise that there is a responsibility on them to contribute to their organisations, which won good conditions for them. These men have not such short memories that they do not appreciate the fact that less than fifteen or sixteen years ago, before Labour came into office, they were enduring wretched conditions. They all appreciate that fact, and they know that during the three years Labour was out of office, there was a tendency to go back to those bad conditions. That is why there is no objection on the part of any worker in the community, provided he has the wherewithal to contribute to the union that is working for his protection and in his benefit. The gibes aimed at the Australian Workers' Union and other unions were simply launched for the purpose of getting a little political kudos. I am satisfied that the majority of the workers in Queensland will stick to their unions, notwithstanding the statement that has been made in this Chamber to-day, and notwithstanding the statement made in the capitalistic press. These men will stick to their unions knowing that the union is the safeguard so far as industrial conditions are concerned. If they want to secure improved conditions and a higher living standard and the protection that industrialists are entitled to, they must not only keep in power a Labour Government but also maintain solid industrial organisations outside Parliament.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4.50 p.m.]: It was rather amusing to listen to the Secretary for Labour and Industry pointing out how the workers appreciated unionism. If they do appreciate it, why make it compulsory? That is the grievance we have—we are not objecting to unions at all; if unions are

*Mr. Moore.]*

efficient and competent, and can give the return hon. members opposite say they do, why make unionism compulsory?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is to compel the miserable minority to become members.

Mr. MOORE: That is what we object to—the tyrannical application of preference to unionists. We are not objecting to unionism, for there are plenty of employers who always pick unionists. What we object to is making unionism compulsory by Act of Parliament; and what I rose for this morning was not to object to unionism, but to take exception to its being done by Order in Council, which, to my mind, is illegal. I firmly believe that still, and the Minister has put up no argument proving that the action of the Government was legal. It was done, however, and employers outside recognised that it was no good spending a lot of money in testing the case when they knew that they would be deprived of the result of the judgment immediately afterwards by Act of Parliament.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry objected to the ex-Secretary for Labour and Industry condoning breaches of the law. The first person to say a word about condoning breaches of the law was the present Minister himself. When the Labour Government were formerly in power, they condoned every strike that came along, and no prosecutions took place, although there was a law which laid it down that action should be taken. Under present conditions it is necessary, as the ex-Secretary for Labour and Industry said, to try to keep people in work, and not to harass employers who are trying to keep men in employment. We want to encourage employers as much as we possibly can to do that.

With regard to trade unionism in times gone by, members were required to obtain certificates of competence. If a man joined a union, it was known that he was competent because he was in the union; to-day there is no such certificate of competence. The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Kurilpa—that you might employ a man off the street who had no skill for an electrical job, whereas, if he got into the electrical workers' union, you would know where he was—was untenable. The electrical workers do not get certificates of competence from the union but from the board which conducts the examinations. We strongly object to this legal preference owing to the tyranny which is exercised.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: A union ticket is granted on the understanding that the person to whom it is granted is competent.

Mr. MOORE: That should be the case, but when we find the books of a union are closed and applicants are not allowed to join, is there any justification for the Government handing over the power of life and death, or the question of work or no work, to the secretary of an organisation who is able to say, "The books are closed and you cannot come in; consequently you cannot get a job"? No Government can defend that position. If there is to be compulsory preference, the only thing that ought to be done is to see that there is a maximum payment provided, and that the books of the unions are kept open so that those who have a right to get a job may join the union.

[Mr. Moore.

If we take that right from a man, you deprive him of the opportunity of earning a living, and place the decision in the hands of the union secretary. That is quite wrong.

The hon. member for North Brisbane stated that during the debate which has taken place we have exposed our hands. There is no exposure on our part. When we were a Government, we did away with preference to unionists, as we believed in the principle that every man had a right to work. We would take the same action again, as we think the principle of compelling a man to join a union before he can obtain work is wrong. It is not a question of exposing our hand.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Do you subscribe to the dictum of the hon. member for Sandgate—that an employer should not observe the law?

Mr. MOORE: We did not say that. I do not think it is fair that power should be given to any individual to say that another man shall not earn his living, or to close the union books and not allow a man to join the organisation. What right has a secretary of a union to say whether a man shall be allowed to work or to tell him that the books of the union are closed? Hon. members opposite might be able to justify it if the books were kept open and they fixed a maximum fee; but to place in the hands of an individual the right to prevent another individual from earning his living cannot be justified by anybody, Government or individual. The whole position seems to be entirely wrong in principle. If a union does some good for its members, there is no occasion for compulsion to join that union. There is no compulsion in other organisations. Their members recognise that they get advantages and consequently they join them.

Mr. FUNNELL: What about the medical profession?

Mr. MOORE: The medical profession and the legal profession are in a totally different position because the members of either profession has to pass a stiff examination before he becomes qualified to membership. It is not simply a question of paying a fee. The member of a union does not have to be skilled in order to join the organisation—he only has to pay the fee. In the other case the members of the organisation are not qualified by the payment of a fee but by the passing of the examination. That is a totally different thing from compulsory preference.

I repeat that we are not objecting to unionism. What we object to is the power that the Government give to an individual to decide whether a man is entitled to work or not. That is the outrageous condition of things we have reached. The suggestion that a relief worker or an intermittent worker does not have to join a union is quite beside the point, because a large number of men who have been put on to main roads work on the rotation relief system and are paid award rates have to join a union. What the hon. member for West Morteau said is perfectly true. If men happen to be working for the Main Roads Commission or the Railway Department, though they are rotation relief workers, they have to pay the union fees. That is all that the hon. member contended.

It is a totally different thing to saying that anyone paid by the hon. gentleman's department had to join.

Mr. GAIR interjected.

Mr. MOORE: I have always thought that preference in the Government service was totally unfair. I cannot see that there is the slightest justification for it. It is absolutely wrong to say to anybody who is going to work for the Government or for the public, "You must join an organisation or you will be paid less or you will not get a job." Nobody can possibly justify it. Everyone who has to pay taxes, if he is competent to pass the public service examination, should have the right to secure employment from the Government. The idea that he should have to belong to any organisation, political or otherwise, is quite wrong.

That is briefly the position that we take up. Hon. members on this side say that every man has the right to a job. We do not care whether that man joins an organisation or union or not; but we do object to joining an organisation or a union being the only condition on which he can get a job.

Question—"That £100,161 stand part of the resolution"—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Larcombe
" Bedford	" Llewelyn
" Bruce	" Mullan
" Bulcock	" O'Keefe
" Conroy	" Pease
" Cooper	" Smith
" Copley, P. K.	" Waters
" Foley	" Wellington
" Funnell	" Williams
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hanlon	
" Hanson	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Hayes	" Copley, W. J.
" Hynes	" Gair
" Keogh	

NOES, 22.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Nicklin
" Barnes, W. H.	" Nimmo
" Brand	" Peterson
" Clayton	" Roberts
" Costello	" Russell
" Daniel	" Sizer
" Deacon	" Taylor, C.
" Fadden	" Wienholt
" King, R. M.	
" Maxwell	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Moore	" Kenny
" Morgan	" Maher

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Taylor, G. C.	Mr. Tozer
" Stopford	" Sparkes
" King, W. T.	" Edwards
" Dash	" Plunkett
" Collins	" Grimstone

Resolved in the affirmative.

CLOSURE UNDER STANDING ORDER NO. 307.

At 5 p.m., under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order of 17th August, Mr. Speaker proceeded to put to the House the resolution under discussion and the remaining resolutions not already agreed to.

Resolution 61 agreed to.

Resolutions 62 to 69, both inclusive, agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) [5.6 p.m.]: I move—

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1932-1933, a further sum not exceeding £4,097,004, 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 1932-1933, a further sum not exceeding £2,880,578, 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 1932-1933, a further sum not exceeding £1,617,242, 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 1931-1932, a supplementary sum not exceeding £58,099 17s. 9d., be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1931-1932, a supplementary sum not exceeding £375,542 7s. 0d., 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 1931-1932, a supplementary sum not exceeding £20,704 6s. 2d., 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 1933-1934, 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 1933-1934, a sum not exceeding £900,000, 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 1933-1934, a sum not exceeding £450,000, be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account."

This is the final Appropriation, and covers the Estimates-in-Chief, and the Supplementary Estimates which have already been passed in Committee. This appropriation will provide Supply for the remainder of the financial year, and for a few weeks in the new financial year.

Mr. MOORE (Aubigny) [5.9 p.m.]: Why does this vote extend to the 1933-34 financial year? Why is it not restricted to the

1932-33 financial year instead of extending two years ahead?

The TREASURER: The 1933-34 financial year follows this year.

Mr. MOORE: This is 1932-33.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: This vote will provide Supply for the first six weeks in the next financial year.

The TREASURER: It is merely following the usual form.

Question—"That the resolutions be agreed to" (*Mr. W. Forgan Smith's motion*)—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.

##### FIRST READING.

A Bill, founded on the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced, and read a first time.

##### SECOND READING.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [5.13 p.m.]: I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [5.14 p.m.]: I think the time is opportune for investigating the affairs of the State and reviewing some of the promises which were made by the Treasurer. In the first place, I am deeply disappointed that the hon. gentleman did not give us some information as to what transpired at the last meeting of the Loan Council, and also as to what happened at the Premiers' Conference. Such a statement would have been of very great interest at the present juncture. For some reason or other to which I shall make reference later, the hon. gentleman has not seen fit to do that. I can well remember that, when the ex-Premier and myself returned from similar meetings, the hon. gentleman who is now Treasurer was always twitting us for not giving information. I venture to suggest that the financial position of the State is more critical to-day than it was when we were in office; and I think the public are entitled to know the exact financial position of the Government. I confess that I thought the Treasurer would have availed himself of this opportunity to give the information to the House.

Reviewing some of the items to which reference is made in the Estimates, I notice that the amount provided for "Contingencies" is a reduction on that appropriated last year. I am anxious to know if the arrangements made will be sufficient. The amount set down for "Contingencies," which includes exchange, is less than the amount last year. Probably very largely due to the lower prices that are ruling, Australia to-day is up against this position—it does not refer to Queensland—that the

[*Mr. Moore.*

imports are greater than the exports. We know that the Bank of New South Wales is anxious to raise the exchange rate, and I want to know from the Treasurer what are the prospects in that regard. Does he anticipate that exchange will go up, or does he anticipate it will come down? It seems to me that that is a very fair question to ask. He himself in his Budget speech admitted what he was not prepared to admit before—that exchange has a very big bearing on the balancing of the Budget.

The TREASURER: Everyone must recognise that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is only since the hon. gentleman has attained office that he has recognised it to any extent. We would be very poor Australians if we were desirous of seeing the financial position go back. It will be a very serious matter if there are deficits from year to year.

I would like to remind the hon. gentleman of some of his own comments a few years ago. As reported on page 1578 of "Hansard" for 1931, the hon. gentleman in dealing with the financial position had this to say—

"A perusal of the detailed information set out in those pages of the Estimates which deal with the Land and Income Tax Department justifies a statement which I made in this Parliament last year, when I expressed the view that the chief State enterprise of the present Treasurer was the Taxation Department."

The TREASURER: That is quite true.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If it was true then, what is the position to-day with regard to the hon. gentleman?

The TREASURER: You increased taxation by £1,750,000.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It seems to me that instead of reducing taxation the hon. gentleman has increased it in certain directions. As reported on the same page of "Hansard," the hon. gentleman made this statement:—

"Having regard to his methods and to the policy of the Government, that department bids fair to become the chief industry of the State."

That is what the hon. gentleman stated in 1931, and I take it that he himself feels that he is the head of a department which is the chief industry of the State. I say deliberately that no party loves taxation as much as the party which the hon. gentleman represents. Their idea is, and they have expressed it again and again, to get at what they think is the big man and tax him; but they have not reduced the taxation on the other man. It seems to me that they overlook the fact that this great country is going to recover from its present financial depression rather by giving encouragement to people to come and get something out of their undertakings rather than to criticise and say, "We are very sorry if you make anything out of it." That is not going to land us anywhere. That policy has been absolutely disastrous to this great State.

Last year the hon. gentleman referred to the big increase in the number of employees in the Land and Income Tax Department from 381 to 549. One would have thought that when the hon. gentleman took charge of the Treasury Department he would have

said straight away, "I am going to reduce the number." But he has not done so. I find there has been an increase of one—I suppose just to make the number 550. It has grown from 549 to 550.

I do not know whether this idea of trying to hoax Parliament was very successful at the last election, but this is what the hon. gentleman said—

"Undoubtedly, 10,000 additional farmers, and others with small incomes have been brought within the ambit of taxation. I have always regarded that as being a violation of sound economic principle."

In view of that statement I want to know what he is going to do to-day with regard to these people to whom he made such a specific pledge—so deliberately that there was no mistaking what he was going to do. He stated that he got an assurance from the people of Queensland that a revival loan of £2,500,000 would be forthcoming. What is there to prevent him from carrying out that part of his policy?

The hon. gentleman forgets the pledge he made on the hustings to reduce taxation instead of increasing it. That leads me to the point that a Government's intentions are often defeated by taxation measures. Very often the imposition of taxation with a view to providing increased revenue reduces the income on which taxation is paid.

With regard to the latter part of the statement I agree with him. I believe that to increase taxation would make it very difficult to collect it, as people cannot afford to pay.

The hon. gentleman talks of pledges. I want to know what he is going to do with regard to the pledges he made about finance. Why has he slipped so badly in that particular direction? Apparently he has forgotten the position in regard to that.

May I draw attention to the revival loan? I heard an interjection by an hon. member to-day that while the Treasurer did not get the revival loan in Brisbane, he got it from the Loan Council. That statement is not correct. The revival loan has not been obtained.

I would draw attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman said—

"A special 'Queensland Revival Loan' of £2,500,000 from Queensland citizens will be invited."

Have Queensland citizens been invited to contribute to that loan? Have Queensland citizens—who have a name for carrying out their promises—gone back on their promises; or has the hon. gentleman felt that it would be useless to proceed in that direction? The hon. gentleman also said—

"It was proposed to invite the co-operation of all Queenslanders in supplementing Labour's onward drive to better times by the flotation of a special Queensland Revival Loan of £2,500,000."

The hon. gentleman cannot deny that he made that statement when on the hustings when he was looking for votes. The words he used were, "A Special Revival Loan"; and the hon. gentleman evidently thought that the Loan Council did not count.

The TREASURER: No.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman may say "No."

The TREASURER: I was only pointing out how erroneous your ideas were.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have had the opportunity of pointing out how erroneous the hon. gentleman's ideas were, and how futile his promises. Here is another choice morsel—

"Queensland's Revival Loan, which the Labour Party intended to raise, would be gone on with if the people gave them a mandate. He would not be mauled by the 'Lyons' or allow the Loan Council to bluff him."

I notice, however, that the hon. gentleman made a very guarded statement when he returned from the meeting of the Loan Council. I am quoting now a press report, and I am assuming that it is a correct representation of the hon. gentleman's statement, because I do not wish to tie him down to something he did not say. He said that he was fairly well satisfied with the result of the Loan Council meeting.

The TREASURER: Yes.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am very glad that I was correct and that the hon. gentleman was fairly well satisfied with the efforts of the Loan Council.

The TREASURER: I did not make statements like you did when you came back, giving everybody the "blues."

HON. W. H. BARNES: I thought the hon. gentleman had the "blues" to-day.

I now want to say a word or two about the promises of the Secretary for Public Lands. He spoke of a direct shipping service to Mourilyan Harbour, and of how the shipping ring had blocked it. It would also be interesting to know whether the hon. gentleman has done anything in that regard. He said that the people of Innisfail were more heavily penalised with regard to shipping freights than the people in any other part of Queensland. I am quoting now from pages 1582 and 1593 of "Hansard" for 1931.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is quite correct. We have done quite a lot. They are quite satisfied.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Of course, if it were a question of accepting promises or of doing these things by making promises, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has done a very great deal indeed. Then I want to know what has happened in the Government Printing Office, and whether rationing still goes on there. I say deliberately that I think it is very much better to ration men than to dismiss them. I am not opposed to the system of rationing work. No man in a public position considers it a nice thing to have to ration people in his employment. We all like to do what is popular.

The Secretary for Mines, the hon. member for Maryborough, from his place in opposition last year, complained that the late Government had budgeted for a lesser amount than that provided the previous year. What about the present Budget? It seems to me that the Government have had to do certain things which they did not care about doing.

I propose to deal with the statement by the Treasurer wherein he set out the amount of money that he expected to receive. This report appeared in the "Courier" of 5th November, 1932, when the hon. gentleman

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

returned from a meeting of the Loan Council—

“Mr. W. Forgan Smith arrived in Brisbane from Melbourne yesterday. Amplifying remarks which had been telegraphed from Melbourne, the Premier said that the arrangements as now finalised would provide for approximately 80 per cent. of the finance necessary to carry out the total programme of works and developmental activity which he had outlined in his Budget speech. The total programme amounted to £3,170,000, and of this amount £2,550,000—including this State's allocation of the proposed new loan about to be floated—had already been assured. He had no doubt that, before the close of the financial year, the balance required to complete the full programme detailed in the Budget would be provided for.

“The funds under the control of the State would enable the Government to carry out an extensive works programme, and thus assist in providing avenues for many citizens with work and wages. ‘I am confident, too,’ added Mr. Smith, ‘that the efforts of the Government in its rehabilitation proposals will serve as an incentive to business enterprise generally, as well as to those of our people whose own financial resources will permit, to co-operate in the campaign towards restored prosperity. United effort is essential, and I shall proceed, at an early date, with the passage through Parliament of the Bureau of Industry Bill, which has been designed to co-ordinate this objective.’”

When certain Estimates were being discussed, the Secretary for Labour and Industry stated that the sum of £940,000 had already been received by the Government. It will be seen from the report contained in the “*Courier*” that the Treasurer stated that he was carrying out the Budget programme. This has to do with the Revival Loan of £2,500,000. In his Budget speech the Treasurer stated—

“The Loan Council has approved of gross expenditure by Queensland of £1,610,000 on account of the State's ordinary loan programme. It is anticipated that this expenditure can be financed by repayments to the Loan Fund by Local Authorities and other borrowers from the Government; by loans to be obtained from the Commonwealth Savings Bank under the Transfer Agreement; and by utilising the cash balance in the Loan Fund Account at 30th June, 1932.”

The sum of £1,610,000 mentioned by the Treasurer must be an approximation. We all know that local authorities pay their interest and redemption on loans, and that other amounts are obtained from the Commonwealth Savings Bank under the transfer agreement.

Then I find that the hon. gentleman appropriates two amounts of £310,000 each. One was an amount that was advanced by the Commonwealth Government in April last to provide work under the winter relief scheme, while the other £310,000 was granted by the Commonwealth to enable the State Government to make advances at a low rate of interest for reproductive work under conditions which were acceptable to the

Government of the day; and their action has been endorsed by the present Government. If the £940,000 received from the Revival Loan has been included in this amount, it brings the total up to the exact amount stated by the Treasurer—viz., £3,170,000. But what is the position? This is the point I want to specially emphasise. We heard a lot of talk about the £2,500,000 loan which the Government said they could obtain. Was not approximately £1,610,000 of that amount to come from local authorities, etc.? It would be a most astounding thing if during the financial year these repayments were not made by local authority bodies. The Treasurer included that amount of £1,610,000 in his £2,550,000. The expenditure of part of that money was authorised before we went out of office. Part of it was also promised to the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company. The Treasurer appropriates the whole of those amounts, and includes it in the amount he quoted. Whilst the Secretary for Labour and Industry made the direct statement that the £940,000 had been received, it now appears, to put it mildly, that he made a mistake. If I described it in any other way I would be pulled up. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman gets only £2,550,000 he is about £620,000 short of his £3,170,000. I am taking the Treasurer's own words. In the course of his Financial Statement, he said—

“The Loan Council has approved of gross expenditure by Queensland of £1,610,000 on account of the State's ordinary loan programme. It is anticipated that this expenditure can be financed by repayments to the Loan Fund by local authorities and other borrowers from the Government; by loans to be obtained from the Commonwealth Savings Bank under the transfer agreement; and by utilising the cash balance in the Loan Fund Account at 30th June, 1932.”

I have quoted absolutely what the Treasurer said, so that there can be no mistake. I say again that the hon. gentleman has not received the £940,000. It seems to me that out of the £4,000,000 which was made available to the States by the Loan Council the hon. gentleman is receiving a very small amount.

MR. WIENHOLT: All the better.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I agree with the hon. member in the main. The policy which was pursued by the previous Government was a wise one. Had the Moore Government carried out the suggestion made to them by the hon. gentleman who is now Treasurer, he would have found himself in a most invidious position to-day. Queensland, in common with every other country, will not extricate herself from the present position until she lives within her means. If more loan moneys are available, the interest bill increases, and the result from the point of view of the State is most unsatisfactory.

In his Budget speech the Treasurer referred to the menace of unemployment. Unemployment is indeed a sad thing, and is one of the most destructive forces in the community to-day. It strikes at the root of what is best in a man or a boy, particularly in the person who is desirous of getting work and is unable to find it. At the same time I can foresee a grave danger of creating in the minds of the people a tendency to

[*Hon. W. H. Barnes.*]

rely on the Government instead of helping themselves.

MR. FOLEY: How can they help themselves if they can't get work?

HON. W. H. BARNES: There may be too much nursing by Governments. Do not think for a moment that I am opposed to men getting help. Nothing is more pathetic than the plight of a man who is anxious to work and cannot get it and has to return to his home where his wife and children are anxiously waiting to know what has happened. It is enough to break the heart of the most courageous man. Only to-day a total stranger said to me that he thought there was a danger of our feeding the people too much. No one can say that a person who is starving should not be fed, and, happily I think, there are very few people in this country who are starving. What we must not overlook in all these matters is that there is an individual as well as a State responsibility. I now want to refer to another matter. A while ago the hon. gentleman said that I was always pessimistic; yet, to quote his own words as reported on page 226 of "Hansard" for 1931, he said that I finished up by calling for three hearty cheers for the Government of Queensland. That is a complete answer to the hon. gentleman's own words. Before I go further, I want to follow up a remark that was made by the hon. gentleman yesterday. Dealing with financial matters, he said that the Moore Government had passed a certain regulation dealing with the Income Tax Department. It is perfectly true that a certain regulation was passed. I replied, by interjection that it was necessary that it should be passed.

THE TREASURER: For a very special purpose.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I did not say that. All I said was that it was necessary that it should be passed, and the hon. gentleman has added the words "for a very special purpose."

THE TREASURER: Why was it passed?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman does not always give information. I was perfectly correct when I said that it was never used. Although the hon. gentleman did not use my name, he inferred that the regulation was passed for the purpose of looking into other people's accounts. I want to say very deliberately that, so far as I was concerned, I never knew of any person's accounts in the Income Tax Department unless the parties came to me. As a matter of fact, I was never once in the Income Tax Office while I was Treasurer; and I certainly never sent for any papers unless a person came to me and said, "I would like you to look into my affairs." Under those circumstances I got the Commissioner of Taxes to look into matters. The hon. gentleman is not worthy of occupying his high official position—

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not indulge in personalities.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker; but I want to say that the honour of the department was maintained in every direction by myself.

MR. WATERS: Not by your Government.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, by my Government, too.

MR. SIZER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove said the honour of the Government was not maintained by the Moore Government. As a member of that Government, I regard that statement as offensive. What the hon. member stated is incorrect, and I ask that it be withdrawn, as it is personally offensive to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Kelvin Grove to withdraw.

MR. WATERS: As parliamentary procedure requires me to withdraw, I withdraw.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I notice, too, that complaints were made because last year I made reference to other States. After all, are we not all influenced to a very great extent by what the other States do? Would anyone say that the affairs of New South Wales as run by Mr. Lang did not hurt Australia? I am sure they did. I want to say that, if Queensland gets behind very much, it does not help Australia. It is no use assuming that, if certain things are done, it does not matter. It certainly does matter very much.

That being so, I realise how important it is that we should endeavour to do our very best on the financial side. We have a right to review what has happened, and I will take the last three years and show what the position has been in connection with income tax. The amount of income tax paid per head of population in the three years mentioned was—

	£	s.	d.
1929-30	...	...	2 12 7
1930-31	...	...	2 13 11
1931-32	...	...	1 14 9

There is a tremendous shrinkage, which we all regret. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, have pointed out again and again in some very excellent articles what the fall in prices in connection with wool has meant to Queensland, and it is very unfortunate that that is the position.

There is another matter I want to refer to. The Treasurer taunted me by saying, "When you were Treasurer, you passed a Bill for £5,000,000 to deal with deficits." He said that no provision was made by the late Government for funding the accumulated deficits, although parliamentary authority was secured for so doing. The needs of the Treasury are very great to-day. I take it that, no matter who is there, whilst we fail to balance the accounts we must be compelled eventually to obtain Treasury bills. There is no escape from that, if we are to pay our way. I ask the Treasurer if he has done anything in that direction. He said that our Government should have done something, but money is more plentiful now than it was then, as shown by the lower rate of interest which is being charged. Has the Treasurer done, or does he propose to do, anything in that direction?

The ex-Premier asked a question yesterday with regard to remittances to London, and the reply he received was an extraordinary one. What objection can there be to stating whether, according to the usual practice, £300,000, plus exchange, was remitted? The hon. gentleman must have had a bad night to answer the question in the way he did. I am quite sure his officers would not prepare an answer like that. Although one Minister has stated that

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

answers are prepared by the officers of the department, I am sure the Treasurer would not take such an answer from an officer, nor would I, without, at any rate, reading it. I do not attach any blame to the officers, which would not be fair, as they are excellent officers. The Minister in charge always sees what the reply is when it is submitted to him. I would like the Treasurer to tell us whether he has remitted the £300,000 plus exchange. An analysis of the figures in the Treasury returns shows that the position for the first four months of this financial year is much worse than for the corresponding period last financial year. If the amount in question was not remitted, it would be very interesting to know where we are to-day from a financial point of view. It would be very easy for the Treasurer to say whether the money was remitted; but it will be noticed that my mantle has to some extent fallen upon him, as he is as close as he can possibly be and has given no information. I used to be blamed very much in that regard.

**THE TREASURER:** I will give you all the information at the proper time, if you can understand it.

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** It is not very difficult to say whether the £300,000 has been remitted, plus exchange; yet we have a learned Treasurer calmly saying that he will give us the information at the proper time. I should be able to understand that very simple sum, if I could not understand any other. You will pull me up, Mr. Speaker, if I say too much about the rumours which are going about its being necessary for the hon. gentleman to get a bigger hat.

We have been taunted by hon. members opposite with having had big deficits. It is true that we did have very big deficits; but I want to draw the attention of hon. members opposite to the fact that during the years in which they were in office previously for fourteen years they themselves had eight deficits amounting to £2,272,314 6s. 2d. and only five surpluses, amounting to £101,130 10s. 9d. Yet they now come along and say, "Look at your record!"

**MR. WATERS:** A very bad record.

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** My record is one that will hold good.

**MR. WATERS:** For all time!

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** It has always held good and will hold good right to the end of the chapter. Part of that record is that from 1904-5 to 1914-15 we had credit balances each year, totalling £717,882 17s. 7d., or an average of £65,000 per annum, as against the £20,000 per annum which the five surpluses of hon. members opposite averaged. Hon. members opposite took office when the total taxation of the State of Queensland amounted to £954,000; when they left office they had raised it to over £4,000,000. On the other hand, it is only right to say that we reduced the interest bill in the three years in which we occupied the Treasury benches. When we left office the public debt of Queensland was £319,404 less than we found it. We tackled the question, we did our job; yet hon. members opposite assail us and say that we did not do so.

**THE SECRETARY FOR MINES:** You were like the son of a rich father who left him money that he did not earn.

[*Hon. W. H. Barnes.*]

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** We left hon. members opposite money. In any event, hon. members opposite said that they left us £5,000,000. It was something over £2,000,000, and at that period difficulties were not as great as they were when we left office.

I propose to make reference to the remarks of the Treasurer when he sat in opposition in 1931. He said that what was required was a restoration of confidence. He went on to refer to the reduction in the interest rates. In "Hansard" for that year, at page 1648, he said—

"I am dealing with the general financial position of the State, which is bad enough in all conscience; but there is no desire on my part to exaggerate the general position. What I am concerned with is the fact that there is no general policy in existence that would restore confidence to the public, or indicate to them that the situation is being grappled with by the respective Governments."

What has the hon. gentleman done to restore confidence?

Attention has been called to his remarks on Sunday afternoon, when he spoke of the need for people to do certain things and to work together. I quite agree with that statement; but what is being done by the present Government in that direction? They are doing things which are destroying confidence, and are not helping very much in the restoration of confidence which is so essential to-day. It is imperative that some encouragement should be given to people to assist the Government to restore the position in Queensland, irrespective of party politics. Whither are we going? If we are to help, we should not repeatedly have those statements made by hon. members opposite which militate against the restoration of confidence and merely drive in a wedge between parties. There is no hope for Queensland or for the other Australian States unless there is a strong disposition to pull together. How can success be assured if hon. members opposite are prepared to drive the wedge in all the time?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Be charitable!

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** How could the Secretary for Public Lands restore confidence when he has already said that he would not pay the interest commitments of the Government? Statements like the one made by the Secretary for Public Lands go to destroy unanimity. Who would trust a Government one of whose members is the hon. gentleman who made that statement and has never withdrawn it?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** I never made it.

**HON. W. H. BARNES:** Unfortunately, the hon. gentleman has done damage to Queensland in that regard. It might be said that, when I dealt with the winter relief loan of £620,000, I was not quite as clear as I might have been; but, in order to make myself quite clear, I will again quote from the Budget, because someone might say that amount is not included in the Treasurer's Estimate of the money he will have available. On page 15 of the Budget the following paragraph appears—

"The Loan Council has approved of gross expenditure by Queensland of £1,610,000 on account of the State's ordinary loan programme. It is anticipated

that this expenditure can be financed by repayments to the Loan Fund by local authorities and other borrowers from the Government; by loans to be obtained from the Commonwealth Savings Bank under the transfer agreement; and by utilising the cash balance in the Loan Fund Account at 30th June, 1932."

I will go on, because I might be told that the £620,000 does not come within the reckoning at all. On the same page the hon. gentleman said—

"In addition to the ordinary loan programme, this State has the authority of the Loan Council to raise and expend the sum of £310,000 under the scheme for special winter relief for the unemployed, agreed to at the conference of Premiers held in Melbourne during the month of April last. The Commonwealth Government will also provide the sum of £310,000 for expenditure on approved works in this State.

"It will be noticed that the full amount of £620,000 is appropriated in the Loan Estimates. Parliamentary authority is required for the expenditure of the gross amount, notwithstanding that a moiety will, subsequently, be recovered from the Commonwealth Government."

There is another point I did not touch on when dealing with the very same thing. I referred to the special revival loan of £2,500,000, and the Treasurer in his Budget speech refers to the matter in the following words:—

"The Loan Estimates also include appropriations amounting to £940,000 in connection with the special revival loan"

A special revival loan—

"For the relief of unemployment, arrangements for which were made at the conference of Premiers held in Canberra and Sydney during June and July last.

"The total appropriation on Loan Fund Account is £3,167,242, as compared to last year's actual expenditure of £1,162,910."

There is no doubt that those amounts are included in the amount which the Treasurer said he had obtained, and which is said by his supporters to be part of the revival loan. Would not the Treasurer like to be able to bury these words "revival loan"? He has a long way to go before the generous people in the city will say to him, "Here you are, Mr. Treasurer, you have the consent of the Loan Council; here is your £2,500,000 revival loan!" Not one brass farthing has been obtained from that revival loan. However, let us hope that the loan which is being floated by the Loan Council will be a success. I am glad that it is not the larger amount which was first suggested. I agree with the hon. member for Fassifern that you can only borrow such an amount as the country can afford to pay.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [7.10 p.m.]: I do not propose to traverse the whole financial field, but shall content myself in the limited time at my disposal to two matters—to the Loan Fund and the consolidated revenue. A new loan is to be floated. Already the good old prospectuses are out, which will, no doubt, be pretty expensive as advertisements are concerned, and the good old calico signs "Loan now open" will regain their position

in prominent places on hoardings. Part of this loan will go to the repayment of Treasury bills. To that extent one cannot object, any more than to say that, so far as £4,000,000 is concerned, the money has already been spent. The Loan Council has decided, after consultation, to buy and split another case of financial stimulant; and I suppose there was a good deal of dispute as to how the individual bottles should be distributed. I have no doubt that the loan will be subscribed, because its attraction is that it will be practically immune from all taxation.

The TREASURER: No; it will be subject to Commonwealth income taxation.

Mr. WIENHOLT: Only to a limited Federal income tax. It is immune from State income tax and unemployment relief tax, and from additional Federal income tax if it is found necessary to impose such additional taxation. To that extent it must attract money that would otherwise go to expand general industry; and drawing money from general industry means more unemployment, or, shall we say, a less chance of employment in general industry? There is an old Greek tale of a miser who owned a horse. Every day he thought he could save money by taking an additional small handful from his horse's fodder, with the result that the horse became extremely emaciated and eventually died. Then the miser complained to all his friends and neighbours what bad luck he had had—just when he had taught his horse to live on nothing it had died! (Laughter.) That is rapidly becoming the state of industry throughout Australia. The more we draw from industry the less employment it can give; and I think the people of Australia should be particularly careful that they do not keep building up further and further loan indebtedness, which will not help to relieve unemployment permanently but will, at the same time, increase the interest burden of the country.

With reference to the consolidated revenue, I have continually advocated that we should live within our means. Both the Treasurer and the hon. member for Wynnum have said that we must live within our means. It is all very well saying that; but how are we going to put it into practice? When we are voting these sums out of consolidated revenue, I think it is opportune to make a suggestion which, if acted upon, would be a blessing in disguise, and a real help to the Treasurer. The Treasurer expects to spend about £15,000,000 out of consolidated revenue. His revenue will be about £13,500,000. The extra £1,500,000 is not in sight, nor do we know how it is to be obtained. In other words, the Treasurer will be overspending to the extent of about 10 per cent. of the money that has been provided. That really means that a man allows his wife £6 a week for the household accounts when his wages only amount to £5 a week. This seems the duty of Parliament to correct. The cure seems to be a very plain one—that we, as a Parliament, should take off 10 per cent. of every vote asked for from the consolidated revenue. That is very simple. If we are asked for £1,800,000, we would just chop off £180,000—the exact proportionate amount the Treasurer says he has not in hand—and leave the Treasurer to square the ledger.

Mr. MOORE: We cannot chop it off the interest bill.

*Mr. Wienholt.]*

Mr. WEINHOLT: We can chop it off the whole vote and allow the Treasurer to square the ledger. We should chop off the 10 per cent. which he asks for and says he has not got; and then it will be his duty to square the account. I suggest that to the Leader of the Opposition as the proper way for Parliament to act when Estimates are brought down. It would be a blessing in disguise to the Treasurer himself because, if we take that step, and the House assists me when I propose it—hon. members will get a chance when the Bill is going through Committee—if we cut off the 10 per cent. of the money which the hon. gentleman says he has not got, he will be able to say to any deputation that comes along, "It would please me immensely to do it; but that wretched Parliament would not allow it, and I have not got the money." That seems to me to be a sound proposition, and I put it to the Leader of the Opposition, and even the Treasurer and other hon. members.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [7.17 p.m.]: I am not sure that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Fassfern is not the correct course to adopt, but whether it would work out in the way he anticipates is another matter. I do not know that it would be wise for the Treasurer to say, "I cannot do this because Parliament will not allow me." In my opinion, the hon. gentleman ought to take the responsibility on his own shoulders and say to any deputation that comes to him and asks for money, "I am sorry, but I cannot do it. The finances of the country will not allow me. Taxation has reached its limit. It is undesirable that we should borrow any more and place a burden on the future in order to reduce our present bill." Consequently, in the interests of the State, I am unable to agree with the suggestion put forward by the hon. member. We know perfectly well that, if it was put to this House, the Government, having a majority behind them, would carry the Estimates in their own way.

We are passing an Appropriation Bill to-night for a very large amount of money, totalling £23,639,623, or an increase over the public expenditure of last year of £3,077,577, if the estimates of expenditure are correct and materialise in accordance with the anticipations put forward in the Budget, which I do not think at all likely. From what we can see at the present time, the expenditure is going to be considerably greater than is anticipated in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. I cannot understand the object of the Treasurer in not giving the information I asked for yesterday. It would have been very simple for him to do so. I asked the Treasurer—

"(1) What amounts were remitted abroad towards overseas interest payments in October, 1931 and 1932 respectively?"

"(2) What were the respective costs of making such remittances, including exchange?"

The answer I received was—

"(1) and (2) The information will be obtained."

The Treasurer must know whether any money was remitted last month and what the cost of it was. He can easily see what was sent last year, and the cost of it. I do not see much object in his refusing to

[*Mr. Wienholt.*

answer the question which is really of interest to the people of Queensland.

There is another thing which I found to be a little awkward in reference to the protestations that were made by the Treasurer during the past two years about the meagre information that had been supplied to the members of the Committee with reference to the Loan Council meetings, which he said was of great importance to Australia. Whenever we returned from meetings of the Loan Council, the Treasurer, as Leader of the Opposition, used to find great fault with us for sitting behind closed doors and in secret cabal, as he called it. He definitely spoke about it on the election platform, and said that, when he went South, he was going to see that the meetings were open; yet in June and July last there were the same secret conferences and there was practically no information given on his return to Queensland. On the last occasion everything was kept a close secret, and most ambiguous statements were made afterwards with regard to the loan of £8,000,000. Queensland will not participate in any part of the £8,000,000 which is to be raised to pay off Treasury bills. Personally I am not objecting to that being the case, because the less money we borrow the less burden will be placed on the people in the future; and that will be better for Queensland later on. But, considering the violent assertions which were made by the Treasurer about the way Queensland had been bluffed out of her rightful share of any loan money raised by the Commonwealth, and his definite assertion that, when he took charge of affairs and went down to the Loan Council, he was going to see that Queensland received her proper share of all loan money, it seems to me that, if £8,000,000 of new loan money is received, irrespective of whether or not Queensland participated previously in Treasury bills, we have a right to our proportion of the whole £8,000,000 that is raised, and not to about one-twelfth of the £4,000,000 that is to be raised, and which amount is to go towards Queensland's share, amounting to £940,000. I presume that, so far as regards the £620,000—which was the proportion of £3,000,000 which we obtained—Treasury bills have been arranged for that amount. The Commonwealth will probably arrange for Treasury bills in that connection for its share; and I presume the Treasurer has made arrangements with the Commonwealth Bank, because at the time the matter was discussed the State was to make its own arrangements to get the first £310,000 of the amount. I presume the Government have made their arrangements for Treasury bills, because there is no question of raising the money other than in that way. So far as one can gather from the figures that have been published about the finances last month, there was an increase in the loan fund of about £180,000. I presume that is a portion of the £620,000 which is being sent up to liquidate the advances which were made out of the moneys which were held by the State in connection with the spending of the relief money in anticipation of this £620,000. Then, of course, there are the sales over the counter, which possibly are Savings Bank money and State insurance funds, amounting to somewhere about £100,000 more than was anticipated.

It all goes to show that the statements which were made by the Treasurer last year when Leader of the Opposition, of the way the hon. member for Wynnum and I had failed in our duty towards Queensland, were so much moonshine. The whole position has been most difficult all the way through. I am not condemning the present Treasurer for not securing more money. I think it is advantageous to Queensland that we should live as far as possible within our income. I am only drawing attention to the fact that he was most violent in his condemnation of the late Government, who did exactly what he is doing to-day, but with infinitely better results. I imagine that, when the hon. gentleman goes to the Loan Council and sees the financial position of Australia as a whole, and remembers that the money that is taken from the people is to be taken from industry, when he recollects that the £82,000,000 of Treasury bills taken up by the banks to meet overdrafts and loan commitments, cannot be permitted to remain unfunded indefinitely, he comes to the conclusion that a halt must be called, and that, as far as possible, we must keep our expenditure to the lowest possible level. I personally think that we could do with a smaller amount than we are asked to pass. I think that we should not overlook the fact that we have to pay interest later on the £3,000,000 of loan money we are asked to pass—£1,400,000 of Treasury bills, and the £940,000 and the £620,000—and that it would be preferable for the Government to set out on a new basis altogether, and make the conditions of industry better by relieving it of as many restrictions as possible and giving the people a freer hand to give the employment which is necessary, instead of endeavouring to secure prosperity by endeavouring to borrow and spend money on which interest has to be paid next year, which is perfectly fallacious. It may not be a pleasant way. We may have all sorts of prejudices against that sort of thing; but we have to recognise that we cannot go on indefinitely borrowing money to ease our conditions in the present at the expense of the future, unless, of course, the Government have in their minds the idea of repudiation later on. I do not suppose they have, and the present policy is building up an enormous liability for the future in exactly the same way as a similar policy did for the fourteen years the Labour Party were previously in office. We endeavoured to give the people social services that we could not afford. We endeavoured to give them cheap meat that we could not afford. We endeavoured to give them all sorts of things that we could not afford—all at the expense of the future by borrowing money, for we could not have done what we did if we had not borrowed money, really at the expense of the people in the future. The result is that now the position is very difficult, and the people of Australia have had to repudiate in part the bargains they made with the bondholders.

In the face of this lesson, we are continuing to endeavour to ease our position by borrowing further sums of money. Whilst we were borrowing £4,000,000 a year and spending it, and Queensland had a rising revenue, those tactics did not get us out of our difficulties. We got into further difficulties. If Queensland could get out of her difficulties by borrowing money and spending it as we spent it during these fourteen

years, there would be something to be said for the policy. If it had achieved a wonderful prosperity, if it had brought about employment for all our people when other States and other countries were suffering from unemployment, we would have a good argument for continuing it. But it has done none of these things. The position was getting worse. In 1922 the revenue certainly showed a slight increase, but nothing approaching the increases which had been registered before. Unemployment was increasing; so that I do not think anybody can contend that we got out of our difficulties by following the practice we adopted during that time. The fact is that we have to look to private industry to absorb the unemployed, who are one of our biggest charges; and in doing that we cannot continue conditions in Queensland that other States cannot afford. It is very nice to be able to say that Queensland has the highest real wage and the highest nominal wage of all the States. It is very nice to be able to say that we provide social services that other States do not give, but, when you have to provide them at the expense of the people of the future by borrowing money on which they will have to pay the interest, it is time we took the advice of the Treasurer in his very nice little pamphlet dealing with dairying, in which he said—"Review your position and find out where you stand!" Is it not time that we reviewed our position and found out exactly where we stand? Is it not better to do that than to go on thinking that by borrowing money the position at the end of the year is going to be better?

The Treasurer stated in his policy speech that an increase in loan expenditure would lead to an increase in the revenue of the State. That has not been borne out to date. The evidences are that a great deal of money is being expended with but little return. The revenue received by the Railway Department for the first four months of this financial year was £152,177 less than the amount received during the corresponding period last year. It is estimated that the total reduction in the railway revenue over the whole year will be only £11,500. The amount of interest received from local bodies during the first four months of the financial year increased by £27,000 compared with the corresponding period last year; but it is estimated that the amount to be received over the whole year will decline by £5,000 compared with last year. The amount paid for interest on the public debt for the first four months of the year shows a reduction of £55,460 compared with the corresponding period last year; and it is estimated that the reduction over the whole year will be only £30,111 compared with the previous year. The Treasury returns for October indicate that there were no remittances sent abroad during that month, accounting apparently for a saving of £35,000. The returns to date do not show that the position has improved. They only show that we have benefited early in the year at the expense of the latter part. We are not going to get out of our difficulties by continually borrowing or by the observance of conditions that cannot be observed in any other State of the Commonwealth. We are not going to get out of our difficulties by issuing Treasury bills or by borrowing in any other way. If we believe that

we can, we shall be sorely disappointed. The Government should take stock of the situation, and not endeavour to get out of their difficulties merely by borrowing the savings of other people. They should endeavour to bring about an increase in employment. There are opportunities to do that. They should encourage private enterprise to absorb the unemployed by making conditions of employment suitable rather than rely upon the initiative of the Government for the purpose.

The TREASURER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [7.32 p.m.]: No one suggests that financial or economic rehabilitation can take place in Australia simply by borrowing money. The difficulty confronting Australia is the low price level for our commodities and the incapacity of the people overseas to purchase the goods they require. The general economic conditions of the country are at fault; and to the extent that we can control them it is our duty to control them. The situation can be faced only in a world-wide way. We have the paradox to-day of the British Government asking the Dominions to send less meat to their market—not because the people of Great Britain or the people of Europe do not require the meat, but because their spending power is so low that they cannot purchase their ordinary bare requirements. What is required is an increase in solvent demand, and, until that is accomplished, financial or economic rehabilitation is impossible. While that remains, are we to stand idly by and see our people condemned to a life of penury, want, and starvation? Are we going to see the families of our Australian people reduced to a C3 class? So far as I am concerned, and so far as my party is concerned, we are going to fight every inch of the way to provide the people of this country with a decent standard of living for themselves and their dependents, and we shall use all the resources at our disposal to achieve that end.

The suggestion made by the hon. member for Fassifern would not have the effect that he has in mind. His suggestion is in the category of a farmer who takes up 5 acres of land and assumes that, if he plants it with cane, he will get so much to the acre, that the crop will be worth so much, the costs will be so much, the return so much, and the profit so much. There are many other factors left out of account. It does not operate in that way. That was tried by the Moore Government. They cut and slashed in every possible direction, with the result that the ex-Treasurer holds a deficit record that I hope will never be excelled by any other Treasurer in Queensland. In the short space of three years he built up a deficit approximately equal to all the deficits amassed since Queensland obtained self-government.

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleague the ex-Treasurer assume that the improved financial position of the State was due to the non-payment of certain commitments of this State. That suggestion has been made by the Leader of the Opposition, the ex-Treasurer, and some of the newspapers supporting them. I do not mind any reasonable criticism of the Government, nor am I hurt at anything they may say about myself; but I would suggest that even Nationalist members have a responsibility

[*Mr. Moore.*

to their country, and are not entitled to make statements regarding the finances of the country which are unwarranted, and are likely to prejudice the interests of the State or create panic or a state of unrest in the public mind.

The Leader of the Opposition asked me a question yesterday, and I told him that the information would be obtained. I did not have time in the morning to give a reply to the hon. gentleman; but he, as ex-Premier, knows that the official publications of the Treasury Department disclosed that information; and a little industry on his own part would have done away with the necessity for asking the question. I will give him and Parliament the figures. From 30th June to the end of September last year the amount of remittances to London was £1,200,000. The remittances for the same period since I have been Treasurer amount to £1,300,000—an amount in excess of the payments in the same period when the Moore Government were in power. Those figures show the foolishness of the canards which have been circulated respecting these matters, and which have been sedulously whispered by people who regarded a political advantage as of greater importance than public interests. For the same period the cost of exchange to the Moore Government was £364,500 as against £329,875 during the corresponding period under the present regime. The exchange rates in the meantime have been reduced to some extent. These figures show very clearly that the saving as compared with last year is a genuine and decreased deficit. It is not due, as suggested by certain base minds, to any manipulation of Treasury figures. The amounts we have transmitted overseas fully and completely answer that question.

The ex-Treasurer referred to the Government printery. I want to inform him that there is no rationing in the composing room. The men are fully employed there, but rationing has been adopted in the book-binding department. To a large extent the employees in the Government printery are fully employed, and there is very little rationing. I hope that the amount of work available will do away with the necessity of any rationing. Rationing is not economic, but it is certainly humane. The best that can be said for the system is that it enables people to obtain some income who would not obtain any at all; and the majority of people are prepared to share the work available with their fellows rather than that some should get all and others nothing.

The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues are most amusing, and always have been, when dealing with questions affecting the Financial Agreement. The ex-Premier and the ex-Treasurer claim that we are adopting the same methods in regard to the Financial Agreement as they adopted. That is not so. Comment has taken place regarding our public statements, and our conception of the meaning of the Financial Agreement. I thoroughly understand the Financial Agreement and all its implications. I represented this State at the various conferences held to consider that agreement, so that I know exactly all its implications. No matter how politically opposed any person may be to me, I do not think it will be seriously suggested that I do not understand any matters which I handle.

Our criticism of the Moore Government was based on the policy they carried out, for which they blamed the Loan Council, and claimed the sanction of the Financial Agreement. When they took office, they inherited an accumulated surplus of approximately £5,000,000. They immediately commenced to deflate and retrench. They refused loans to local authorities and to settlers through the Agricultural Bank on the plea that no funds were available, whilst at the same time they used their cash resources in making loans to the Southern States. When criticised about the matter in this House, they claimed that no other course was open to them. They claimed that the Financial Agreement was such that these loan balances were not subject to their control, and that they had authority only to spend the amount that the Loan Council allocated in accordance with agreements made by that body. I always challenged—and still challenge—that view. The accumulated cash balances—the savings of previous years that were in the hands of the State—are in the control of the State, and it is entirely within the power of the Government of the day to use that money in any fashion they desire. The Moore Government did so, inasmuch as they used it to liquidate their revenue deficits. They claimed that they did not spend that money. The fact is that they dissipated it in the form of deficits; and their accumulated deficits of over £4,000,000 are costing Queensland 5.32 per cent. per annum in interest.

We have never argued that repayments to Loan Fund Account, moneys received from the Commonwealth Bank under the appropriate agreement, moneys received from the Public Curator for investment, and moneys received from other sources, do not come within the scope of the term "new money." That point was never raised, and it would be foolish to argue in that way, because the facts would be against it. This year, in preparing the Budget and in making provision for the loan allocation of Queensland, we had certain resources at our disposal which enabled us to finance our quota of the loan appropriation. In other words, the £1,610,000 that is set out in the Budget and the Estimates is actually in the control of the State. All that is required is the general approval of the Loan Council that that is part of our loan programme. We submitted that amount of £1,610,000 ourselves, and no effort was made to cut it down. We intimated that that money was available, and we proposed to use it for our general loan programme, thereby making it unnecessary for Queensland to obtain anything from the new loan allocation. The loan programme of the Commonwealth this year is £6,000,000 for general loan works, not including Queensland's share, and £7,000,000 for the special revival loan agreed to at the July conference.

Before I proceed to deal with the present position I may say that not only was the attitude and excuse of the Moore Government invalid from the point of view of the facts, but their policy was such that, in the event of any arbitrary allocation being demanded by a member of the Loan Council, the quota of Queensland would be materially reduced. Under the Financial Agreement, when no unanimous decision is arrived at, the amount available is allocated among the various Governments in the proportion that

each State's requirements bear to the proportion of total expenditure for the previous five years; so that the Moore Government's policy was such that in any arbitrary allocation of funds at the disposal of the Loan Council our quota thereby became diminished. The Government had a perfect right to carry out any policy they desired. We always said that while in opposition; but it was futile for the Moore Government to claim that their policy was the responsibility of the Loan Council when the policy was their own creation, for which they should have been manly enough to accept full responsibility.

At the recent conference it was decided to go on the market for a loan of £3,000,000 issued at par at 3½ per cent., £4,000,000 of it to be used for the funding of existing Treasury bills, the object being to strengthen the position of the Commonwealth Bank to carry the entire responsibility of the Treasury bills.

The statement is frequently made that it would be better to continue financing by Treasury bills rather than have any funding loan. The reply to that is this, that, while the associated banks carry two-thirds of the Treasury bills, the full liability is at all times on the Commonwealth Bank inasmuch as financial institutions holding these bills can rediscount them at the Commonwealth Bank at any time they desire. If the associated banks were prepared to agree to discontinue their right of rediscounting with the Commonwealth Bank, then something could be said for such a policy; but so long as the liability for the floating debt rests on the Commonwealth Bank, it is obviously necessary and desirable to fund it as early as possible, and so relieve the strain on the Commonwealth Bank.

The Queensland loan programme for the current year amounts to £3,167,242, as follows:—

	£
Ordinary public works ... ..	1,607,242
Commonwealth-States winter relief ... ..	620,000
Special relief ... ..	940,000
	3,167,242

The ordinary public works expenditure will be financed from our own resources, that is, from cash in hand at the 1st July, 1932, repayments to the Loan Fund Account by local authorities and other borrowers, and from loans which will be obtained from the Commonwealth Savings Bank.

The necessary funds for the expenditure in connection with winter relief, of which the Commonwealth Government will provide a moiety, will be obtained by the issue of Treasury bills to the Commonwealth Bank. Arrangements in this regard were made with the bank last July.

So far as Queensland is concerned, the only item for which finance has to be provided is the special relief loan of £940,000. Our requirements in this respect will be met to the extent of £334,000 out of the loan of £4,000,000 which will be applied towards financing the public works and special relief programmes of the several States.

We are fortunate for the reason that we are dependent to a comparatively small extent only on the raising of fresh loan

*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]*

money to enable us to carry out our total loan programme this year. Some of the States must rely on financing nearly the whole of their requirements either by Treasury bills, or from the proceeds of loans.

The ordinary loan programmes of the States, with the exception of Queensland, amount, in the aggregate, to £6,000,000, and the special relief programme for all the States, including Queensland, is £7,000,000—a total of £13,000,000. This does not include the winter relief expenditure of £3,600,000.

Prior to the recent conference, certain States had obtained advances on Treasury bills, which reduced the requirements on account of the £13,000,000 to £11,275,000. The £4,000,000 which is to be available for public works and special relief works will be apportioned amongst all the States, including Queensland, on the basis of the total requirements of £11,275,000.

Each State will receive, approximately, 35 per cent. of its requirements. As already explained, Queensland's proportion is based on the £940,000 required by this State to carry out the special relief portion of our total loan programme. As our portion of the new loan will be £334,000, only £606,000 will be required to complete the whole of our finance on loan account this financial year. The position is that we are assured of 80 per cent. of the funds to enable us to proceed with our loan programme.

It is confidently anticipated that the balance of the money required to complete the loan programme will be obtained as and when required.

In reference to the suggestion that has been made by hon. members opposite that Queensland has not shared fairly in the allocation of the money, I shall take this opportunity of showing that the wish is father to the thought. The Leader of the Opposition, by virtue of his speech to-night and of other speeches he has made on the financial question, obviously is endeavouring to queer the pitch of the Queensland Government. His speech was such as not to be of any help at all in regard to the loan flotation that is now before the public; and we know that hon. members opposite, or, at least, the majority of them, who have been long associated with the Tory Party in this country, are prepared to do anything that political malevolence can suggest to injure and interfere with the Labour Government and stultify their programme in various ways. We know their record in the past in this respect; and the actions of people at the present day and the future are determined by what they have been in the habit of doing in the past.

With regard to the allocation of this fund, I want to give some figures—

LOAN PROGRAMME OF THE STATES FOR YEAR 1932-33.		£
New South Wales	...	7,530,000
Victoria	...	4,540,000
Queensland	...	3,167,000
South Australia	...	2,860,000
Western Australia	...	2,680,000
Tasmania	...	800,000

That is the loan programme of all the States as approved by the Loan Council.

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

The balance of requirements, apart from funds already in hand for the various States, is as follows:—

	£
New South Wales	3,923,000
Victoria	1,100,000
Queensland	606,000
South Australia	1,707,000
Western Australia	1,674,000
Tasmania	233,000

The percentage of funds secured to total requirements is as follows:—

	Percentage.
New South Wales	48
Victoria	76
Queensland	80
South Australia	40
Western Australia	38
Tasmania	70

It will be seen from those figures that, both in regard to the amount of funds required to complete the programme and the percentage of the amount already in hand, Queensland is more favourably situated than any other State. That completely disposes of the canards that have been sedulously circulated by members of the Tory Party in this State.

With regard to the interest rate generally, it is the policy of Governments to reduce the interest burden on the community as much as possible.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The policy of some Governments.

The TREASURER: I do not know what attitude the hon. member's Government adopted, but there is no doubt that, if the hon. member's method of accountancy were applied generally by Governments, it would bring about very disastrous results. The idea of writing off £28,000,000 of the railway indebtedness by one stroke of the pen and imagining that the debt had been disposed of is so Gilbertian a form of finance that only the hon. member for Murilla would have the folly to suggest it.

In the policy of progressively reducing interest, the Commonwealth Bank has played a very important part. Prior to the Loan Council meeting it had already intimated its intention in this direction. The rate on Treasury bills has already been reduced to 3½ per cent., with a further probable reduction early in the new year to 3 per cent., so that the Treasury bills which the Queensland Government will require this financial year will cost the State considerably less than the debt involved in the deficit of the previous Government. The ex-Treasurer preened himself on the fact that he had no Treasury bills, yet he is carrying a debt on account of deficits charged to the loan fund costing the State 5.32 per cent.—a higher rate than is being paid by any other State in the Commonwealth.

I think I have covered the salient points raised in the debate, and the information I have conveyed to Parliament and the country will be of advantage in clearing up the position. I have no doubt that the loan flotation now being entered upon will be successful, and that the people of Australia will play their part in providing the necessary finance for the various Governments in the Commonwealth.

Question—"That the Bill be now read a second time" (*Mr. Smith's motion*)—put and passed.

## COMMITTEE.

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

Clause 1—“*Appropriation (Schedule, Parts A, B, C, D, E, and F)*”—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [7.59 p.m.]: I take exception to the Treasurer's statement that he had answered my question. He did not. I did not ask for the amount of money that had been sent overseas from July to September. I asked for the amount for October, and it is no use pretending that what he said was a reply to my question. It was not.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 8, both inclusive, Schedule, and preamble, agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

## THIRD READING.

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

“That the Bill be now read a third time.”

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 8.3 p.m.

---