

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 1932

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 23 NOVEMBER, 1932.

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

QUESTIONS.**VALUE OF STORES IN IPSWICH RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.**

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) asked the Minister for Transport—

“What was the value of stores in the Ipswich Railway Workshops—(a) On 31st December, 1928; (b) on 31st December, 1931; (c) on 30th June, 1929; and (d) on 30th June, 1932?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*), for the MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. J. Dash, *Mundingburra*) replied—

“Ipswich general store—(a) £259,392 1s. 2d.; (b) £201,787 2s. 5d.; (c) £205,154 15s. 6d.; and (d) £170,629 10s. 7d.”

PROTEST FROM GOOBURRUM ROTATIONAL RELIEF WORKERS IN RE DEDUCTION FOR UNION TICKETS.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Labour and Industry whether he has answers to the questions

Mr. Tozer.]

which I addressed to him on the 18th instant, and which I repeated yesterday?

(No answer.)

At a later stage:—

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Labour and Industry, without notice, whether he has answers to the questions which I addressed to him on 18th instant, and which I repeated yesterday?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member can only ask a question once. It rests with the Minister to decide whether he will answer it. The hon. member has already asked the question once this morning.

Mr. MAHER: I undertood the hon. gentleman did not hear me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulation No. 230 under "The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1930."

HOSPITALS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend 'The Hospitals Acts, 1923 to 1929,' in certain particulars."

Question put and passed.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to Amend 'The Local Authorities Acts, 1902 to 1929,' in certain particulars."

Question put and passed.

NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS BILL.

THIRD READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*): I move—

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

Question put and passed.

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. FOLEY (*Normanby*) [10.35 a.m.]: I paid particular attention during the debate yesterday to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members opposite in order to gain some idea as to the extent of their knowledge of the economics of the social system we are living under to-day, and to try to ascertain whether

it would be possible for those hon. members, in the event of their being entrusted with power, to solve some of the difficulties we are faced with to-day in Queensland. After listening to their speeches, I came to the conclusion that they are quite unfitted for the work, even to the extent of mitigating the conditions which now unfortunately obtain.

We have the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition arguing that unemployment will disappear as soon as prices and costs adjust themselves. That is an old platitude which is being voiced by many who do not understand the position. If they would just look around and examine the conditions in countries where prices and costs have adjusted themselves, and compare those conditions with those which prevail here, they would come to the conclusion that that is not the solution at all. I can quote in illustration Japan, China, and India. If there are any countries in the world where prices and costs have adjusted themselves, it is in those which I have mentioned; yet we find the condition of industry there in a much more deplorable state than it is in Queensland. Right through his speech the Leader of the Opposition referred to the continual interference with individual freedom. He argued that many of the legislative measures and regulations passed by Labour when in power previously and those being passed now had the effect of hampering industry in this State.

I do not agree that that is the basic cause of the world's troubles or even of Queensland's troubles to-day. As an illustration on the subject, I would refer the hon. member to the United States of America, where they have the open shop and no labour regulations excepting in special industries where the workers are industrially organised and able to force conditions from the employers; but, generally speaking, right through the United States of America to-day, the most highly industrialised country in the world, the open shop prevails, yet that country is in the deplorable condition of having from 11,000,000 to 15,000,000 unemployed workers, and there is no possibility of placing them in employment until something turns up. That is the viewpoint of most hon. members opposite, who say that, if something would only turn up—if these restrictions could be wiped away and there was industrial freedom—quite possibly things might adjust themselves.

Another objection made by the Leader of the Opposition was the interference of this Government with legislative measures passed by the late Government. Well, it is high time that some measures passed by the late Government were interfered with; it is high time that some were scrapped, and legislation more in keeping with the times put into operation. We have only to analyse the condition of things resulting from three years of Nationalist administration in this State to gauge the value of the legislation of hon. members opposite in regard to ameliorating business conditions and accelerating the progress of this State. From any angle from which one cares to analyse the position one finds a continual slide. Unemployment figures, for instance, trebled themselves, notwithstanding the measures passed by the Nationalist Party. Although it was claimed by the Ministers who sponsored those measures that they were designed for the alleviation of the conditions

[*Mr. Foley.*

prevailing in Queensland, no improvement in trade or business returns occurred. Naturally, therefore, when amending or repealing any measure passed by the late Government the Labour Party is endeavouring to improve the conditions and introduce something more in keeping with existing conditions.

In conclusion, the Leader of the Opposition expressed strong objection to the idea of planning as applied to industry in Queensland, arguing that it interfered with the business freedom of the community and would bring no good results. I would point out that in the United States of America long distance planning has already been adopted as the only means of thoroughly organising the resources of that country, with a view to mitigating the unfavourable conditions that prevail there. They are applying many of the methods which have been adopted by the Soviet, modified, of course, to suit the conditions of the United States. Planning is no new idea in industry. All the big trusts and combines throughout the world have for a number of years adopted planning as applied to the industries in which they are interested.

The PREMIER: Cartels as an example.

Mr. FOLEY: Even big businesses in Queensland adopt similar methods, looking as far ahead as they can; and how the Leader of the Opposition can object to it as applied to the social conditions of Queensland as a whole is beyond my comprehension. As a result of the methods of the past we are faced with obstacles; and, unless we have a supreme economic council capable of organising the resources of this State in such a way that due consideration will be given to all the economic problems involved, we can only expect chaos to rule here, as it has ruled throughout the rest of the world. Had there been a little more planning of a world-wide character, we would probably have found that instead of the depression lasting for over three years, an adjustment of conditions would have occurred and prevented the continuation of the existing deplorable state of things.

The hon. member for Fassifern, whom I credit with the possession of more than the average intelligence of hon. members opposite, protested against the rapid multiplication of economists during the period of depression. I am somewhat in accord with his condemnation of the type of economist that seeks publicity throughout the world press to-day. They would have us believe that, if their advice were followed, the world's chaotic conditions would adjust themselves; but they mean in effect that, by the strict observance of their formulae, it would be possible to bolster up a gradually decaying system. I agree with the hon. member for Fassifern that there are too many economists of the type who seek the limelight of the public press. The hon. member referred to the economic struggle in this State following the year 1902, and pointed out that no economists were required at that period to assist us in our difficulties. He added that the economic conditions of this State were righted without the aid of the economists; but I fear that he has exhibited a lack of knowledge of the economic conditions that prevail throughout the world to-day. In the year 1902 world production had not reached the high standard of to-day, and

there was ample scope in the different countries of the world for expanding markets. During the period 1928 to 1932, world production has reached a higher level and markets are saturated. Many countries of the world have become highly industrialised, and are on the lookout for markets for their products. The economic circumstances of the present period are entirely different from those that operated immediately following 1902. World economic conditions have materially altered, and new methods will be required to remedy the present chaotic conditions.

The hon. member for Fassifern also stated that husbands, brothers, and male workers generally were being displaced by the wholesale utilisation of female labour in industry. That circumstance has certainly contributed in a slight degree to our economic disorders; but it is certainly not the basic cause of the economic dislocation. I have an excerpt from the "Daily Standard" which deals with the basic causes of the existing world depression. It appears under the headings—

"HAS THE TIDE TURNED?
WORLD ECONOMIC POSITION.
CRISIS OF SUPERABUNDANCE."

The article is based upon a report issued by the International Federation of Trade Unions. The article points out that, despite a world-wide depression extending over a period of three years, the stock of consumer goods in the world to-day exceeds the quantity of consumer goods in the world in 1927-28. Therein is stated the basic cause of the existing depression—a superabundance of production. As the Premier has often expressed it, production has outpaced solvent demands. The following article gives some idea of what we are faced with:—

"The first question which arises is—what are the world stocks to-day of the most important products, because the answer will tell us how soon we may expect a keener demand for raw materials, which might really mean a fortunate turn of the tide.

"Unfortunately, an inquiry into world stocks does not yield results which tend to encourage optimism.

"In the middle of 1932 the stocks of wheat in the world were two and a-half times as great as in 1927. The 12,000,000 tons available constituted about 10 per cent. of the last world harvest. The sugar stocks were 80 per cent. higher than in 1927, being almost 9,000,000 tons, or 35 per cent. of the world sugar crop of last year. Stocks of coffee were from three to four times as large as in 1927, being 1.8 million tons, or 65 per cent. of the crop of last year.

"Thus the stocks already in hand are equivalent to the whole of the world demand for 1931.

"Cotton stocks were 50 per cent. larger than in 1927, being 1.8 million tons or 40 per cent. of last year's crop. Jute stocks have increased almost eight-fold during the period 1927-1931; 750,000 tons already in hand to-day are 60 per cent. of the world production of last year.

"The stocks of raw silk are thirty times last year's crop, or almost three times as big as 1927.

Mr. Foley.]

"Rubber stocks are more than twice as big as in 1927 and comprise 80 per cent of the world production of last year, or almost eleven times the average monthly world output.

"Coal stocks are four times as great as in 1927; stocks of oil about the same, but constitute 23 per cent. of last year's oil output. If the demand remains on the present level it will take three months before the present stocks of oil are cleared and new supplies needed.

"Stocks of benzine are almost 10 per cent of last year's world output, stocks of copper seven times as big as 1927, or 45 per cent. of the world production of 1931.

"Stocks of lead are three times as large as in 1930, and come to 13 per cent. of the world production of the previous year.

"To clear these stocks, no lead ought to be mined for two whole months throughout the whole world.

"Stocks of zinc are three and a-half times those of 1927 and make up 15 per cent. of the present output of the world; stocks of tin three times as large as in 1927, amounting to 33 per cent. of last year's production."

As I pointed out, there is no comparison between the conditions existing to-day and the conditions existing in 1902. Other crises we have passed through in the history of capitalism have shown that, after a period of depression, there has been a period of low production, which has eventually moved gradually upwards to a peak point of business prosperity in the next trade cycle. It is just the opposite to-day, for, instead of stocks being depleted as a result of three years' depression, we have the spectacle of enormous productivity and stocks increasing, with the result that greater stocks exist after three years of depression than at the commencement of the period.

Mr. WIENHOLT: Which of our primary products can we not sell?

Mr. FOLEY: Most of our primary products are in much the same position. We can sell quite a lot of our products; but the element of price enters into the question, and that is an important matter when we remember that, for example, the stocks of wheat in the world to-day are four or five times greater than they were in 1927. Indeed, the stocks of practically the whole of the basic materials required in industry are greater than when the original glut took place.

These factors point to the necessity for adopting methods entirely different from those that were followed in 1902. The old cry of "More confidence" has had its day. What we want is a greater measure of organisation and community control to ensure that the needs of the community receive paramount consideration.

The Bill now before the House is a genuine effort to establish an organisation that will be of practical benefit. As the Premier has pointed out, the idea is to plan ahead in an endeavour to prevent the anomalies that accentuate any period of depression. The success of the Bureau of Industry will largely depend upon its personnel and upon the powers that are vested in its members. If

world-wide conditions do not improve, there may be a necessity to add to the powers vested in the bureau in order that it may function to a greater degree than is contemplated at present. Planned economy is of infinitely greater benefit to the State than a haphazard system that leaves everything to chance. Provided the members of the bureau are common sense, practical men capable of planning ahead, they can do much to mitigate many of the existing evils.

I have endeavoured to show that to a great extent the present world-wide conditions have been brought about by the unorganised and unplanned methods adopted in industry. Trusts, combines, and cartels are notable examples of the existence of planned methods; but, unfortunately, our social system generally lacks any orderly plan of campaign. The result is that each individual is working out his own destiny regardless of the interests of the community as a whole, with the inevitable consequence of chaos, glut, bankruptcy, poverty, and destitution for a large proportion of the world's population. The Bill now under consideration is a step in the direction of orderly planning.

One of the big tasks that the world is confronted with to-day, and which will face the Bureau of Industry to a lesser extent, is the absorption of the enormous stocks of basic materials needed in industry that exist at the present time. It is those accumulations of basic materials that are really preventing an upward trend in prices; and, unless we can evolve some scheme whereby those stocks can be absorbed, I cannot see any possibility of an upward trend or a return to prosperous times. The only method that can be adopted to absorb those stocks and prevent an intensification of the present condition is the employment of our man power, and the giving to the workers a purchasing power that will enable them to keep pace with production. That is the only solution, if the capitalistic system is to be perpetuated. According to the reports that have appeared from time to time in our press and also our various magazines and the cable news that comes to hand, the big capitalists throughout the world know that this is the only possible solution. Unfortunately, they are as helpless to bring about such a condition as is the average working man. We had an illustration just recently of one big magnate, whose fortune, which a little while ago was estimated at £200,000,000, has been reduced to £30,000,000 as a result of the fall in the value of his securities. Working men throughout the world are in much the same position as that capitalist. The depression is world-wide, and capitalistic society is so intricate that it is difficult to get unanimity in order to bring about what most of the capitalists know is the only solution of our troubles. It should be apparent to the average member of this House, and even to the average school boy, that, if you cannot keep pace with production, you will continually have hold-ups and depressions, probably greater and worse in their effect than the depression we are passing through to-day; so that to me and to many others what I have suggested is the only possible solution if we are to perpetuate the present system of capitalism. I want to make it clear that I am not in favour of the perpetuation of capitalism, but, from a capitalistic point of view, that is the only solution.

[*Mr. Foley.*]

Realising as I do the world-wide trend to-day, I submit this viewpoint to the Premier for his earnest consideration—that, when appointing the members of this bureau, as far as possible he should see that the men appointed should be men of common sense, with practical minds, and men with a socialistic outlook in preference to men with a capitalistic outlook.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. FOLEY: My reason for that suggestion is that there is a possibility that the present world depression will become more intense, that the drift will continue, and that it will not be easily righted. If that is so, the conditions of the workers in this country will become worse. If the personnel of the bureau is capitalistic in outlook, the amount of good the members will be able to do will be considerably limited. If they are socialistic in outlook, having some sense of community interest, and realising that the community must come first as against the individual, they will be better able to recommend something which will be in keeping with circumstances as they arise.

There is one outstanding feature in Queensland to-day which is very striking. Queensland has the natural wealth resources necessary to sustain human life. We have also thousands of men and a great many youths leaving school who are willing to work to produce those things which constitute the needs of life; but they cannot obtain employment. The reason of that is that they are dissociated from the ownership of the means of production and cannot find employers. Employers find that, owing to the low market conditions, they are unable to employ them at a profit to themselves. The point I want to emphasise is that, if this depression increases and our unemployment problem becomes greater, the position will arise as the result of the people insisting upon it, and we shall be forced to find them employment of some kind. For that reason I am recommending that the personnel of this bureau be practical, earnest men with a socialist outlook, and not dreamers.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

Mr. FOLEY: It may become necessary, if conditions get worse, for this bureau to go further than is anticipated at the present time. From what I can gather from the measure, the idea is to plan and organise the resources of the State so that the finance at our disposal can be used efficiently and made to go as far as possible. If conditions improve—there is every possibility that they may get worse, and I have shown that there is sufficient evidence for that statement—a different form of organisation from that now existing may be necessary as time goes on.

The hon. member for Toowoong may rest assured that his fears that this Bill will bring about the socialisation of industry are unfounded. The Bill, unfortunately, does not go so far; but the hon. member might as well try to stop the rising tide as to stave off the socialisation of industry by playing upon the fears of the people in the way he attempted to do in his speech yesterday.

In conclusion, I quote a short extract from a work published 100 years ago dealing with this very question. In that book—

one of the most logical treatises I have read—this is pointed out—

“Production of the means to support human life and the exchange of things produced are the basis of all social structure.

“In every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes and orders is dependent upon what is produced and how it is produced, how the products are exchanged. Social changes and political revolutions are due to changes in the mode of production and exchange.

“The growing perception that existing social institutions are unreasonable and unjust, that reason has become unreason and right wrong, is only proof that in the modes of production and exchange changes have silently taken place, with which the social order, adapted to earlier economic conditions, is no longer in keeping. From this it also follows that the means of getting rid of the incongruities that have been brought to light must also be present, in a more or less developed condition, within the changed modes of production themselves. These means are not to be invented by deduction from fundamental principles, but are to be discovered in the stubborn facts of the existing system of production.”

It should be apparent to any hon. member in this Chamber that the capitalistic system as we know it has really outgrown the capitalistic mode of using that system to advantage. The holdup is world-wide; the facts mentioned by Marx and Engels are true to-day. They point out that the system has practically outgrown itself, and for that reason the time is not far off when a bureau such as we are establishing will have to be composed of men with a proper outlook in order that they may establish an organisation suited to the bringing about of a system based on community instead of individualistic lines. We have a world-wide illustration of the necessity. Millions of people are unable to find a way to earn the necessaries of life; and that is due to the working of the capitalistic system bringing about its own collapse. This will become intensified as time goes on; and for that reason we must plan as laid down in this measure in an attempt to mitigate the conditions prevailing. I repeat that the hon. member for Toowoong may as well try to stop the rising tide as prevent the inevitable establishment of socialisation, or, in other words, the community control of industry in the interests of the community itself.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [11.15 a.m.]: When the hon. member for Normanby commenced his speech, he said, in effect, that all the wisdom on this subject was on the other side of the House; and he implied that no one else—and particularly the Opposition—had given any consideration whatever to the important subject-matter of the Bill. As he proceeded with his subject, he adopted the George Reid attitude. First, he said that the capitalistic system would continue; but I think that remark slipped out inadvertently. Later on he suggested that the appointees to the Bureau of Industry should be persons with a socialistic outlook. He was very emphatic upon that point. He concluded his speech by indicating that right

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

away in the distance the conditions of Russia were approaching; and he appeared to hope for the association of the ideas and conditions of that country with life in Queensland.

The Bill under discussion is one of the most important measures ever introduced into this House. It reveals the fact that the very effective measure passed by the Moore Government is to be repealed, and that it is to be superseded by this very drastic measure, which provides for the constitution of a Bureau of Industry. The Bill carries out the intentions of the Premier as expressed at Ipswich on 30th May last during the election campaign, when he said—

“Labour would re-enact the 44-hour week; pay award rates for relief work done; give access to the Arbitration Court to all workers; and abolish that exorcism on the public service, the Bureau of Economics and Statistics, and displace Mr. J. B. Brigden.”

If inquiries were made as to who is to be appointed to the new bureau, it would be found that Mr. Brigden is not included in the personnel. Mr. Brigden is one of the most capable men ever associated with the public life of Queensland. He is to be set aside, and the intention of the Premier as expressed at Ipswich is to be carried out. Mr. Brigden is doing his job, and he is to be displaced. That was the statement made by the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Premier did not say that he was to be displaced for doing his job.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I read the report of the Premier's speech in Ipswich. It was made at a public meeting held on 30th May, 1932, just before the elections. Many very extraordinary statements were made during the election campaign, and the Secretary for Public Instruction cannot truthfully deny that that statement was made.

It is not wise for us to close our eyes to the objects of the Bill. Probably the majority of the members of the present Government are Lang men, and they are carrying out their instructions. Effect is being given to parliamentary influence supplemented by influence from outside.

Let us examine what occurred at the last Labour Convention, held in Brisbane from 11th to 16th January, 1932. Let me tell the House what was done there. I admit that the motion which I am about to read was defeated, but it really has a bearing upon this Bill. The motion read—

“(a) That a definite review be made of the fundamental plank of the party—viz., socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Either it is impracticable to put same into operation, or, alternatively, it be an instruction to the political party to evolve plans for its full operation within two years of gaining office; or

“(b) That political candidates for election seek a mandate from the people for complete socialisation by definitely advocating same from all public platforms at next election.”

That was a motion moved at an important Labour convention.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It was defeated.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman has spoken too soon. It is true that it

[*Hon. W. H. Barnes.*

was defeated, and I was candid enough to say so. It was defeated because it was thought that it was moving just a little too quickly. The Secretary for Labour and Industry, speaking to the resolution, said—

“While he was as eager to work towards Socialism as anybody, he also wanted very much to see the Moore Government defeated.”

I can quite understand him to be very eager in that direction. Then another prominent member whom we all respect—yourself, Mr. Speaker—said—

“The objective was the guiding star of the movement, but it could not be achieved in two or three years.”

Subsequently the following resolution was carried at the instigation of the same prominent member:—

“That it should be the duty of the Q.C.E. and A.L.P. branches, and Labour members generally, to use every opportunity of educating the people in the principles of the Labour objective and platform.”

This Bill is the outcome of what the Government have in view. They may endeavour to conceal it as well as they can; but the object in view is to carry out their policy—the socialisation of industry. The hon. member for Normanby made that very clear. That means that it is the intention of the Government to move towards the socialisation of industry; and the socialisation of industry means the wiping out of the existing order of things.

Mr. W. T. KING: Where did you see that?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Maree asks a silly question, because he knows that he has subscribed to the principles of this Bill. There are other evidences in the direction I have indicated which I will quote; but, putting them together, there is very strong evidence in the direction I have indicated. The Government have declared that all individuals must belong to a certain union or association, and that, unless they do so, they will not get work. The question of merit does not enter into the matter. A man might be the best tradesman in the world, but he is told that, if he does not belong to a union, he is not to receive work.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the real tradesman is a unionist.

HON. W. H. BARNES: We talk about freedom, but there is no freedom under this Bill. Hon. members opposite would be the first to object to interference with the liberty of the subject; yet they are interfering with the liberty of the subject at every turn.

Edward Bulwer Lytton has said that—

“Personal liberty is the paramount essential to human dignity and happiness.”

Where is the personal liberty when people are compelled to join certain organisations? The object of the Government in formulating that policy is not in the best interests of the country, the real intention being to create a mighty power that can be used for political purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to try to discuss the principles contained in this Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am seeking to show that this Bill is really the outcome of instructions that have been given by outside organisations, Mr. Speaker.

This Bill is a most extraordinary one. It proposes to make new appointments. The appointments of the Government officials mentioned in the Bill is quite satisfactory; but no information has been given as to other than the ex officio members. We know, of course, that the number of members of the bureau shall not exceed fifteen; but as to whether the present Director of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics will be the Director of the Bureau of Industry we have had no information from the Premier. It is also stipulated that the members of the bureau other than the ex officio members shall be appointed in the first instance for a period not exceeding three years.

Mr. W. T. KING: Are they not eligible for reappointment after three years.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not suggesting that they are not; I am merely pointing out that, in the first instance, their appointment is for a period not exceeding three years.

Never before have I seen a Bill which contains such wide powers as are to be given to the Bureau of Industry under this Bill. In his introductory speech the Premier covered a great deal of ground, and urged the necessity for co-operation in and assistance to industry; yet at the same time he is responsible for a Bill which will tend to injure industry. The powers of the bureau are very wide; the members can inquire into almost any matter. No restraint is imposed upon them, and doors are being thrown open to them that will not be in the best interests of the business community of the State.

Provision is made that the Minister shall be the president of the bureau; but the Bill is silent as to who shall be vice-president, and how that appointment will be made. The Bill is silent in that regard for the obvious reason that the Government will be able to make an appointment that will help them in the political sphere.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is nothing wrong with that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not surprised at that statement from the hon. gentleman in view of his high ideals in other matters.

The Bill does not say that fees will be allowed to members of the bureau or to members of the district employment boards. It does say, "The fees (if any)"; but I venture to say that, in accordance with most Labour legislation, good care will be taken to see that fees are paid. Moreover, the Government will be very careful in their selection of the members of the bureau and the district employment boards.

I would like to ask, what are the intentions of the Government in that particular regard? Are they by that means going to assist in balancing the Budget?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is more than you could do.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman knows that it is more than he can do, even though he is not prepared to pay interest.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They never gave you another chance.

HON. W. H. BARNES: They were very wise in not giving the hon. gentleman a chance. The Bill gives the Bureau of Industry tremendous powers. It can institute all classes of inquiries. It can ask what time people go to bed, and what time they get up.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, it cannot.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, it can; and there is something else that it can do. It seems to me that it is leading in this direction—that by and by every babe that is born will have to be christened as a unionist.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is christened as a unionist now.

HON. W. H. BARNES: You have already fixed that up, have you?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There is a union of the Trinity, and you know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: I would like to know what these tremendous powers really mean. What is going to be done? I can imagine how well the union secretaries who will be appointed to the bureau will carry out these powers. There is a report abroad—possibly in connection with this Bill—that some union secretary went into one of the business places in Brisbane—he did not know that he was addressing one of the principals—and said, "It is our turn now. We will make the bosses squeal." (Interruption.) It seems to me that this Bill is going to help in that direction.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Did you squeal?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have never squealed. The Premier asked the Opposition to help in solving the problem. I admit that there are some things that are bigger than party. I say emphatically that there is a duty cast upon every member in connection with every Bill that is brought in, and especially in connection with finance, to do what he can to help to bring about a better state of things.

Mr. W. T. KING: You never did it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am always doing it by giving sound advice. The Premier asked the public to help. He is helping by passing irritating laws and seeing how much he can irritate the people. What is the position in regard to any business? Take the number of returns that have to be made out! They certainly find employment; but they are irritating; and in many cases they are responsible very largely for the difficulties which people find in connection with business. These returns are going to be added to. It makes work, but it means extra cost in running a business without giving any return. Like the previous Labour Government, the present Government are proverbial for seeing how they can harass industry on the one hand; and on the other hand they come along and ask for help. One has never seen such inconsistency anywhere as is shown by the present Labour Government. They have power to inquire into the relationships between employer and employee to find out how they are getting on.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: The industrial relations.

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

HON. W. H. BARNES: Who are the parties who will be responsible for any relations? I do not know of any business that can succeed unless the relations between employer and employee are satisfactory. The policy pursued by the Labour Government is making it more difficult to run a business because they are everlastingly raising difficulties between employer and employee, which make it almost impossible for them to act in concert.

The hon. member for Normanby said that we are still sliding. When the employees have the opportunity of expressing their opinions again, the present position will be altered. They know which party serves them best, as many letters published in the press have indicated since the return of this Government to power.

There is another phase. The Bill provides that the power of delegation may be given to members of the bureau. Just imagine what the position will be! There may be a union secretary who wants to get even with somebody, and he may seek the power of delegation so that he may make certain inquiries. Is that going to lend itself to happy relationships in connection with industry?

MR. W. T. KING: That won't be done under this Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: At any rate, the power is there.

There is another power there which is an awful power. Some one can go to the income tax office, provided he is authorised by the bureau.

MR. G. C. TAYLOR: You have already had someone there.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is an absolute misstatement. I was not there once during my ministerial office; and anyone who makes a statement like that is making a statement which is not true. I was never there.

MR. G. C. TAYLOR: You had inquiries made.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Whilst exception was taken here to that regulation—and the members of the present Ministry condemned it at every turn—there were good reasons why that regulation was framed.

There is power under this Bill enabling an individual to go into a department which is supposed to be a department in which there is the utmost secrecy, and inquire into the position of any person in the community. I say that is wrong. I was never at the income tax office—never once, even officially—but if people came to me with their business, I then sent for the Commissioner of Taxes and went into the matter, but not otherwise. I resent the insinuation which has been made by people who do not know the facts and who do not want to know the truth. I say that the proposal to allow any individual to go into the income tax department is absolutely wrong, and should not be allowed.

I notice also that power is to be given to lend money. Is the bureau to have the power to grant loans out of the Treasury? I notice, too, that the bureau is to have the power to fix the rate of interest. Where is the Treasury going to come in? I can visualise the union secretaries representing people outside with sufficient power to outvote the other members of the bureau on the

matter; and they will probably carry out the decision of the Government. I want to know what Queensland is coming to when the rate of interest can be fixed by outsiders.

Then, are loans to be granted to companies, partnerships, firms, or individuals, as provided in the Bill? It seems to me that, by introducing a Bill which will allow money to be granted to an individual or a company we are taking a very unwise course, and I have no hesitation in saying that that should not be done. The Bill is so elastic that the Governor in Council—very largely influenced as it would be in this case by the Premier—may make an advance to an individual or to a company. That seems to me highly improper. There again, regulations can be made for the administration of the Bill. The clause gives the Governor in Council power to go practically here, there, and everywhere. A provision which is so comprehensive in that respect can become a menace to the community, as probably no one knows better than the Premier. I can see behind the whole business the fact that the Premier is forced by the extreme section of his party.

MR. G. C. TAYLOR interjected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: He is forced by the extreme section to do certain things.

MR. G. C. TAYLOR again interjected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Enoggera must obey my call to order.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Bill also authorises the bureau or its members, or any person authorised by the director, to enter at any time during working hours—

“any land, factory, mine, workshop, or place where persons are employed, and may inspect the same or any part of it and all plant and machinery used in connection with it.”

The Premier in one breath says to industry, “Come and help us in our times of difficulty!” and in the next breath he says, “We are going to tie you up in every possible fashion, and make it difficult for you to function.” I can see that this is only a preparatory measure to carry out the policy of the Labour Party. It is not to be done all at once, but step by step; although, if a motion which was defeated at the Labour Convention had been carried, the objective would have been to carry it out in two years. Probably the idea is to do it during the life of this Parliament.

MR. W. T. KING: You know that that is not correct.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I do not know it; on the contrary, there is absolute evidence that it is correct, although the hon. member may not like it. Will a policy like that help private enterprise? I say emphatically that the way out of our difficulties, by the use of private enterprise—and we have to face the position and finance ourselves just as individuals do—is not by passing measures of this kind. It seems to me that the hon. member for Normanby let the cat out of the bag and told us what is in the mind of the Government. I dare say he was not as careful as the Premier.

The Labour Party is seeking to do something which, instead of helping the economic position, instead of helping people out of

employment, instead of creating confidence, will do the very opposite of these things. The Government are trying to kill every movement in the direction of better things. The Premier must know it. How can he ask for the confidence of the people when he restricts them at every turn in their own business? It is this that is ruining the affairs of the country. There have been too many artificial restrictions not only in Queensland but also throughout the world, and, whether we like to admit it or not, the position of this State to-day is very largely the result of two things—the Government borrowing what they should not have borrowed and lending institutions lending when they should not have lent.

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: It is the result of your policy of deflation for three years.

HON. W. H. BARNES: No; it was done during the period when Labour was in office previously—borrowing and then taxing to an enormous degree to pay the piper. This Bill is not calculated to help the important industries of this great State at this juncture.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR (*Enoggera*) [11.45 a.m.]: The hon. member for Wynnum stated that the Government would be dominated by trade union secretaries, but the hon. gentleman is suffering from megalomania. The union secretaries have no more control over the Government of this State than the high financiers and the people behind the Country-Progressive-Nationalist party have over the hon. member.

This Bill, which proposes to create a Bureau of Industry, has not come a minute too soon. It is necessary that something should be done to stem the tide of the chaotic conditions which have been the natural result of a policy of deflation extending over a period of three years. The bureau will be constituted for the specific purpose of grappling with many industrial problems by planning for the future in regard to the industrial affairs of the State. The problem of unemployment will have to be considered; and, in the alleviation of that problem, the bureau will have a man-sized job. I am confident that the bureau will be able to ameliorate the present distressful condition, if it proceeds to tackle the work in a proper manner.

A report has recently been issued by the International Labour Office of the League of Nations at Geneva, in which it is estimated that on 1st July, 1932, one adult out of every twenty-eight throughout the world is out of employment. That state of affairs is certainly condemnatory of the present capitalistic system. It clearly indicates that big business, high financiers, and the wonderful administrators of world affairs were not able during a period of unprecedented productivity to apply sufficient business acumen to the alleviation of a problem upon which the International Labour Office has so severely commented. Queensland and Australia are faced with the problem of unemployment in common with the other countries of the world.

Hon. members opposite have suggested that the solution of this difficulty should repose in the business geniuses of the State; but experience has proved such a policy to be an abject failure. The Government can no longer allow industrial affairs to drift as they have in the past. A determined effort must be made to stem the tide of

chaotic industrial dislocation that has been allowed to flow uninterruptedly during the past fifteen or twenty years.

The hon. member for Cook stated that employment could be provided only when industry had been placed on a profitable basis.

Mr. KENNY: Quite right.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: The hon. member overlooks the fact that every native-born or naturalised subject has the inherent right to live in this country. As he cannot exist on air for any great length of time, it is very necessary that he should be provided with some of the proteins and hydro-carbonates which scientists tell us are so necessary for the continuation of human life.

Mr. KENNY: He is not compelled to work for wages.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Air is the only thing that is free under the present system of capitalism. If a man can only be employed when profit can be made from his labour, what is to happen to him when profit cannot be made from his labour? That is one of the problems which the bureau must inquire into. We cannot have a proportion of human society starving, who, through no fault of their own, cannot be supplied with the employment that is necessary to create their living conditions, because some individual or corporation of individuals cannot make a profit out of their labour, and consequently cannot employ them.

The hon. member further stated that industry can only be carried on in regard to industrial employment when the capacity of the industry to pay is taken into consideration. He agrees with that statement, but loses sight of the fact that industry can only be carried on when the capacity of that industry to sell its products exists in an industrial market. Consequently the hon. member for Cook considers that the supplying of the worker with the necessary amount of currency to purchase foodstuffs can be brought about only when he is employed at a profit; therefore, when he is not so employed, he has no purchasing power, and his opportunity of purchasing foodstuffs is reduced accordingly.

In an article published in "The Commerce and Finance Review" in the United States of America, entitled "Capitalism at the Cross Roads," Scoville Hamlin, a director of three or four companies operating in that country and a well-known industrialist economist, says—

"A system of economy, like a machine, can endure a long time merely by patching and repairing. Ultimately it becomes a question of reconstruction or collapse. Reconstruction is the permanent and only way out of this world-wide business depression. The capitalistic system must be overhauled from the bottom up and the top down. Government and industry must be reorganised with a view to eliminating the weaknesses in the capitalistic system; with a view to stabilising the flow of income."

This gentleman wants a continuation of the present system, but realises that some very drastic measures have to be taken in order that it may continue. He realises that Governments and industry must be reorganised in order to eliminate the weaknesses of the system. We say that we want to eliminate

Mr. G. C. Taylor.]

the weaknesses that have crept into the industrial system in this State whereby our workers and the people who produce have not been given access to the means of production.

The hon. member for Toowong made an absurd statement which, if correct, shows the great need for a Bill of this type. The hon. member stated that 100 per cent. of the bank deposits had been handed over to the various Governments. If that is the case, will the hon. member explain what is left in the banks to enable them to carry on their business? If 100 per cent. of a business is handed over, does it not follow that there is nothing left? Is it not, therefore, the case that the banks are carrying on on the cheque system, with no real security upon which to base the circulation of cheques? That system will sooner or later cause a real collapse, not only here but in every other country in which the system operates. Evidently the hon. member for Toowong forgot himself when he made that statement yesterday afternoon.

I desire to quote a statement made by Rudolph Spreckels, the millionaire president of the First National Bank of California, and a man who probably would endear himself to the hearts of Opposition members because of their belief in big business men. This is what Mr. Spreckels said in a book which he recently wrote—

“Let not the spark of human kindness die in America. We must not tolerate a continuation of commercial greed and the placing of dollars above human rights and needs. Europe is demonstrating to-day the inevitable result the policy of commercial greed leads to. The toll in money and in human life now being paid at the altar of government submission to the demands of capitalism should be a warning that no intelligent American can afford to ignore.”

That statement comes from the representative of one of the largest banking institutions in the United States of America; and I dare say, if hon. members opposite heard the statement at a banquet, after being well filled and attuned to the atmosphere, they would probably say, “Hear, hear!” and agree with Mr. Spreckels inside the four walls of the banquet hall. At any rate, that is the statement made by a gentleman who is probably more interested in finance than any other American banking authority.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member connect his remarks with the Bill?

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: I am endeavouring to show that this Bill is necessary. We must consider the position of other countries somewhat similarly situated industrially to our own country. When we find that great industrial chaos exists in those countries and big business men make statements to the effect that something must be done by Governments to control industrial affairs to give some measure of compensation to the workers, and, when we find at the same time that the alternative to that being done is a collapse of the whole industrial system, we must take note of these conditions. I claim that this Bill has been designed to mitigate the evils so far as Queensland is concerned.

It is very evident that people in this country are no better off than people in other

[*Mr. G. C. Taylor.*]

parts of the world. This measure is designed to bring about greater co-ordination in industrial affairs with a view to improving the present position.

The Bill, designed as it is to deal with all phases of industrial life, is something that is very necessary, and it will probably have very far-reaching effects. The mere fact that the Bill provides for the creation of country boards gives me the idea that these boards will do very valuable work if properly constituted, and if the line of demarcation laid down for the working of those boards is very definite. It will be possible for the boards to go into the question of expenditure in national affairs—where roads are being constructed, where secondary industries are being assisted, and where factories are being built. All these matters can be gone into and local evidence obtained on all questions under review. That is a very necessary proposition to put into operation at the present time. In the past we have had the expenditure of hundreds and thousands—nay millions—of pounds, in an off-hand manner. Before any real consideration had been given to the matter, the expenditure was authorised and gone on with; and to-day we are faced with the position of having to incur greater expenditure in the future. We must take a lesson from the past; and this Bureau of Industry Bill is designed to see that no more mistakes are made such as were made by the Land Settlement Committee and other bodies in settling soldiers on the land following the great war.

Labour is very necessary in industry. Everybody knows that, without the application of labour to machinery, nothing can be produced. Labour must also be applied to the land before production can take place; consequently our friends opposite, especially the hon. member for Wynnum, are fearful that we may give some organised body of labourers some rights in connection with the administration of this Bill. They do not take the workers into consideration, because psychologically they are not fit to do so. They only see through the eyes of the man who invests money. As the worker is the one who produces, he has a right to a say in the government or administrative acts of a country.

We have in front of us two alternatives. We have either to solve this unemployment problem—eliminate it in some way or other—or else it will eliminate us. It cannot continue, because chaos will breed in Australia something similar to what it has bred in Russia; and we shall have a more or less large industrial army of discontented individuals who will be prepared to stop at nothing in order to achieve their ends. On the other hand, if we can ameliorate the present condition of affairs, if we can provide the workers in industry with a little more than they are getting because of the fact that the big business owners are getting more than they are entitled to, then we shall do something for the workers in industry. We shall probably be able to give more employment by the introduction of shorter working hours in industry where that can be effected, thereby ameliorating the conditions which exist to-day.

This Bill is, I believe, the most important measure that this party has brought down this session, so far as the industrial side of the life of Queensland is concerned. It

behoves every member of the Government, and even of business circles outside, to see that the Bureau of Industry is assisted in its endeavour to ameliorate the present chaotic conditions of industrialism in Queensland.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [12.6 p.m.]: In presenting this Bill to the House the Government remind me of a quack standing over a sick patient suffering from a malignant cancer. The quack's method of reviving the patient is to stimulate him occasionally with a dose of brandy and thereby endeavour to prolong the agony instead of doing what a qualified practitioner would do, namely, tackle the job by a major operation, and in that way try to cure the patient. The quack merely endeavours to lull his victim into a false sense of security.

The Bill starts at the wrong end. The actual effect of the creation of the Bureau of Industry under this Bill will be to endeavour to find palliatives and temporary remedies for a disease which should be tackled as being dangerous; but the Government are not attempting to do that under this Bill.

I venture to say that, if any outside body was to approach the Government and ask for the wide powers contained in this Bill, the request would be promptly rejected.

Mr. W. T. KING: Correct! Why should an outside body have it?

Mr. MAHER: I agree with the hon. member for Maree. Why should any outside body have the powers contained in this Bill? If a request was made to the Government by any outside body for such powers, it would be regarded by any decent Government as an absolute impertinence on the part of the persons making the request; but in this instance the Government are delegating to an outside body powers which, in my opinion, represent a usurpation of the functions of the Government themselves.

Mr. RUSSELL: The Government are shirking their responsibilities.

Mr. MAHER: The Government are shirking their responsibilities, as the hon. member indicates. In their weak and cowardly way, they are afraid to face the position, and are endeavouring to find a scapegoat and to put the responsibility for finding a way out of our difficulties on a Bureau of Industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is hardly using parliamentary language in describing the Government as being weak and cowardly. I suggest that he should choose his language more carefully, otherwise it will be difficult for me to protect him.

Mr. MAHER: What I was going to say is that there is no use at all in organised planning unless industry is to be permitted to function on the basis of profit. If industry is to be restricted by taxation and dominated by union control, and its freedom curtailed by legislative action, there is no hope of a Bureau of Industry being able to revive it. The remedy lies in the hands of the Government, who should take such steps legislatively and administratively as to ease the difficult conditions rather than endeavour to deal with them in a roundabout way under this Bill.

We should look at the position in a clear thinking discriminating way, to discover just

what is wrong with us in Queensland. We have a country of marvellous resources if we could only take hold of the job and try to convert latent possibilities into industrial effort and profit, not only to the leaders of industry but also to the employees who might be engaged in the process. For instance, our seas are teeming with fish; yet nobody seems to be able to take hold of that great natural asset and convert it into cash. Why? Simply because every time men interested in industry and wanting to exploit its possibilities look at the balance-sheet of Queensland—indeed of Australia generally—and see the tremendous amount of money that is exacted in taxation—particularly in Queensland—when they see the restrictions imposed on industry by union control, and how their plans and books and everything else may be discussed by union secretaries, naturally their incentive to embark in a new industry disappears. Every other country in the world with abundance of fish round its coast is able to utilise those resources and convert them into millions of pounds—all of which makes for industry and employment. We have abundance of fish in our coastal waters; but can anyone point to a single fishing industry taken up by Austfalians?

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Yes, at Torres Strait.

Mr. MAHER: I understand that the Japanese largely control the fishing industry there.

Mr. KENNY: There is a Queensland industry there.

Mr. MAHER: I accept the word of the hon. member for Cook; but I think it must be rather insignificant, because I have not heard of its product being sold either here or abroad.

Mr. KENNY: It is just started.

Mr. MAHER: Just so. A Norwegian company operates off the coast of Western Australia. These Norwegians can come from the uttermost ends of the earth and operate in their own way in Australian waters and make a profit. I suppose that during the past twenty years these Norwegians have taken millions of pounds worth out of Australian waters by whaling; yet our people are unable to enjoy the fruits of these assets. Something must be wrong. We have the leaders of industry here—men of capacity to take the lead in such ventures. We have workmen equal to the world's best. We have capital lying idle, waiting for profitable investment. When the position is analysed, as I hope to analyse it this morning, I think hon. members will agree that the reason why we are not developing our industries and allowing them to provide the employment our people need is our excessive taxation and onerous control and domination of industry generally.

The hon. member for Normanby referred to Japan. There is a little country which has a virile population of 70,000,000, and, despite the world depression, only 320,000 of them are out of work. They live at quite a decent standard—much higher than many hon. members opposite think—because they have the purchasing power and the wage they get meets all their requirements, though it may be low comparatively.

Let us examine the position of our woollen industry. Last year Australia produced 937,597,000 lb. of wool; but out of that

Mr. Maher.]

wonderful production only 45,500,000 lb. were utilised in the Australian woollen mills. Look what a difference it would make to this country if we could establish woollen mills, or enlarge the existing mills, to utilise one-half of our total production! Look at the avenues of employment that would be opened up if we could manufacture the wool and sell the product on the markets of the world at a price that the world could afford to pay! We have stalemated in our woollen industry, with little or no progress made during the past fifteen to twenty years in the manufacture of the raw materials into the finished product. There must be some solid reason for that. The hon. member for Oxley is a director of a woollen mill at Ipswich; but I know that during the past few years, and even during the prosperous times, the mill had considerable difficulty in paying a dividend of 5 per cent. to its shareholders. How is it that people can come from Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and other countries of the world, buy our wool, ship it to their own countries, pay export and import duties, pay milling costs, manufacture it and send it back to this country, and undersell our own manufacturers? There is something wrong somewhere. Will anyone say that the people who perform the work in Great Britain, France, or Germany do not live up to a decent standard, at least equal to the average standard of the industrial workers in Australia to-day? The leaders in industry in these oversea countries and the skilled workers as well have sufficient intelligence to realise that they have to manufacture at a price that the world can afford to pay. They realise that they must do so otherwise chaos will result, and industry perish. It is the struggle for existence.

The people in Australia will not realise the hard fact that, if we are to live, we must be able to compete on the markets of the world. The Sunshine Harvester Company, one of our greatest industrial enterprises, lives in this country in what might be termed an industrial hothouse. It is protected from the severe gales of competition by a high tariff wall. If that wall were removed, it would not be possible for the enterprise to subsist. I am informed that the late Mr. Sam McKay of that company took £7,000,000 out of Australia, which he invested in Canada as a result of a merger between the Sunshine Harvester Company and the Massey-Harris Machinery Manufacturing Company of Canada. Why did he do that? Mr. McKay was an Australian patriot, anxious to promote Australian industry and to employ as many fellow citizens as possible. He realised that, with a high protective tariff, and knowing that the feeling of this country was distinctly in favour of high protection, there was no hope for world expansion for his industry under the existing conditions in this country; so he removed a large amount of Australian capital to Canada for the purpose of consummating the merger to which I have referred. In other words, Australian capital, unable to be used profitably in this country, was taken away to Canada, where labour conditions, lack of restrictions on industry, combined with good government, enable industrial enterprises to succeed and to place their products on the markets of the world. By the introduction of outside capital, Mr. McKay was able to provide some of the life-blood of one Canadian industry. That

is the position in respect of the Sunshine Harvester Company.

Mr. W. T. KING: Where did he make that money?

Mr. MAHER: He made that money here under a protective tariff.

The Ford Company sent representatives to Australia a few years ago to inspect a site for a factory at Newcastle. They made their report after a careful study of the position, including the political outlook in Australia. These men reported adversely on the proposal of establishing a factory in Australia because of the strikes and restrictive legislation, together with the general labour conditions. They returned to the United States and went to Europe, and have established factories in England, Ireland, and, I think, in Germany also. That money could have come into this country to assist us in developing the motor car industry. It did not. I ask hon. members opposite: Can we go on on these suicidal lines? Here we have, on the one hand, men capable of promoting industry, capital lying idle, and boys and girls waiting for jobs, while, on the other hand, we have the union boss standing behind the labour leaders dictating to them in their place of political power, and forcing conditions on industry which make it utterly impossible for new industries to be promoted, or established industries to carry on successfully. The only industries which can thrive to-day are those which might be considered special industries; that is, industries which have a monopolistic position, and for whose products a special demand exists. Apart from that, no other industry will be attempted under existing conditions, and the position will go on getting worse and worse.

The Premier, no doubt in a laudable attempt to solve the problem, proposes to throw the responsibility of the Government on the Bureau of Industry in the hope that it may be able, starting from the wrong end entirely, to improve the position to which I have alluded. It cannot be done. One need only place himself in the position of a man about to contemplate the investment of capital here. The first thing he must necessarily look at is, how far taxation is going to affect him if he launches out in business in Queensland. If he estimates a profit on the total capital invested in his company of, say, £10,000 for the year's work, he finds, on investigation, that over £4,000 will be filched from him by the tax collector. That amount includes unemployment relief tax and income tax only. If local authority taxation and land tax, which any company would probably be called upon to meet, is added, one can see the impossibility of such a company starting operations. After all, the capital of such a company is only the aggregation of the savings of a number of small people. One man might give it a lead; but it is necessary for him to induce people with £50, £100, and £500 to invest to take up shares to launch the company. Those people invest because they desire to improve their lot in life and give industry a push. When they examine the position, and see that if a profit of £10,000 is made in one year's operations, from 10s. to 13s. in the £1 of their profits will be taken away by the Government in taxation alone, then they will not bother about starting an industry. We are only breaking the spirit of the leaders of industry in our State to-day. If these conditions are allowed to continue, what hope is there

[Mr. Maher.]

for any one of us? That can only end in absolute chaos. Government members must be able to realise the position; yet they talk glibly of the necessity for a change in the capitalistic system, which they contend has failed and must be replaced by some other system. In the days of monarchy in France the same class of people said much the same thing—that times were bad, and, if they could lop off the heads of the Royal family, everything would be all right. Establish a republic, they said, and all would be well. But all was not well. The republic did not cure the industrial troubles of revolutionary France. So is it with the Labour Government in Queensland. They look for some new "ism" in an endeavour to find a way out of the difficulty, rather than tackle the job itself. No system can replace the existing system, with all its faults and defects. The history of the world shows that, wherever a change from the capitalistic system has been made, a reversion has subsequently been made to that system, under which much good has been accomplished in all countries. A study of history shows that the driving power behind the greatness of every world power to-day has been the possibility of profit from increased trade under the incentive of human effort. It has been the ability to promote enterprise under unrestricted conditions which has placed Great Britain in the position she occupies to-day. That could not have been done under Bolshevism, Communism, or any other such system.

The way out of our difficulties is by an application of the old homely remedy of economy. We have to apply it in our daily life. Why cannot we apply it in the realms of government? When we can put the finances of Queensland in order and remit some of the severe taxation which is bearing so heavily on industry, and when we can remove the domination of the union bosses, all the troubles which stand in our path will disappear. Unfortunately, the Government are not prepared to take action, preferring to delude the electors by suggesting that some "ism" such as Bolshevism or Communism—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the hon. member very wide latitude, but I hope he will not abuse it.

Mr. MAHER: Reverting to the purpose of the Bill, the Secretary for Public Works stated yesterday that Victoria offered no advantages in industrial investment as compared with Queensland. As I mentioned earlier, out of a taxable income of £10,000, about £4,000 is extracted by the tax collector, whereas in Victoria only £875 is collected on the same income. If £500 is allowed for unemployment relief tax, it will be found that a Victorian company with a taxable income of £10,000 will be required to find £1,400 in taxation as against about £4,000 in Queensland. Under those circumstances it is impossible for our industries to thrive. That is evidenced in the figures in connection with our factories. In 1912-13 we had in Queensland 42,363 employees engaged in factories and in 1929-30—after a lapse of seventeen years—we had only 42,600, which shows that there was no expansion in industrial development during what should have been a very fruitful period in our history. Instead of there being expansion, our secondary industries stood still. That serves to emphasise the point I have made.

I have previously referred to our wool industry and our fish industry, and I would now like to refer to the question of agricultural implements. Some time ago a scheme was formulated in Ipswich for the purpose of establishing a factory for the manufacture of agricultural implements. Some very prominent and influential men associated themselves with the venture; but, when they looked at the matter from all angles, although they realised that the State of Queensland, with its rising agricultural development, seemed to provide a good market, and although Ipswich was a suitable place for the manufacture of these implements, the proposal was abandoned.

At 12.52 p.m.,

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

Mr. MAHER: We have, too, the question of the rayon industry, which has developed enormously in other countries. Numbers of countries have profited by that industry, and it is a serious challenge to our wool industry; yet no one in Australia has ever attempted to exploit that industry. We use a great deal of artificial silk, which is imported from Japan, Italy, and other countries, but nobody has attempted to develop the rayon industry in Australia. We produce large quantities of tallow and fats; and we send them to Germany, France, Great Britain, Japan, and other countries for conversion into soap, candles, and various other commodities which the world requires. Then we have here an abundance of hides and skins, and we should be able to convert these hides and skins into leather and sell that leather on the world's markets. There is an enormous field for expansion and development in this country if only the thing could be tackled free from the restrictive industrial conditions imposed by union leaders in alliance with political Labour.

Other countries are forging ahead. The question of over-production has been touched on by hon. members opposite. My experience in business is that there is no such thing as over-production if you are prepared to get your costs down to a price at which the world can buy. We have evidence of that on every hand. Our wool is being sold to-day at a price which ten years ago nobody ever dreamed it would be sold at. Our wheat, butter, meat, timber, and everything else that we export are being sold and are being absorbed by countries throughout the world. That illustrates that there is no such thing as over-production so far as Australia is concerned, so long as we are able to sell our products at a price which the world can afford to pay. It is because we have failed to realise that point that we are suffering to-day. As an instance of union domination in industry, and as showing how a great export trade can be absolutely killed, let me say that at Newcastle in 1922-23 they had an export trade with India of 104,000 tons of coal, with the Hawaiian Islands of 54,000 tons, and with Western America 123,000 tons of coal. Many other countries also purchased coal from that port, but I do not want to weary hon. members by going through the whole list. I just mention that to illustrate how that rich foreign trade has been utterly killed by the conditions to which I have alluded. For the trading year 1926-27 the export trade of

Mr. Maher.]

Newcastle coal to India fell to 1 ton, to the Hawaiian Island to 2,605 tons, and to Western America to 6 tons. The reason is that the miners at Newcastle—a most excellent body of men—have been led astray by crazy communistic agitators. From 1914 to 1929—a period of fifteen years—4,500 strikes occurred on the northern coalfields of New South Wales. If we add together the number of men engaged in each strike the total would represent a loss of 8,000,000 working days. Those statistics are verified by the Department of Labour and Industry in Sydney and illustrate how a great industry can be destroyed. For the last ten or fifteen years there has been practically no coal exported from New South Wales, for the simple reason that the men, under instructions from political and union leaders, have resisted any attempt to reduce the production costs of coal so that it can be sold in the world's markets, as at one time it was, when Newcastle was a port which attracted the ships of the world.

The PREMIER: Have you heard of oil-burning vessels?

Mr. MAHER: Yes, I have; but shipping people have told me that one of the primary reasons why they converted their coal-burning vessels to oil-burning vessels was on account of the unreliability of labour. The ships would be held up in Australian ports for two, four, or six hours after the advertised sailing time because the firemen failed to arrive on time. We find the seamen's union has dominated the shipping of the Commonwealth for the last twenty years to the detriment of the industry. As I pointed out, the unionistic control and stranglehold on the shipping industry has had a disastrous effect, and 4,500 strikes have taken place on the northern coalfields of New South Wales in a period of fifteen years. There was an uncertainty in getting coal. When ships came long distances out of their way to get coal at Newcastle, a shipping strike would be on. The strikes occurred with such regularity that the ship-owners directed the captains of their vessels to go to ports where they could get coal and not have to submit to such delay and consequent expense. All through it has been a case of killing the goose which lays the golden egg. If the men were left alone they would be all right. If they were removed from the control of the leaders who preach class-consciousness, and urge the men to fight the boss and make him squeal, things would be all right. We find such leaders in industrial unionism, and we find them in this Parliament. (Government dissent.) Whilst we have that class of industrial leader in Australia—a crude unintelligent type of individual, who dictates to the men and holds threats over their heads—as they are doing in Queensland—and while such leaders are aided and abetted by political power as represented by the Labour Party, we may well hold up our hands in despair of any hope of the revival of industry and the finding of employment for our boys and girls.

Mr. Laurence Ennis, who was connected with the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, stated before he left Sydney that, with a bit of common sense, we could develop in Australia a splendid export trade in fabricated steel; but, unfortunately, the common sense to which he referred is conspicuous by its absence among the political

and industrial leaders connected with unionism in Australia to-day. And so the unfortunate toilers have to put up with these leaders—they are lions led by asses. Never was there a truer expression than that as applied to our working men and women—they are lions led by asses.

On the score of over-production I say the world is waiting for our products, if only we tackle the question in the right spirit and cut our costs and offer our products at prices that the world can afford to pay. The world is hungry for our primary products. It has a large appetite, but it has not got big money to pay for the means of appeasing that appetite. The population of the countries of the world has increased largely during the past twenty-five years, and there should be even greater demand for the products of a country like this; and the countries which recognise these facts and adjust themselves to the new conditions are the ones which will win. In my opinion, we are not going through abnormal times to-day at all. We went through abnormal times during the war period, when we had inflation caused by borrowing in many countries of the world. To-day we are back to normal times or to something approaching normal times—to the pre-war level and a little lower unfortunately—and I do not see much hope under present conditions of any improvement beyond pre-war level. I can certainly see no hope whatever for the old times to which we have been used, which arose largely from the tremendous borrowing in every country prosecuting the war. Those times are gone, and we have to realise that we are up against low prices, up against debt, up against taxation, up against union domination and restriction in industry; and until we can alter those four factors I see no hope, and nothing but chaos, with disastrous results to us all. There is a solution to our trouble, but not along the lines of a Bureau of Industry. Nothing that this bureau can do; nothing it can achieve by means of district employment boards; nothing it can contrive by its own centralised efforts; nothing it can do by the usurpation of the rights of government will solve this problem until we tackle it along the lines which I have set out, and which I may summarise in six points. Nothing can be achieved to help our suffering country unless there are—

(1) A definite and clean-cut reduction in production costs enabling us to compete in the world's markets.

(2) Interest reduction—

There has already been a reduction in interest—

(3) Taxation reduction—remissions of Federal, State, and local authority taxation.

Emphasising that point, let me say that the total wealth production last year was £54,000,000, of which the Queensland Government, the Federal Government, and the local authorities took no less than 56.2 per cent. In other words, more than half of the £54,000,000—something in the vicinity of £30,000,000—was taken from industry and production in this country in order to satisfy the demands of Governments. What is left for industry? What is left for the people to carry on with? What

can we hope for under such conditions? Let me add the other points—

- (4) Freight reductions—rail freight and water freight.
- (5) Reduced cost of government and general services.
- (6) Abolition of land tax—State and Federal.

Those are my six points, and, if they are given effect to, industry will be given a chance and Queensland and Australia will soon be on the high road to national solvency and better days.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. T. KING (*Maree*) [12.45 p.m.]: I have listened with a very great deal of attention to the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Moreton, and one would have expected an hon. member of his calibre not to decry his country. From the beginning of his speech until the end he decried the country that gave him birth—the country in which he lives, and the country which returned him to Parliament. When an individual is given the opportunity to do something for the people and for the country, he should avail himself of that opportunity, and should not decry his country. He should endeavour to uplift the country, and not condemn it.

One listens with a great deal of amusement to some of the speeches delivered by hon. members opposite. The hon. member for West Moreton went out of his way to liken the condition of this country to that of a sick man suffering from a malignant cancer who was given a dose of brandy to revivify him. The hon. member has a very convenient memory; he remembers only those things that suit him. It was a very sick man and one urgently requiring a dose of brandy who was handed over when the present Government assumed control in Queensland. We are endeavouring to renew the life of that individual. Both the hon. member for West Moreton and the hon. member for Wynnum have charged the Government with being responsible for the present conditions in this country, for this, and for that, and for all the ills that befall mankind to-day. They were all in existence when the late Government were in power; but they failed to mitigate those conditions or to assuage the distressed feelings of the people. They have failed to indicate how they provided for the wants of mankind during their term of office.

The PREMIER: They were a Government of wreckers.

Mr. W. T. KING: They created wreckage from beginning to end, and then passed the wreckage on to us. In a pharisaical kind of manner—a manner peculiar to them—they now say, "You can have the wreckage. You are responsible for the wreckage, and you can endeavour to revive the individual that we so completely wrecked." Because we are not able to revive the wrecked individual in a few minutes, we are charged with failing in our duty to the people. I believe that some hon. members opposite possess political consciences in this matter. I am sure that, when they view the past three years in retrospect, they will admit that there were things that they might have done, and things that they should have done. They realise that they failed to do many things, and, above all, that they did many things that were wrong.

The speech of the hon. member for West Moreton from beginning to end was a tirade of abuse against the Government. Evidently he is prepared to adopt the statement of that well-known French philosopher, Voltaire, who said that, if you threw sufficient mud, some of it was bound to stick. He may be prepared to observe that statement very closely; but that will not further the progress of the country. It will not enable us to get one inch further ahead. Criticism of a destructive nature will not tend to get us out of our difficulties. I am prepared to allow members in general to decide just whether the hon. member for West Moreton played the game. It is only natural that some hon. members opposite will applaud him to the skies. Of course, they intend to replenish the inner man during the adjournment and to return full of energy, and other things that can be obtained during the adjournment, to carry on the debate during the afternoon and probably into the night. They are of the same political convictions, and live in the same political atmosphere as their brother, and must accept his sentiments and acts in that regard. The hon. member for Cook has hurled abuse and destructive criticism at the Government when his duty as an hon. member should be to assist in the good government of this country. The rules of this House dictate that I address him as an hon. member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to proceed with the discussion of the Bill before the House.

Mr. W. T. KING: I was endeavouring to show how the hon. member for West Moreton got off the track in considering this Bill.

By the creation of this Bureau of Industry we shall do something in the interests of Queensland. The Government are endeavouring to decentralise and place industry on a solid basis; and the creation under this Bill will, we hope, be a long and lasting benefit to Queensland.

Hon. members opposite have endeavoured to tear asunder the cogent arguments which have been put forward in support of this Bill, and they do not give us credit for being sincere. The hon. member for West Moreton said that the Premier was making a very laudable attempt to place industry on a solid foundation, yet he instantly departed from the spirit and essence of that statement into the realms of destructive criticism. I agree with the hon. member that it is not only a very laudable attempt, but a sound attempt on the part of the Government, to revitalise industry.

Some hon. members have contended, without foundation, that this Bill is an onslaught on private enterprise. At the present time all enterprises in this State need every protection that can be afforded them. There is nothing in this Bill, if examined from a purely national aspect—not from a destructive viewpoint, but from a common-sense viewpoint—that will prevent hon. members from supporting it in every detail. Although there may be room for a difference of opinion regarding the broad principles involved in Acts of Parliament, especially in regard to matters of policy, there is a national outlook in this Bill which should appeal to every hon. member. On analysis it will be found that it is for the benefit of Queensland as a whole.

Mr. W. T. King.]

The Government have made an honest endeavour to co-ordinate industry, and in doing so are going outside in order to secure the best brains; therefore, hon. members opposite should cease indulging in the captious criticism which is so peculiar to them, and look at this measure from a common-sense point of view. This Bill stands for the encouragement of industry, and no matter what hon. members opposite may say to the contrary the Government are to be congratulated on its introduction. They are actuated by a desire to rehabilitate industry. In view of the unemployment problem confronting the world, and the general depression in world prices, some action must be taken, and by this Bill the Government are endeavouring to alleviate the position.

In his remarks this morning the hon. member for West Moreton in an endeavour to emulate ex-President Wilson, but not going quite so far, emphasised six points. To those who analyse his speech, the main point is that the hon. member believes in a definite cut in production costs, by which he means a further reduction in wages. Evidently the hon. member is of opinion that only in that way can industry be resuscitated.

Mr. EDWARDS: Surely you realise the position!

Mr. W. T. KING: The hon. member who courteously interjects no doubt also believes in reducing wages. Indeed, that idea is part and parcel of the political faith of hon. members opposite.

Mr. DANIEL: You know that is untrue.

Mr. W. T. KING: The hon. member for Keppel is in the same political boat. If he had his way, he would steer the ship of State upon the shoals of reduced wages.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why not be fair?

Mr. W. T. KING: Undoubtedly members of the Opposition regard a further reduction in the wages of working men as being the only course that can be followed.

At 2 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. W. T. KING: The hon. member for West Moreton gave the House certain formulae which he thought would cure unemployment, and which he considered quite necessary in dealing with the present position in which Queensland finds herself; but it does not require a very close analysis of these formulae to show that they stand on a structure that will not bear close scrutiny. The formulae he put forward would render the position entirely ridiculous.

He put forward the proposition that there should be a definite cut in production costs. When he said that, he made no apology for it. He did not cover it with any gloss or glamour, and I say that he meant a definite cut in wages. We cannot look for a revival of industry or any uplift in the conditions of humanity from pursuing any course that is associated with a definite cut in wages. Though definite cuts have been proposed at different times by economists, the common-sense people of the world recognise that at the present time other avenues should be explored and other factors considered in order to bring Queensland and the Commonwealth of Australia along the road to prosperity. While at times we are inclined to look upon economists as being in a position to help us out of our difficulties,

I view with a certain amount of distrust the economists of to-day. The world in general seems to be in a financial morass, and the economists are unequal to the task of evolving any proposition that will give new hope to the world. Books have been written by political economists in order to give people something to talk about; or something to think about; and to that extent they have achieved their purpose, which is a very small purpose indeed. When the country requires them, or when people would be guided by them, thinking that they probably know more about things than the average person, they have failed. They certainly have been weighed in the balance and definitely found wanting.

The hon. member for West Moreton placed a kind of panacea before the Assembly and said that if we could get these things then everything would be quite correct; that we would reach a sort of millennium and everything in the garden would be lovely. The hon. member referred to the question of interest reduction. Hon. members opposite know that they had an opportunity of reducing interest, and they know that they did not take advantage of the opportunity. They knew that the Premiers' Plan involved a reduction in interest of 22½ per cent.; and, although they should have made that interest reduction automatic, they did not do so. They really left it to the people to apply to the court for a reduction instead of making the reduction automatic. We on this side have done more in regard to that than hon. members opposite, because we made the reduction compulsory and automatic.

Then the hon. member suggested the remission of taxation. What a breadth of vision that reveals to us! We would all like to see taxation remitted. No Government taxes just for the mere purpose of taxation. Governments have to live by means of finance just as individuals live through the medium of food and other essentials of life. A Government lives primarily upon revenue, and it is necessary to have revenue. A mere broad statement of such a character as that made by the hon. member for West Moreton cuts no ice at all. If we had arrived at a position in which we could remit taxation, we would be in a wonderfully prosperous condition. It is the easiest thing in the world for any hon. member to speak about remitting taxation and to have his remarks reported in "Hansard" for the edification of his supporters. I venture to say that an additional supply of "Hansards" will go into the West Moreton electorate during the week-end. The hon. member should be more broadminded in this regard, and should not merely say that we should remit taxation, but he should take steps to bring it about. When the hon. member had the opportunity, he did not show any desire to have taxation remitted. If an hon. member advocates a certain line of action, the onus is upon him to take action to endeavour to bring about what he desires; but, instead of making out a concrete case, the hon. member has vaguely left the matter to the imagination of the people of Queensland, and more particularly to the people of his electorate, who he desires should see that he has made a speech in favour of remitting taxation. At some forthcoming local festivity it will be pointed out that the hon. member believes that the farmers in his district should have taxation

[Mr. W. T. King.]

remitted. He can go to his electors, and say, "I do not believe in putting this taxation upon you, and am not responsible for it. I made a statement in Parliament that I believe in remission of taxation." It will appeal to the common sense of individuals here, however, and of those in his electorate when they have a chance of expressing their opinion, that the mere shibboleths expressed by the hon. member are found, on analysis, to have no weight.

The hon. member for West Moreton stated as his fourth point that freights and fares should be reduced. We have reduced certain freights and fares because we had to do so; and we regard the remission of freights and fares by the previous Government prior to the election as an improper thing. We cannot, under the circumstances, reduce fares and freights, so the fourth point of the hon. member goes by the board. I dare say that it took the hon. member a good deal of time to formulate his proposals, and required a certain amount of courage on his part to bring them before the House.

Then the hon. member went further, and mentioned a fifth point—the reduced cost of government services. If it were possible to reduce the cost of government services, that would be done by this Administration. The Budget the Treasurer brought down indicated that the cost of government has been reduced to the extent of about £220,000, and we hope to live up to that.

I take it that the hon. member for West Moreton discussed with hon. members opposite, including his leader, the points which he suggested were necessary for the rehabilitation of industry and that they have the general approbation of his party and his leader. He believes in reducing the cost of Government services. Where would he do it? In which department would he commence? It is very easy to get up and make broad statements, but, if he would prune Government service costs, and if he would enter into detail and show our Treasurer how it could be done for the benefit of the country, I am sure the hon. gentleman would not be so unreasonable as to be averse from giving credit to the hon. member for his suggestion. When, on the other hand, we find that he does not go into detail and simply makes the broad suggestion, it is only reasonable to assume that amongst those who read "Hansard" are some who will say, "How is he going to do it?" It is true that he spoke in Parliament and said he was in favour of reducing Government costs; but he had not the courage to tell Parliament how it can be done. It is no use telling us that he is in favour of reducing costs unless he tells us how, and it is therefore useless for us to take much interest in his suggestion.

Then we arrive at the last little plank which he has formulated for himself, and which he has brought forth after much stress and turmoil, much mental and physical effort. He is to be congratulated upon the physical and mental effort which he devoted in placing his views before this Chamber; but, apart from that, what is the value of his suggestion?

His sixth plank is the abolition of land tax, both State and Federal. In regard to that, I would say that he was a prominent member of the Government party for three years, although not actually on the front Treasury bench, and shares the responsibility

which attaches to that Government for not having done anything during that period to abolish the land tax. No doubt during that term he brought his proposal before the leader of his party, and his leader told him that the tax should not be abolished. Why, then, should he bring the suggestion forward under circumstances like this? He had the opportunity for three years, and in all probability it was turned down when he made the suggestion; how then can he with any reason make the suggestion now? We have to take the hon. member as we find him, and leave him to the common sense of his own people.

Summarising, the hon. member believes in a definite and clean cut reduction in costs of production. He believes in reducing wages. He believes, in the second place, in a reduction of interest; but he did not bring that about when he had the opportunity. He believes, in the third place, in a reduction of taxation, but he does not show how he proposes to effect it. He believes in a reduction of freights and fares, to which I say they were reduced at a time when they should not have been reduced. He believes in reducing the costs of government and general services; but he does not tell us how that could be brought about. In the last place, he would abolish State and Federal land tax.

The Bill is for the general benefit of the people. The Opposition are not justified in condemning the Bill merely because it provides for the centralised control of industry and for the protection and wellbeing of the people of Queensland as a whole. Their main objection is to the alleged domination by unions; but the unions will not dominate the matters that will be subject to the control of the bureau. The unions are a necessary institution, and they have just as much right to be consulted in regard to certain things as the employers or their organisations. The Opposition have indulged in destructive criticism purely with the object of being able to return to their electors and to say that they had delivered speeches along certain lines. If a citizen of Mars were to land in Queensland to-morrow, and unhappily become possessed of a copy of the Brisbane "Courier" or the "Telegraph" containing a report of the speeches of hon. members opposite, he would form an incorrect idea about the mentality of the people of Queensland and the condition of our State. He would conclude that we were struggling in the throes of despair. If he happened to be a politician from Mars—no doubt he would be a politician of reasonable standing—after reading those speeches he would have a still higher regard for his own standing. He would consider that hon. members opposite were the champion pessimists of the universe. Incidentally, he would fade away to his own sphere grateful for the fact that he was not a member of the Opposition in the Parliament of Queensland. That is not overstressing the point, nor does it amount to exaggeration. Men have a duty to their country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to discuss the Bill before the House.

Mr. W. T. KING: Perhaps I was led astray in my endeavour as a Queenslandler to put hon. members opposite on a true and correct path again. Undoubtedly the Bill

Mr. W. T. King.]

will encourage and make for the rehabilitation of industry.

Mr. DANIEL: You cannot pass any law to encourage industry.

Mr. W. T. KING: I am prepared to give the hon. member for Keppel some prominence in the debate by replying to his interjection. I leave his remark and the hon. member himself to the common-sense people of his electorate at the next election. The Bill will abolish the Bureau of Economics and Statistics and will set up a Bureau of Industry, to be composed of fifteen members. The composition of the new bureau is ideal. It will consist of the Minister and several heads of Government departments, against whom nothing can be said by hon. members opposite. It will consist of representatives of commerce, industry, and other interests. They will be asked to bear their share of the responsibilities of the bureau. It will be the duty of the bureau to inquire into the organisation of trade and industry in Queensland, monetary conditions, employment, unemployment, the relations between employer and employee, and unfair competition. I strongly support the Bill.

The problem of unemployment has a very vital and material bearing on this great State. One hon. member opposite said that he viewed the passage of the Bill as the advent of ruin to industry. He strongly condemned the proposal that the bureau should sanction loans to local authorities, companies, firms, or individuals.

The object of the Bill is to help industry. If industry can be revitalised through lending money to local authorities, firms, or private companies, the Government will be justified in doing so, and will be acting in the best interests of the State in pursuing such a policy. Hon. members opposite forget that the administrators of this measure will exercise and will be guided by common sense reasoning in arriving at a decision. The mere fact of power being given in the Bill to make grants in that direction will not take away from them that modicum of common sense which they are supposed to exercise, and will exercise, at every step. If individuals, companies, or firms, who are factors in our industrial life, are assisted to that extent, then justice will be done.

By the appointment of rural, mining, roads, works, finance, and other committees in order to secure the co-ordination and centralisation of authority, which has not yet been apparent in industry, much good will be accomplished. Hon. members opposite have adopted the theme that Queensland cannot be legislated out of her difficulties, and that private enterprise, if left unmolested, will help her through. Private enterprise of itself cannot pull Queensland through. It requires assistance.

Mr. KENNY: You will not give it a chance to do so.

Mr. W. T. KING: The hon. member infers by his interjection that his party was not given that opportunity. Private enterprise has not been restricted or prevented from making Queensland prosperous.

The Bill is a genuine and honest attempt to help Queensland. It purposes focusing all industrial activities in one central position. The Opposition should be only too pleased to get behind the Government with constructive suggestions to help in this

[Mr. W. T. King.]

respect, because any constructive suggestions which will help to restore prosperity will be embodied in this Bill when it reaches the Committee stage. Although Queensland, in common with the rest of the world, is passing through a period of depression, she will pull through. Since the Labour Government assumed power they have been responsible for stopping the drift, especially in industrial affairs. If they do not do anything more than this, they will have accomplished something which the people of Queensland will always remember them for, because it is something for which the people are genuinely thankful, and which will in time have a very beneficial effect.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [2.24 p.m.]: This Bill is viewed by the Opposition with rather mixed feelings. It is supposed to be an improvement on the Bureau of Economics and Statistics Act passed by the late Administration, and its structure is said to be founded on that Act. The Premier admitted that the worst feature of the Bureau of Economics and Statistics was that it had no administrative functions; but this Bill goes to great length to bestow on this new bureau tremendous powers, which were not dreamt of when the Moore Administration brought in their measure. That bureau was constituted primarily for the purpose of collating statistics and acting in an advisory capacity to the Government in delving into problems affecting the State. This Bill goes a good deal farther; and whilst we may agree with some of its provisions, because they hold out some promise for better things, at the same time it is a distinct menace. We feel that this Bill means the institution of a new department of State, resulting in more bureaucratic control and more inquisitorial powers to be possessed by Government departments.

In stating the objects of the Bill, the Premier hinted that, if private enterprise did not solve the problems of the day, then there was a possibility of some system of public control being instituted. There we have a hint of socialisation. As a matter of fact, some hon. members on the Government side have openly avowed their adherence to a system of socialisation and public ownership. One hon. member on the Government side put it in a way that indicates that he has to some extent climbed down from his previous position when he talked about community control, whatever that may be. Probably that is a milder form of socialisation. All thinking men must revolt at the chaotic condition of the world to-day. The time has arrived when all sections should unite, if some way can be found, for the purpose of solving our immediate problems. Of course the trouble is world-wide, and, before any remedy is at hand, some international action will be necessary to increase price levels. It is idle for us to think that we in Australia can legislatively increase commodity prices and thus create a greater purchasing power, seeing that the bulk of our national wealth is derived from the income we receive from the sale of products shipped overseas, and for which we must take the world's parity. Until world prices can be raised, it is idle to think that we can institute a system in Australia whereby commodity prices can be increased; therefore, we have to afford some temporary relief until such time as some international action can be

taken that will increase commodity prices. Under present-day conditions—with jealousy existing between nations, with the United States of America holding out for its pound of flesh, with Germany and other countries in the process of defaulting, and with Great Britain making herculean efforts to pay her war debts—it seems that there is no opportunity in the near future of bringing about any international arrangement.

The Premier has pointed out the startling paradox of bountiful nature side by side with poverty. The position has been clearly set out in the "London Chamber of Commerce Journal" for July last, in which this is stated—

"We see, on the one hand, nature, immensely bountiful; scientifically equipped factories capable of providing every human want, and ready to raise the general standard of living of all human beings to an infinitely higher level; and, on the other, millions of men all over the world without work, in great poverty and want; factories working, at a loss, to 25 or 50 per cent. of capacity; and the Governor of the Imperial Bank of India, referring to the 'teeming millions of Africa and Asia' as 'half-starved, and less than half-clad.' Instead of a great increase in the general standard of well-being, a progressive decline. Again, to quote the Governor of the Imperial Bank of India, 'one can scarcely agree that there is any over-production in regard to requirements, but there is certainly over-production relative to purchasing power.'"

The Royal Bank of Canada, in its monthly letter of June, 1932, puts the position in a nutshell—

"When all of the nations of the world desire to sell and none desire to buy, but purchase grudgingly in as small quantities as possible, there is an added impetus forcing prices to lower levels and reducing purchasing power."

While we are certainly suffering like every other nation, as far as possible we want to avoid a continuation of the causes which have brought about the existing state of affairs in our own country. The causes of our own financial depression are fairly well known to us. Summing up the whole position, we have certainly all lived beyond our means; and to-day we are paying the penalty for years of extravagance and years of wastefulness. I am reminded of Mr. McCormack's axiom, "You cannot get more than 20 cwt. out of 1 ton of potatoes." Each successive generation has produced an era of prosperity, followed by a period of depression; and the obvious inference is that the period of depression through which we are passing to-day must eventually be followed by a period of prosperity.

The depression through which we are going to-day is not comparable with any depression that has come within our knowledge. We read of the tremendous depression that occurred after the Napoleonic wars, when the whole of Europe was affected. That was supposed to be the greatest depression the world had ever seen; but, in comparison with the depression we are experiencing to-day, it was infinitesimal. To-day the outlook is not at all hopeful. There seems to be no vantage ground ahead of us. There seems to be no

peak of prosperity ahead of us. It is a question whether we in Australia have learned our lesson. We have been accustomed to a great number of luxuries. We have had the benefit of vast sums of money that we borrowed from our friends, in addition to our own income. We certainly lived on the income we received from other people; and to-day we are asked to pay up, or, at any rate, we are asked to live within our own income.

We talk about sacrifices. It seems to me, as Sir Stanley Argyle pointed out the other day, that we are all prepared to accept the sacrifices made by the other fellow. The community at large must recognise that there is no hope whatever of going back to the old state of affairs. When you see the enormous increase in the cost of social services in Australia, one must be struck by the lengths to which humanitarian legislation has gone. During a period of five years, according to the Commonwealth Financial Bulletin, No. 22, the cost of Government expenditure on the various social services has risen enormously, as shown in the following table:—

| | 1925-26. | 1930-31. |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| | £ | £ |
| Old age and invalid pensions | 8,252,387 | 11,710,953 |
| Maternity allowance | 680,855 | 630,652 |
| War and repatriation service | 8,466,104 | 10,466,542 |
| State expenditure on education | 9,578,325 | 10,973,922 |
| State expenditure on charitable institutions other than hospitals | 1,293,806 | 5,392,700 |
| Totals | £28,271,477 | £39,174,769 |

That shows an increase of £10,903,292, or an increase of 35 per cent. in the space of five years. During that period seven Governments over-spent their incomes by £43,000,000; the public debts increased by £142,000,000; taxation, compared with the five preceding years, rose by £81,000,000; being an average annual increase of more than £16,000,000; and the value of production fell by approximately £65,000,000. There we have the whole thing in a nutshell. We do not contend that the whole of our present difficulties have been caused by these increased services. The Administrations of all the States have been governed by similar conditions, and we have arrived at a stage at which we have to admit that there is no chance whatever of going back to the conditions which obtained a few years ago, and that, if we are wise, we must endeavour to live within our income.

I said a little while ago that the Premier, in his second reading speech, rose to great heights in regard to some items; but his reference to State control must certainly make us pause. If this bureau is designed to act as a new department of the State, having large administrative powers and autocratic powers over the individual, practically existing as a supreme economic council, we must resist the attempt to foist this new institution on the public; but, if it is the desire of the Government to institute a bureau that will call upon all citizens to co-operate, and, whereas the bureau has power of co-operation of the right men, whose advice can be sought in regard to industrial and other matters appertaining

Mr. Russell.]

to the prosperity of the State, the Government will receive every possible assistance from the outside public. Some of our friends opposite see here an attempt to foist a new system on the State. It has been asserted by several speakers opposite that capitalism has failed, though I was glad to hear the hon. member for Normanby, who has always posed as an ardent Socialist, admit this morning that he is a believer in the system of capitalism, showing that he himself has no faith in the doctrines which others preach in this Chamber. He has evidently been convinced that to-day capitalism offers the only means of salvation.

Mr. CLAYTON: He has farmers in his electorate now.

Mr. RUSSELL: The journal of the Labour Party, "The Daily Standard" of 18th April, 1928, stated—

"The history of capitalism is a record of periodic depression and mass unemployment, an inherent characteristic of the system, which will not disappear except with the disappearance of the system itself."

Those views are held by many hon. members opposite, and, while I am prepared to respect the opinions of any man with regard to Socialism, I think the Government would be ill-advised, even if the system of capitalism has been found wanting, to foist any other system on the public at this juncture. I assert that capitalism, however, has not failed, and that the ills through which we are passing to-day are merely a passing phase. Capitalism has so far withstood the shocks of all attacks. Despite the shackles that have been put on it by the Labour Party, despite the enormous load of taxation private industry has to carry to-day, despite all the sloppy sentimentalism and political humanitarianism of the other side, capitalism survives to-day as the only system that will afford salvation to the community.

During the last decade there has been too much pandering to sectional interests and offering sops to the electors, and the electors have certainly returned to Parliament men who will offer them the biggest price for their votes—I am speaking politically.

Notwithstanding the attacks that have been made on the system of capitalism, the Soviets have themselves admitted that, without capitalism, their plans could not be put into operation. Why did they look for outside capital to carry on their own schemes? The fact shows that they themselves believe that capitalism is necessary, and that, without private capital, their schemes cannot be put into effect. Labour Governments have had half a century in which to put their policy into effect. They have preached Socialism, but they have achieved nothing but disaster and discontent throughout the world by preaching doctrines which lead us nowhere. Capitalism still survives, and will survive, and the Government will be wise to get co-operation amongst capitalists, amongst traders, amongst men who are willing to put their money into enterprise in their efforts to put the ship of State on an even keel.

The Premier asks for the co-operation of all sections of society, and I think that it is his duty to prove to the public that his Government are sincere in the attempt they are making to resuscitate the fortunes of this State. Such a time is not opportune for

[*Mr. Russell.*

trying to put into effect party shibboleths, which characterise much of the class legislation of the present Government.

How the Government can expect the people outside whose assistance they want—the people with enterprise and capital—to help the State out of its difficulties, when the Government have inflicted on the country some of the most outrageous legislation ever introduced into this Parliament, passes my comprehension. I would ask the Premier to look at the following acts of legislation and administration, and ask himself whether they offer sufficient encouragement to capitalists and business men to come into his scheme enthusiastically. For instance, his Government recently increased railway freights—directly against the interests of the primary producers. There has been a reinstatement of railway strikers—men who defied the laws of the State—men who put themselves beyond the law.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in anticipating a discussion on a Bill which is to come before the House; nor is he in order in abusing the latitude which I have extended to him. The Bill gives him a very wide scope, but he is not in order in going beyond those limits.

Mr. RUSSELL: I do not want to do that, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to show that, in asking for the co-operation of all sections of the people, the Government are not showing their sincerity by inflicting these acts of legislation and administration on the public. I say that at a time like this the Government should put aside all legislation of a partisan nature. If the time is ripe for the co-operation of all sections of the community, let us drop political controversy, and try to set the people an example, and prove to them that we are prepared to sink political differences in an endeavour to get all sections to come to the aid of the Government to make this bureau a success. The people outside will be willing to come to the assistance of the Government; but they cannot be asked to assume all the burden of making a success of this measure. To get the best results the Government must show their willingness to co-operate with people who are opposed to them politically.

We have also had the reimposition of the nefarious principle of preference to unionists in all our awards. That is not making for the contentment of the country, or protecting those people who object very strongly to that principle. All that it is necessary for the State to do is not to conscript men and women into an industrial army to be debased by political patronage but to see that even-handed justice is meted out to all, and so that no man may tyrannise over his neighbour. I am sure that greater enthusiasm will be shown by the public outside if the Government will show their sincerity by dropping a good deal of their legislation, which is of strong partisan nature.

I take it that the main functions of the bureau will be to make investigations into proposed industries, into the reduction of costs in industry, and for the purpose of obtaining the best results from industry. One of the most important functions of the bureau will be to make a thorough investigation into the cost of living. We all know that it is the practice of the Commonwealth and of the States to regulate the standard

of living by the cost of living. Our Industrial Court has postponed consideration of the basic wage until February next. That is a great pity, because we contend that the Queensland basic wage should be fixed in conformity with the fall in the Federal basic wage. Our standards of living should not be fixed by wages awarded by the Industrial Court, but should be fixed by the ability of our industries to pay wages. The decision of the Federal Arbitration Court in Sydney in June, 1931, should serve as a guide. No Bureau of Industry should be dominated by, or be subservient to, the party in office. The Federal Arbitration Court last year uttered this dictum—

“For this court to fix a basic wage at an amount which would procure an average standard of living for wage earners such as the court would very gladly see prevailing, would be more than futile, if the nation's income is not large enough to maintain the prescribed standard. However grievous the lowering of a customary standard may be to those with heavy responsibilities, and however painful to declare that such a lowering is for the time being unavoidable, the court must perform that duty.”

The bureau should examine the system of arbitration awards. We have the paradoxical situation of awards being fixed on the basis of the cost of maintaining a man, wife, and three children; and we are to-day paying wages for thousands of wives and children who do not exist. We should make some attempt to remove the present farcical position in regard to arbitration awards, particularly where Federal and State awards overlap. I have already stated that our system of Arbitration Court awards must be the laughing stock of the world. The basic condition that must be considered in the fixation of wages is the amount derived by way of national income. The standard of living would have been very low in Queensland were it not for the loan money available, or for the cheques received in payment for our exported primary products. Without these sources of supply, high wages would have been an impossibility. Before fixing the rate of wage in any industry the court should take into consideration the ability of industry to pay. That should be one of the basic duties of the new bureau.

In view of the changed conditions in this country, a strong attempt should be made to bring about an exodus from the cities to the land. In the past town industries were created principally by borrowed money and by lavish expenditure upon public works. Those conditions have passed, and the cities and towns are now unable to sustain their populations. Something must be done to transfer the population from the large centres to the country. We have sufficient land upon which to settle our surplus population. It should be the tendency in every civilised country in the world to reverse the process that has been going on for the past quarter of a century. By the institution of machinery as a result of the great amount of prosperity that was created, there has been an undue congregation in large centres of people who should never have left the land. It seems to me that the time is now ripe for a renaissance, or a “Back to the Land” movement. By this means we shall be able to find sustenance for the

excess population of the towns. A man has a better chance of eking out a livelihood from the land on a decent basis, and would be much better off than loafing about town waiting for the Government to give him sustenance. The bureau will be doing a great work if it institutes a “Back to the Land” movement. That would help to find employment for a number of our youths. The greatest tragedy of the unemployment evil is the great number of youths who cannot get work. The only avenue left them is to get back to the land. While the returns of settlers may not be very great for the first few years, it is, nevertheless, a safe haven, because they would at least keep themselves in food, whereas in towns their position will be gradually getting worse and worse. As the Premier said, no decent man can wish to see a continuance of the present policy of unemployment relief, or the granting of rations to men who cannot get work. We must endeavour to preserve the self-respect of men. We are bringing up in the world a body of men who are without any aspirations, and are being taught to live on the Government. That is sapping the moral fibre of the nation, and it devolves on us to see that these conditions are altered so that these men, women, girls, and boys can retain their self-respect.

I would strongly advocate that the bureau consider the removal of taxation on instruments of production. Ever since the Labour Party took office we have seen a gradual increase in taxation. While times were prosperous the primary producers were quite content to find their share of that taxation, but to-day, owing to the enormous drop in the world's prices, the primary producers are finding the burden of taxation irksome in the extreme. While a tax on profit is the fairest form of taxation, I would advocate the removal of all forms of taxation on instruments of production. In that I would include the abolition of the land tax. I know that hon. members opposite have peculiar ideas about the land tax. The Premier stated that, if a man has uninterrupted possession of land, he should pay for that privilege; but land is as much an instrument of production as a plough or a harrow. That being so, all taxation on land in production should be removed. I have no sympathy with the land jobber who makes huge profits out of the unearned increment on land; but, after all, the unearned increment on land is not something very tangible. You cannot live on it, because you can only receive it when you sell. I cannot see how the unearned increment is worth anything to a landowner during his lifetime. We must see that all taxation on instruments of production is removed.

In order to allay the present unrest amongst a great section of population I would most respectfully suggest that we should make some attempt to put into effect the principles of co-operation. That would be a counterblast to the nefarious doctrines preached by Communists and Socialists. As a matter of fact, a Communist, if he sincerely believes in the doctrines of communism, is to be respected, because the word “communism” implies the holding of goods in common. But the Communists to-day do not advocate that. They are merely advocating the destruction of the present social order so that they and their friends may profit by the resulting chaos.

Mr. Russell.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member connect up his remarks with the Bill!

Mr. RUSSELL: I was going on to the question of co-operation. That is a system that the bureau might advocate in order to placate the present unrest, to some extent at least.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not considering what suggestions should be offered to the bureau. We are considering at this stage whether a bureau shall be established. Perhaps the hon. member will confine his remarks to that question.

Mr. RUSSELL: I think the bureau should be established, but on proper lines. When the bureau is established men should be appointed who have broad ideals. Amongst those ideals I submit that the question of co-operation should take a leading place. There should be advocacy of the principle of co-operation between master and man. The object of the Bill is to bring about peace in industry; and I am offering something which I can respectfully submit to the bureau; and it is essential that the right men are obtained to advocate those principles. I sincerely want to remove a good deal of the present unrest.

Hon. members on the Government side preach to their supporters that we on this side have no sympathy with the working man. We are quite prepared to support this bureau if it is going to bring about peace in industry. To bring about peace in industry it is necessary to establish peace and contentment amongst the working classes. To do that, let us offer to the working classes some interest in the work in which they are engaged.

A good deal of the trouble in the past has been caused by the fact that men have been exploited by designing employers. Those conditions have passed. As a rule, the employers to-day are a decent body of men, open to reason—men who have had a bad time in the last ten years from the enormous taxation that has been imposed; but there is a spirit of enterprise amongst the employing class, the members of which will rally round this bureau if some scheme can be evolved whereby the industries of the State will be rehabilitated.

The best scheme to advocate to the bureau is the encouragement of the fullest co-operation amongst those engaged in industry. That is the solution of our difficulty. I do not believe in the destruction of capitalism, as advocated by some hon. members on the Government side. I believe in the fullest encouragement being given to capitalism, just as I hold that there should be a greater diffusion of capital. I believe in popular, not public, ownership; and I contend that the more capitalists there are, and the more interest that is created in a given industry by giving men a share in that industry, the more likely you are to stop a lot of the present unrest. That is the most effective reply to the doctrines of the Communists.

The bureau has a great work in front of it if it will set its hand to bringing about contentment in industry. The only way to do that is by a system of co-operation. That is a nobler doctrine, as well as a more economically sound doctrine, than that of the living wage, or any of the other doctrines

preached by Labour. A poet of ancient Greece declared that—

“The Gods sell us all good things at the price of toil.”

The Australian worker must cease to expect favours as payment for his vote, and must rely—not on politicians, but on his own efforts to improve his lot.

In order to preserve the proper balance of the use of nature's resources, we can do no better than accept the proposal of a noted economist. A good deal has been said about economists to-day. I have a good deal of sympathy with those who say that the economists have not been able to lead us out of this morass; but I offer this as coming from one of the leading economists in Great Britain, Sir Henry Strakosch, as I think his words will appeal to most men. He said—

“A PROPER BALANCE IN THE USE OF THE NATION'S RESOURCES.

“(a) The share of the national income falling to the wage-earning class must be great enough to induce them to hire out their labour, yet no greater than the producing class are able to bear.

“(b) The share falling to the producing class (which includes services needed for production) must be great enough to meet their personal wants, maintain their productive equipment, pay wages, taxes and debt charges, yet no greater than the consumers of their production are able to bear.

“(c) The share falling to those who lend money must be great enough to induce them to save and lend, yet no greater than debtors are able to bear.

“(d) The share falling to the State and other public authorities by way of taxation must be great enough to enable them to meet the expenses of administration (mainly in the form of wages, salaries, and other services), yet no greater than the taxpayers are able to bear.”

If this bureau could be removed from complete political domination or political interference, much good could be accomplished. The commercial community is quite willing and anxious to co-operate in every way possible in the rehabilitation of the State, and will assume its share of the burden of responsibility of the bureau. I conclude with these lines—

“God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith,
and ready hands;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above
the fog,
In public duty and in private thinking.”

Mr. C. TAYLOR (*Windsor*) [3.3 p.m.]: This Bill is of a most comprehensive nature, and gives very wide powers to the contemplated bureau to inquire into the best method of reducing the unemployment that exists in Queensland at the present time. I am quite in sympathy with a bureau of this kind being established, because I do think that some action is absolutely necessary in order to reduce, so far as is humanly possible, the unemployment that exists at the present time; but I think a less comprehensive platform would probably have been better than the very wide platform which has been given to this bureau.

[*Mr. Russell.*

Quite a number of the things which are specified in this Bill are matters which have received the attention of Governments for very many years past, and, so far as one has been able to judge, they have been dealt with quite satisfactorily.

The question of loans to local authorities has been mentioned this afternoon. Before a local authority can get a loan from the Government, it has to provide the Government with a specification of the contemplated works. That programme of works is submitted to officers of the Government, who go through it very carefully, and then they make a recommendation to the Government, and, if the recommendation is satisfactory, and the Government can provide the necessary finance, that finance is found. During the progress of the expenditure of that money it is closely scrutinised again by the officers of the department to see that it is not wasted, but is used for the specific purpose for which it is lent. If any hon. member takes the trouble to go through the Auditor-General's report, he will find that the amount of money owing and in arrears by local authorities—and when I speak of local authorities, I am not including harbour boards, but municipalities, shires, and towns—he will find that the money in arrears by the whole of the local authorities throughout Queensland is a negligible amount, showing that the money has been well spent and that the local authorities are carrying out to the best of their ability their obligations in regard to this matter.

If we include that in the scope of the bureau's activities, we shall be simply double-handling the position, so to speak, which is quite unnecessary at the present time. If this bureau carries out the whole of the programme outlined in the Bill, the Government will become a rubber stamp. The bureau will practically undertake the whole of the work for which the Government are responsible at the present time, and remove it from the ambit of governmental activity. I do not think that is necessary or desirable.

Every recommendation which the bureau may make with regard to matters assigned to it has to be agreed to by the Governor in Council; and, when the Government give their sanction to it, it is adopted.

The functions of the bureau in quite a number of directions are of such an inquisitorial nature that they will cause quite a lot of trouble to those who are employing labour to-day. The powers of the bureau to make inquiries into businesses are in some directions quite all right; but, when it comes to making inquiries into the financial position of industry and other things of that kind, it is likely to cause more trouble in industry than exists at the present time.

The hon. member for Wynnum referred to the Income Tax Department, and to give any outside department of the Government power to call upon the Commissioner of Taxes to give certain information—and the bureau is to be permitted to delegate that power to any individual, who may or may not be a member of the bureau—is a very unwise procedure to adopt. The Income Tax Department should be sacrosanct as regards any interference by any other Government department, because the Commissioner of Taxes and his officers are quite capable of carrying out their duties without interference. I fail to see why any outside body should have the right to come

along and make inquiries in the Income Tax Department.

Mr. LLEWELYN: Was it not your party that inaugurated that?

Mr. C. TAYLOR: If it did, it did a wrong thing. I do not believe in our party or any other party doing it. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Wynnum say that, while his Government had that power, it was not exercised. It is not wise to delegate such a power to any other body, no matter what its duties or activities may be. The Commissioner of Taxes is quite capable of carrying on the duties of his department.

The main features of the Bill are designed to relieve unemployment. That must commend itself to every hon. member. Everything that can be reasonably done to minimise the unemployment which exists at the present time, and to get back men to normal employment, should have the support of every hon. member. What we are asked to decide is whether the methods proposed to be adopted by this bureau will bring about the necessary re-employment of men who are out of work to-day. Every hon. member knows that, although there are always some men and women who are unemployed because of their own limitations, at the present time thousands of persons are out of work through no fault of their own. How we are to rehabilitate industry is one of our most difficult problems. The matter is not purely domestic or local. In every country in the world we find it existing; and in every country endeavours are being made to find a way out of the difficulty. Every country has a very hard row to hoe in that respect; but in any scheme which we propose in Queensland we must bear in mind the fact that Australia is largely dependent on the overseas markets for the prices of her primary products. We know how they have slumped. The Premier has often said that the solvent demand which is necessary to raise the prices of commodities does not exist. How long this state of affairs will continue we cannot tell.

The hon. member for Hamilton made some reference to the Industrial Court. I have always believed in arbitration, but to a very great extent it has failed. It has not solved the problem we want to solve; and we find ourselves confronted with difficulties as great as those which beset us before we had any Arbitration Court.

Have hon. members opposite ever stopped to consider what the dairying industry means to Queensland in the matter of employment and the return of money to our State? If the same conditions were applied to the dairying industry as are applied in the city of Brisbane and other cities, we would not be exporting a single box of butter. I say that from my own knowledge and observation. Apply the hours, wages, and the other conditions of city industries to the dairying industry, and Queensland, instead of exporting tens of thousands of boxes of butter every month, would not be exporting a single box. I challenge any hon. member to contradict that statement. I honestly and sincerely believe that what I say is true. If, after investigation, this bureau can bring forward a suggestion which will show the people of Queensland what can be done in that industry under award rates, it will be doing a very great service to this State. We have to face the facts

Mr. C. Taylor.]

as they are, and to do something that will rehabilitate our existing industries and create others.

The wool industry provides a considerable amount of employment and wealth for the people of Australia. It has passed through very serious times during the last two years, and there appears to be but little daylight ahead. A Wool Convention has been called to meet in Roma on 4th December, to be attended by representatives from all parts of Australia, with a view to devising means to rehabilitate the industry. If nothing can be done, then Queensland and Australia are in for a very trying time.

A few months ago I interested myself in the question of scouring wool. I wrote to the Prime Minister on the subject, and he suggested that someone should appear to give evidence before the Commonwealth Wool Investigation Committee. I think I am correct in saying that all wool must be thoroughly cleansed and scoured before it is manufactured into cloth. We export 5 or 6 per cent. of our total production in a scoured condition. It appeared to me that thousands of men might be permanently employed in this country in scouring the wool before it is exported overseas. Great Britain and other wool-buying countries may have very good reasons for preferring to take our wool in the grease; but the matter should be subjected to a thorough investigation. Just about the time that I was in communication with Canberra, an officer of the technical college, whose name I cannot just now recall, gave evidence before the Commonwealth Wool Investigation Committee in Brisbane. The report of that committee was released last week, and, so far as I am able to glean from the newspaper report, no reference has been made to the matter that I brought under the notice of the Commonwealth Prime Minister. I feel that my suggestion would make for permanent employment, and that it would not be a palliative or something of a temporary nature.

The hon. member for West Moreton stated that overseas milling interests were able to purchase their raw material in this country, manufacture it abroad, and under-sell our milling interests in the sale of manufactured articles. I make bold to say that the capacity of Australian woollen mills has doubled, and perhaps trebled, during the past fifteen years. Quite a number of mills have been established in the South. One was established in Charters Towers; but it did not turn a wheel. When we consider the question of local manufacture and the ability of overseas industries to purchase their raw material, manufacture it overseas, and return it to this country to our industrial detriment, we must remember that we cannot have it both ways. If we are going to send ships fully loaded to Great Britain and other parts of the world, we cannot expect them to return to Australia empty unless we pay two or three times the present outward freights. All these aspects of the question must be considered and investigated before we can really tell what we can do in this regard. Matters which formerly concerned Australia only have now become international in character, while the interests of the component parts of the Empire have also to be considered. I do not profess to have other than an ordinary layman's knowledge of the wool scouring industry, but it is worthy of the closest investigation.

[*Mr. C. Taylor.*]

Then take the question of the railways, which I wish to connect up with this Bill. They employ a very large number of men. We must give some consideration to the causes of the very serious depression existing in railway traffic throughout Australia to-day. We must realise the fact—and it will remain a fact for a number of years—that Australia has spent £300,000,000 in the construction of railways. I find no fault with that. No man living twenty or twenty-five years ago ever thought that each State's best asset would become a liability; but the unlooked for has occurred. We see no possibility of the railways becoming a paying concern for many years. We cannot do without them; therefore, we must maintain them, and employ as many men as possible in carrying on this activity in Queensland and the other States. Here is to be found one reason why we are in such serious financial trouble to-day. If we only had the £20,000,000 which the railways in this State have lost, our financial difficulties would be very much relieved. We have not got that money. We have gone back to that extent, and have written that amount of capital off their capital value. That is one of the reasons why we are suffering so acutely.

At the present time we have a prospect in Australia of a harvest of over 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. The wheat industry creates a considerable amount of employment both on the land and in carrying the crop on our railways and overseas. Of those 200,000,000 bushels we must find a market for over 150,000,000 outside Australia. Only some great calamity will prevent these figures from being realised. We have to compete with other wheat-producing countries in the selling of that wheat. That is another thing we have to consider. There is a tremendous over-carry of production in Canada and other wheat-producing countries. Practically the whole of our surplus wheat from last season has not been disposed of yet; and we must find an overseas market for this year's surplus production. The prevailing prices are exceedingly low. Wheat to-day in London may be worth 6s. a bushel—the price we are asking for it in Australia. We must accept that price, knowing perfectly well that in doing so our producers will not make anything out of their crop.

The whole of the matters which this bureau will have to consider are of a tremendous magnitude. That is why its scope is so huge and big, and why quite a lot of things would have to be overlooked, because the bureau cannot give the necessary time to consider them as they should be considered. Of the 150,000,000 bushels of wheat which we shall have to export, a large quantity goes as flour to Egypt, China, and Japan. If, as the result of investigation or arrangement, we could manufacture all that wheat into flour before it left our shores, it would mean tremendously increased employment in our flourmills. The suggestion may not be practicable; still a subject like that is worthy of the closest investigation at the present time.

In every country there are industries which may be called key industries, as, for example, the iron and steel industry. I will show how men actuated with the very best intentions are apt to make mistakes, and perhaps involve their country in tremendous losses. Hon. members will remember that Mr. Theodore was a very ardent supporter of the proposal to establish iron

and steel works at Bowen; and the Government of the day purchased an island off the West Australian coast, where excellent iron deposits were to be found. I do not think that any hon. member who heard Mr. Theodore expatiate on the iron and steel works proposal will to-day regret that those iron and steel works were not established, because, had such a thing happened, the State would have been burdened with an additional debt of from £3,000,000 to £4,000,000, and would have had an unprofitable industry on its hands. When the idea was first mooted, it was suggested by the sponsors of the proposal that such works would supply the Queensland railway system with all necessary rolling-stock and material. We know that the Railway Department does not require much material at the present time; but no one could foresee that. It all emphasises the fact that the present is not the time for a narrow outlook on the part of members of Parliament or members of the Bureau of Industry.

I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Normanby express the hope that the additional members on the Bureau of Industry would be members of socialistic unions. If we are going to deal with these matters from the narrow standpoint that, because one party introduces a measure, its successor in office should repeal it, we shall make no progress at all. I hope the Premier will appoint the best men to the proposed bureau, and that, in considering men for appointment, he will have no regard as to whether they are Socialists, Communists, or—

AN HON. MEMBER: Presbyterians!

MR. C. TAYLOR: Yes, or even Presbyterians. (Laughter.) I hope the hon. gentleman will appoint men of vision—men who will be able to direct us as to the proper action to take.

I come in contact with quite a number of men engaged in rural industries. Many of them are making a success of their venture. Thirty per cent. of them are not; they are having the struggle of their lives to make a living on the land under the conditions which prevail at present. I realise that all wealth comes from the land; but there are difficulties associated with land settlement in Queensland which do not apply to other States. I think the Government scheme of sending a number of unemployed men to Beerburum is a good one, even if the men concerned only maintain a reasonable standard of living. From what I have seen, the scheme will probably be attended by good results. Our inquiries should be directed, not so much to the primary products that are at present being grown, but to the growth of primary products that have hitherto been neglected, the aim being to assist the State in every way possible. At the present time 50 or 60 tons of tobacco leaf that is not worth 1d. per lb. is held in Brisbane, which shows how necessary it is that a bureau such as this should inquire into an industry like the tobacco industry. There are bound to be failures in that industry. Nature will provide failures under the very best conditions, but, so far as individuals are concerned, there is a great future before the tobacco industry, if it is intelligently and properly handled, and let alone. We do not want too much Government interference. In industry generally there is far too much Government interference. Can anyone say that things are

better because of Labour administration during the fourteen years that Labour was in power? There are troubles outside Queensland that we have not been able to overcome.

The hon. member for Hamilton spoke about an international arrangement with regard to prices. I am afraid that is only a vision. We know how difficult it was at the Ottawa Conference for the representatives of our own Empire to come to an agreement; and we know how very difficult it has been to put that Empire agreement into operation. If the spirit of co-operation prevails, and if the party element is eliminated from the work of this bureau, we shall probably see an amelioration of existing conditions and profitable employment found in our main industries. It is heart-breaking to go along Roma street on Tuesday and Friday mornings in each week, and see 200 or 300 men lined up at the Roma Street Police Station either getting the dole or rations. That has been going on for some months. Any hon. member who cares to walk up there between 8 and 8.30 a.m. on those two mornings will see those men lined up—men who could do a good day's work if the work was there for them. The work is not there for them, and we have to maintain them. Whether we like it or not, every honest man who is out of employment has to be maintained by the rest of the people. But it is a pity, it is a shame, and it is a blot on our civilisation that these men cannot be found profitable employment owing to the conditions prevailing at the present time. My sincere wish is that it will not be long before a change comes; and I hope the bureau will not be interfered with, because, if party politics are going to count in this matter, it will not get us anywhere. The trouble will be accentuated instead of lessened.

MR. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [3.34 p.m.]: I do not think there is any necessity for this Bill at the present time. I do not think the Bill has any possibility of success. We have far too much governmental interference in industry, and it would be better if we allowed industry to function along natural lines, and allowed the country to expand and the people to work out their own destiny. We can quite understand the Government bringing forward this Bill, which, no doubt, has been introduced to placate their supporters. The Bill will find a good deal of employment for certain Government officials, but, if we draw upon the small funds already existing and give certain individuals high salaries, we are going to add to unemployment.

There is nothing new about a Bill of this class. If we read Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," we find that they tried exactly the same principle there many centuries ago. They brought in Bills to establish bureaux to provide food and work for the people. We are up against a huge problem. We have a great number of very fine men equal to any in the world as workmen, out of work at the present time. It is our duty to put them back into work; but I do not think we are going to do that by the establishment of this Bureau of Industry or any other kind of bureau. Statisticians can make all the inquiries in the world; but what we want to do is to provide satisfactory work at a cost at which our products can bring a profitable return

Mr. Nimmo.]

in the markets of the world. As Mr. McCormack said when he was Premier, "What does it matter what are the actual wages paid so long as they provide the wherewithal to purchase the necessaries of life?" If industry is functioning correctly in a country the price of articles will be fixed by the rate of wage paid in industry. If everybody is working at a high rate of wage, goods can be sold at a high rate; but no one is any better off. We may pay high interest rates on loans; but, if the cost of living is high, the people getting those interest rates are deriving no great benefit from them. The proposed Bureau of Industry is not going to work out in the best interests of the State.

If it is really the Government's wish to put men back into employment, industry will have to be encouraged; but are the Government encouraging industry? We find that compulsory unionism is the order of the day. Preference to unionists is established. Practically union members are being conscripted into an army really to fight industry.

Part III. of the Bill deals with the collection of statistics and offences. Apparently the Bill is designed to find out what offences are being committed, and inspectors will go round to police the different industries. I for one am going to do all I possibly can to prevent the passage of the Bill.

If the Government have any idea of trying to encourage industry in the State, would they try to stamp out the outside insurance offices and not allow them to function? We had a Bill brought before the House recently in which it was made compulsory to take out a bond with the State Insurance Department, and private insurance offices were not allowed to compete. That created a further monopoly for the State Insurance Department.

We have high taxation and high railway fares and freights in the country. When we find that the governmental expenses take 56½ per cent. of the production from the land, we can understand why there is so much unemployment here.

If we had some way of allowing industry to function without interference—and I would go so far as to say that possibly it would be a good thing to adjourn Parliament for two or three years and allow industry to function under the legislation which existed some little time ago—there would be some hope for us. During the regime of the late Government many industries were commencing to grow again. The iron industry was making many articles which previously had not been made here. I understand that one company was turning out ploughshares. Another company was making agricultural machinery. To-day all that is stopped, showing that we cannot compete under the restrictions that have been placed on industry. In Ipswich the woollen industry had built up quite a big trade under the regime of the Moore Government; and the woollen manufacturers in the South asked the woollen companies of Queensland to consent to operate under a Federal award. Fortunately, our conditions were slightly better than they were in the South, and we refused. To-day we have a fierce competition as the first fruits of the Labour Government's interference with industry. We have the enforcement of the preference to unionists clause, under which all employees must leave our works

[Mr. Nimmo.

unless they are prepared to join a union; and we have all kinds of requests from the unions for conditions which it is impossible for the industry to carry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Were the Queensland woollen mills not union mills?

Mr. NIMMO: All the employees were not unionists. Although the industry is seasonal, at certain periods when we are busy we may have to employ certain persons for two or three months, and their employment for that period necessitates their taking out union tickets, which amounts to a tax upon them.

There will be fifteen members of the bureau, seven of whom will be the Minister and heads of Government departments, and eight will be appointed or elected—how, I do not know—apparently from the Trades Hall.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not in the Bill.

Mr. NIMMO: It practically says that they are to be trade unionists.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not the Trades Hall.

Mr. NIMMO: If the remaining seats on the bureau are given to them, it looks as though the outsiders will have the majority; and it is very hard to say how far such a bureau will be prepared to go. The Bill also gives power to the bureau to delegate its authority to anyone, and its powers are terrifically wide. In fact, there are five powers which, if put into operation, will enable the bureau to do practically anything.

The hon. member for Normanby said this morning that the Act passed by the late Government should be scrapped; but I think that the proof that Act was a good one is to be found in the fact that under it industry expanded, and that in the most difficult period in the history of this State. We must realise that an economic crisis developed all over the world, although hon. members opposite did not admit it, or failed to realise it, until they took office. During the regime of the Moore Government hon. members opposite refused to admit the existence of a world-wide depression, and contended that the lavish Government expenditure of the past should be continued. During the regime of the Moore Government there was greater expansion of industry and a greater number of factories in operation than there were during the immediately preceding six years. The hon. member for Normanby stated that, whilst the late Government were in power, unemployment doubled. These figures show the percentage of unemployment during the period the Moore Government were in office—

| | First Quarter, 1930. | Second Quarter, 1930. |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Per cent. | Per cent. |
| New South Wales ... | 16.3 | 21.0 |
| Victoria ... | 14.1 | 17.6 |
| Queensland ... | 8.4 | 10.1 |
| South Australia ... | 18.6 | 21.4 |
| Western Australia ... | 15.1 | 18.7 |
| Tasmania ... | 7.5 | 18.9 |
| Commonwealth ... | 14.6 | 18.5 |

These figures show the percentage of unemployment during the third quarter of this

year, when the present Government were in power—

| | Per cent. |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| New South Wales | 33.0 |
| Victoria | 27.0 |
| Queensland | 19.3 |
| South Australia | 35.4 |
| Western Australia | 30.1 |
| Tasmania | 26.9 |
| Commonwealth | 29.6 |

The figures show that during the reign of the Moore Government the increase was less in Queensland than in any other State of the Commonwealth or in the Commonwealth as a whole. I have submitted those figures to refute the statement of the hon. member for Normanby.

He also stated that the United States of America had adopted a scheme of planned economy. That country may be planning ahead; but I understand that the industrial situation there is very much worse than it is in Queensland. I am well aware that the United States of America adopted a migration quota; but for many years it was the ambition of every foreigner of the world to migrate to the United States to engage in manufacture for export. The United States was not prepared to treat fairly with Australia and other countries of the world who constituted her customers, and eventually her trade declined. To-day she is left stranded commercially with a huge population to maintain. Queensland, although a primary producing country, is young and vigorous, and should be able to adjust conditions much more easily.

The hon. member for Windsor suggested that we should scour the whole of our wool clip before it is sent overseas, but I trust that that tragic step will not be taken. After taking into consideration scouring and other costs, the ultimate return would be less than if the wool had been exported in the grease. It is calculated that greasy wool is reduced in weight by 50 per cent. in the process of scouring. Its value for spinning purposes is calculated in "counts," and it is highly desirable that the live, crimped, delicate fibre should not be injured during the scouring process. The effect of scouring the wool locally is to reduce its value; therefore, this suggestion is not within the realms of practicability.

The bureau which this Bill will establish will confer great powers on outsiders. There is no doubt that the Australian Workers' Union will have powerful representation on the bureau. Seeing that the political lives of so many hon. members opposite are dependent on that organisation, it is only natural that this union will demand what it wants. It is not always a good thing to give any union or any man all that is asked for. Men in industry to-day actually tell the boss how the industry should be run; but, if their ideas were carried out and the industry managed by the men, they would very soon find themselves out of a job and the industry closed. Some years ago the late Mr. Lewis Thomas, of Ipswich, owned one of the largest coal mines at Blackstone, in the West Moreton district. The miners were always talking about striking, and actually going on strike. Mr. Thomas ultimately became disgusted, and said that he would hand the mine over to the miners to run themselves. He told them to form their company and carry on. The miners formed their company and operated the mine; but,

under their management, the coal was taken out of the mine in such a way that the shaft was endangered, and the mine had to cease operating. That is one instance showing that it is not beneficial to hand an industry over to the employees to manage. An employee may think that certain things will be better for him; but the man running the industry knows from practical experience that it is better to work along certain lines if the industry is to flourish.

A good deal of talk has been indulged in about the displacement of employees by the introduction of machinery in industry. In fact, that statement is repeated very often. Everyone will admit that one machine in a workshop will displace many men; but it must not be forgotten that the manufacture of machinery creates a lot of work. The other day I saw a practical illustration of that in the making of the ordinary digging fork. At one time the making of a digging fork represented a day and a-half's work to the man engaged in making it; but, after one fork had been made, it was almost impossible to get an exactly similar fork produced, as a fresh operation was involved in the making of the second fork. Then dies were introduced by first-class tradesmen, which enabled hundreds of digging forks to be manufactured by machinery which was operated by a boy or by a labourer. The result was that digging forks could be produced at a very low price, and that enabled a greater number of people to buy that article.

I call a further authority to my aid in the person of Dexter S. Kimball, Dean of Engineering at the Cornell University, United States of America, who gives a practical illustration of how men displaced from industry through the introduction of machinery have been absorbed in other industries. As he points out, when opera and reading glasses were made by hand, their price put them beyond the reach of the average person. With the introduction of standardised manufacturing, great progress was made, and, as Dean Kimball points out in the "Coal and Coal Trade Journal" of December last—

"If you go to Southbridge, Massachusetts, you will find a town of 20,000 odd people, about that size, I think with twenty or so manufactories making nothing but optical goods; and you will find the whole population French Canadian who have been elevated, brought into these industries and elevated, until to-day they form one of the important elements in that field of manufacturing."

He goes on to say in regard to boots and shoes—

"You can't find a man to-day who can build you a shoe. We make shoes in just the way I have indicated, with complicated costly machinery, skilled operators, and a few technically trained men to keep the factory in operation. The shoe-making industry, the records of which we have in the census, has to-day more men making shoes in shoe plants, than were employed at shoe making thirty years ago. . . ."

That goes to show that, with the cheapening of the price of shoes, the number of men engaged in their manufacture was considerably increased.

I think the Government would be well advised not to proceed with this Bill, which

Mr. Nimmo.]

is merely introduced to placate their more active supporters outside. No business is meant by the Bill. The less interference there is with industry the better chance there is for industry to expand. All the research in the world will not, of itself, stimulate industry. I say most earnestly to the Premier that the sooner we get one industrial system for the Commonwealth so that we shall have uniform conditions in industry, the better it will be for the country. Under the present system, if one State is more favourably situated than another in regard to industrial conditions, it has an advantage when it comes to trading. Seeing that we have no interstate barriers, there is no reason why we should have varying industrial conditions in respect of goods that are sold in the one market.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.59 p.m.]: This is one of the most important Bills which have come before this Parliament. It proposes to establish a bureau, which will be given the power even to recommend the complete alteration of our existing system. While it is undoubtedly a wise step to co-ordinate effort in an endeavour to solve our difficult problems, our first duty is to discover what the problems are without creating what may, after all, be only a buffer between the Government and the people—the sort of body that will be expected to shoulder the responsibility that should be borne by Parliament.

I fear that this Bill is one of the biggest steps towards the socialisation of industry, production, and exchange that we have ever had before us. The Premier, in stating the case for the Government, said that it was to provide a combination of effort, and that the whole community was involved. It would be a very good thing if we could get the whole community to exercise whatever force they have in a combined effort to improve the present position. If that could be done, we would get out of our difficulties much quicker than under present conditions. But how is it possible to do that? The legislation we have in all the States of the Commonwealth to-day more or less breeds class hatred; yet we are bringing in a Bill that is supposed to combine all these efforts, which have been driven apart for many years.

The Premier said that, if the present system breaks down, it is our duty to replace private control by public ownership. That means the socialisation of industry, to which I am very much opposed. Why has private enterprise failed? Private enterprise the world over has always taken the initial step, and has proved successful in trade and commerce; yet this Bill will give power to replace private enterprise by State enterprise or Government control. What has been the experience of State enterprise in Queensland? State enterprise has proved a ghastly failure, and must always prove a failure. We must analyse the position to ascertain why private enterprise has not progressed in the manner we could wish. We must take into consideration that private enterprise sets out with a certain amount of finance and a certain amount of knowledge of industry. In developing industry, private enterprise has to encounter a whole mass of difficulties. If it is a manufacturing business, capital must be found for machinery, then the raw material must be found to work on, and then it will probably strike trouble because compulsory unionism exists. Not only is private enterprise compelled to

employ a unionist, but it is compelled to pay him a certain wage, and the hours and conditions also are laid down.

At 4.5 p.m.,

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

Mr. PLUNKETT: There would be no objection to that, provided industry can carry it; but we have reached a stage when that cannot be done. We have too much interference with private enterprise by the State. The only reason for private enterprise failing is owing to the fact that we have surrounded it with conditions which make it impossible to carry on business.

If we are willing to give an opportunity to people with money to come here to start private enterprises, we must let them come on the best possible basis; but, on the contrary, we tie them down with regard to hours and conditions, and subject them to all sorts of humiliating restrictions. We do not even stop there. If private people make a success of their undertakings, we make them pay more State income tax and land tax, and they have to face the danger of having their businesses tied up by strikes. Everybody who is prepared to come here to start private enterprises should be given every encouragement. The Government should protect them and help them in every possible way to make their undertakings a success. People are not going to start industries unless there is a profit to be made. That is the reason why many of our manufacturers in Queensland have closed down. We produce raw material in our primary industries, but we have not manufacturers here to produce the finished article. We find they are in Victoria, which buys our raw material, and sends back to us manufactured goods.

It is idle to bring in this legislation to set up a Bureau of Industry, comprising fifteen members, some of whom will be drawn from the public service and others from outside, and give them power to do all sorts of things. It will be impossible for them to do the things we want them to do. I am opposed, and always will be opposed, to the Government appointing any public servants to positions like this, no matter how sincere or honest they may be. It is wrong for the Government to appoint them to bureaux and boards and shoulder them with the responsibility of carrying out governmental activities. The Government have the privilege of their advice at all times. Every Government servant recognises that the Government are his employers; and in every effort he makes he must have at the back of his mind something which will fit in with Government policy. No matter what Government may be in power that idea will be in his mind, and he will direct his efforts along those lines; therefore, it is wrong to appoint public servants to these positions, especially as their knowledge should be available to the Government at all times.

I do not admit that private enterprise has failed at all; but it has suffered through the restrictions placed upon it by Governments; and so long as those restrictions obtain people will not be encouraged to come here to start industries. I have often wondered whether the harassing conditions placed on private enterprise have been imposed with the object of surrounding it with conditions which will make it impossible to

[*Mr. Nimmo.*

carry on. This Bill practically says that, as private enterprise cannot make a success of its operations, we must alter the position and replace it with State control and ownership.

The speech of the hon. member for Normanby would make one come to the conclusion that the Government do not want private enterprise; that they do not want people to come and invest their money and establish industries here. According to the hon. member, the State should do all these things; yet State enterprises proved a ghastly failure, and we are still being taxed to pay interest on the money borrowed and spent on those enterprises. We blame private enterprise because we have hamstrung it, and then we want to replace it. I feel for people who have spent a great deal of their time and money in trying to do something for themselves and Queensland generally, if they are to have the results of their energy and life's work socialised. It is wrong for a Government to do anything on those lines, and I enter my strong protest against it. So long as the Government set up a bureau of this description and give it statutory powers, we cannot be successful. If such a bureau makes recommendations which do not fit in with Government policy, will members of the bureau be sacked? If the bureau does not make recommendations which suit the Government, will the Government nevertheless put its proposals into effect? If the bureau does make a recommendation which suits the Government and it is put into effect, and then there is a change of Government, will the new Government wipe out the bureau?

We are interfering with private enterprise at the expense of the people. We are interfering to such an extent that people in industry to-day do not know where they are. Nobody will invest money. We pass more laws in Queensland and in Australia than anywhere else in the world, and then we puff out our chests and say, "This is a free country." Nothing of the sort! It used to be free; but it is not now. People to-day, especially those who employ labour and have businesses, have great difficulty in discovering what is the law; and, when they do discover it and have carried on for a few months, Parliament amends the law, or a new regulation is issued which puts them to the trouble or annoyance of ascertaining once more whether they are not committing a breach of the law. People with money to invest get tired of doing that sort of thing; they are tired of too much party politics. If we could shut up Parliament for five years, it should be for the benefit of people like that. The people are just fed up with interference by governmental regulation; and the sooner we recognise it the better. We shall not improve conditions by this Bill or any other Bill unless we modify our interference and limit our restrictions. We are politicians, and we try to pacify the people with palliatives.

We talked about unemployment in 1925, and passed an Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Act to deal with that problem. Now we have a measure laying down practically the same basis of action, which did not cope with the evil in the least degree. I speak feelingly, because we are not relieving the position, and never will if we keep on as we are going, socialising industry and bringing down everything to one level,

instead of building up. Hon. members will realise what chaos that will result in.

There is another aspect of this question. Suppose that, with all the good intention in the world, we agree to do something for the rehabilitation of industry. We have to remember that we are only one State of the Commonwealth. We must remember that we are restricted by tariffs and other things over which the State Government have no control. It might be possible to arrive at a solution upon an Australian-wide basis; but it is no use one State endeavouring to carry out a policy that will be nullified by the actions of other States.

The Bill does not indicate who the eight outside appointees will be. The hon. member for Normanby tendered a little advice to the Premier, when he suggested the source from which they might be recruited, but that is just the danger. It has been said, and perhaps with a great deal of sincerity, that the Premier and many of his supporters are prepared to do the right thing, but they are being driven by an irresponsible section. How can we in such circumstances expect a Bill or a bureau to save us? It cannot be done. The Premier will have to be very careful in the selection of the appointees if the bureau is to be given a fair and reasonable chance, and the necessary co-operation is to be secured for the benefit of the State as a whole. Upon the type of appointees will depend whether or not the bureau will obtain the goodwill of those engaged in industry.

The hon. member for Maree devoted about half an hour to an attempt to criticise the splendid speech delivered by the hon. member for West Moreton merely because the latter hon. member had suggested six points for the serious consideration of the Government and the bureau. In his attempt to ridicule the suggestions of the hon. member for West Moreton, the hon. member for Maree stated that if a visitor from Mars heard the remarks of the hon. member for West Moreton the citizen of Mars would immediately decide that the hon. member was decrying his country. With the hon. member for West Moreton I am proud of my country, and I shall resist any effort that might be made to damage it. I give hon. members opposite credit for expressing their opinions; but I deplore the action of certain hon. members in endeavouring to criticise hon. members on this side merely for political advantage. It does not say that I am opposed to the best interests of my country merely because I am prepared to express my candid opinion. I know that my country is capable of great possibilities, and I agree with the Premier that there should be a combination of effort to ensure the success of this State; but that cannot be done under existing circumstances, because class legislation has set up an insuperable barrier. If we can get away from party politics, and if we can invite the whole of the people—

Mr. O'KEEFE: Why not advocate Socialism?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I do not believe in Socialism. I believe that the success of this country depends upon individual effort. I do not hold with the equality of man. We are born unequal, and we go through life unequal—unequal in energy, ability, and capacity. By their class legislation the Government are assisting considerably to kill

Mr. Plunkett.]

the personal initiative of our people and to kill private enterprise. We cannot hope to lift our country out of its difficulties merely by appealing for the votes of the people. We may get Governments into power, and keep them in office by tickling the ears of the people with pleasant promises, but that will not help the State. If the State is prosperous, it does not matter what Government is in power, or what party is in opposition. There is a human element within us which becomes uppermost when we make an appeal to the people to return us to power, but very often those appeals are not made in the interests of the State.

I am very much opposed to this Bill, and could speak for a long time upon its objections. I have entered my protest regarding the difficulties I see in connection with it.

The hon. member for Maree asked how the land tax could be abolished in these precarious times. The late Government did not re-enact the super land tax; but the present Government were not long in power before it was again imposed. It would be better for Queensland and Australia if that form of taxation was wiped out altogether. Land is the basis of all our wealth; and we cannot talk about encouraging the people to produce if at the same time we are taxing them out of existence.

The people in the cities fail to realise that their position is maintained only by keeping production up to a certain level. It is the drop in the prices of primary products which has caused our present troubles. If these prices had remained at their former level, our present difficulties would never have arisen.

The hon. member for Maree also stated that the Government had reimposed the old railway rates and fares because the late Government reduced them on the eve of an election. He did not tell the whole story. He did not say that the Government failed to increase fares and freights in Brisbane and the suburbs in the same proportion as fares and freights were increased in the country, where our wealth is produced. If the Government desired to govern fairly, why did they increase fares and freights on one section of the people, and allow another section to go scot free?

I know that it is difficult under present conditions to reduce expenditure, but governmental expenditure is too high. That is brought home to us when we consider the number of people in this State, and when we realise that 40 per cent. of the total taxation is earmarked to pay the wages of the State employees. That is a very high percentage; and it would pay the Government to engage some outside authority to make a complete investigation of the public service from top to bottom with a view to eliminating those employees who are not capable of earning their money. Until that is done, I shall not be convinced that many of our Government departments are not over-staffed. I am not alone in that opinion. It is high time that the Government caused some investigation to be made so that something might be done to reduce governmental costs.

Private enterprise is to-day hamstrung by excessive taxation and restrictive conditions. These facts prevent it expanding. Successive Governments have brought about this set of conditions; and now the Government declare

[*Mr. Plunkett.*

that, because private enterprise is not expanding, they must replace it with socialised industry. To do this would be calamitous, especially to the people on the land.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [4.24 p.m.]: One must realise at this stage of the consideration of this Bill that it is practically impossible to break new ground. It has been considered from all angles, and statistics from all the world over have been quoted on matters appertaining to it. I honestly believe that the Premier is not sincere in bringing down this measure. I believe that he realises that, if he could only throw off the influences operating within his own party, he has all the machinery necessary in measures already on the statute-book to achieve the results desired by his party. Already in the various Government departments the Premier has all the information that he seeks to get by this Bill. The hon. gentleman has the ball at his feet; and no one realises better than he that we cannot continue to produce at a cost which is in excess of the price realised overseas for our products. Eighty per cent. of our butter, and 90 per cent. of our wheat and wool are exported overseas; indeed, practically every product which creates employment and wealth in Queensland is exported in varying quantities to other countries. If we are to continue to export at a loss, or to export under conditions which involve subsidies of various kinds, it stands to reason that industry cannot employ all the labour that should be employed.

Mr. FOLEY: Other countries are saying the same thing.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member is prone to go to other countries, but I prefer to stay in Queensland. I have no wish to go to Jerusalem for an illustration. (Laughter.) No other country in the world can be quoted to fit in with the conditions that are peculiarly applicable to Australia, and more particularly to Queensland. We are a primary producing country, with excellent opportunities for development, whereas most of the other countries are primary manufacturing and have a great surplus population. We should realise that we must export to create the wealth of this country. It has been foolishly said that we should live within our own boundaries; in other words, that we should be self-sufficient. That is a most stupid argument. Could we, for example, eat all our butter and wheat, or could we wear all the wool we produce? Certainly not!

When we get down to fundamental, we realise that all the information that the Premier may glean as a result of this legislation will not improve the position one iota, because the hon. gentleman has to cut the costs of production. Let me examine the position as I know it to have existed in Australia for many years. We have hopelessly failed on the manufacturing side of our activities. We set off by placing a 10 per cent. tariff on manufactured articles from overseas. That tariff was increased up to 60 and 70 per cent.; but, despite that, our locally produced articles have not monopolised the home market. That failure has been due to the fact that, as heavy duties were placed on imported articles, costs went up proportionately, so that the articles manufactured in Australia cost just as much as, if not more than, the imported article in some cases. That makes it impossible for the

article to be purchased and for production to take place at a cost somewhat in consonance with the prices realised for primary products. Let us look the facts in the face. If the suggestion is made that costs will have to come down, there is immediately the accusation that there is a desire to sweat and starve the workers of the State. The indisputable fact remains that those who are responsible for the sweating and starving are the people who expect one set of workers to find the wherewithal for those who are unemployed to live on. There is no one responsible for this but the supporters of hon. members opposite. We do not want to starve anyone; but sooner or later we must face the position. If we produce butter and sell it overseas at a loss, we cannot afford to employ people here. If we produce wheat, the position is exactly the same. If we cannot manufacture our raw materials in our own country and employ our people, then the industry must collapse. The Premier is sufficiently conversant with the position in Queensland and Australia to realise that the present condition of affairs must cease; but in passing this legislation he is, to some extent at least, fooling the people.

Mr. FOLEY: In what way?

Mr. EDWARDS: The Premier knows the position, and no further information that he can get will help him. The Labour Government appointed the beef cattle industry commission. Did they act on the advice of that commission? I want to give Mr. Payne the greatest credit for his report in regard to that industry, because, although he is a public servant, he was big enough to state exactly what was wrong in the industry. What was stated in that report is absolutely true, and that has been borne out by facts. What did the Government do to rectify the position? An advisory committee was appointed to go into the question of land rents in the sheep areas when the price of wool first fell. Did that committee not definitely report that, under the existing legislation, it was impossible for the industry to continue? Was that report acted upon? Of course, it was not! That proves that the hon. gentleman does not require the information, because, on account of the control of industry by the workers, he cannot possibly apply it at the present time. Is the hon. gentleman going to be big enough to save this State? In 1924 Mr. Theodore had the opportunity to save the State. He stated definitely that the position could be saved. When he came back from the old country and realised that certain things had to be altered before he could get any money to carry on, he definitely stated that the extremists in the Labour organisation must go. But how far did he carry that out? The opportunity was there. The ball was at his feet, the same as it is at the feet of the Premier to-day; but he was not game to kick it. Unfortunately, that is the position to-day. The Premier is not game to say that we must clear up the unfortunate position in regard to industry, relieve industry of taxation, and create such a position that industry will be able to function and introduce new capital and employ our workers. If the Premier did that, he would have three-fourths of the people in the State behind him; but courage is necessary, and it is not forthcoming in regard to the all-important question that we are discussing at the present time.

When hon. members opposite introduced an amending Bill in connection with the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Act in 1925, they said it was going to function exactly along the lines that this Bill is going to function. But what did it do? It did nothing but hamper industry. No matter what statements may be made by the Premier or other hon. members opposite, the fact remains that the information sought under this Bill is obtainable from the different departments if the Government will only use it. They must realise that the country has to be worked on sound business lines, and that, when we export our products overseas, we have to get something in return so that the producers of those products will have sufficient confidence and means to employ the labour in the State. Until we do that we are not going to get out of our difficulties; but will be further involved, and ultimately get to such an unfortunate position that our industries will collapse. Do hon. members opposite want them to collapse? Are they just edging on this position like the man who has been on the spree, and who says, "I will take the last drink," and that puts him on the spree again? Are they edging on in that way, or are they trying to right the position so as to bring Queensland back to financial stability? Many representatives of outside Labour organisations—it would be wrong perhaps, to say Labour members in Parliament, as they have not made definite statements—but statements are definitely made outside that the sooner the capitalistic system and private enterprise break down the better. Does the Premier believe that, and is he trying to bring that about? If he is, we have indeed got into a deplorable position. There is no need for the Premier to gather statistics or get reports in connection with this proposed Bureau of Industry, as he has the whole of the information available now. Has he sufficient courage to get up in his place and say that Queensland must be saved? If he could shake off the influence behind him at the present time, the people of the State would respect him for it. The Premier must realise that our boys and girls who are growing up will not be able to find employment if we are going to fool about under these conditions. We must be prepared to face our difficulties, and realise that there has been a serious falling off in the prices of our primary products sent overseas, and we must meet that falling off by the cutting of costs.

It is quite wrong to ask the people under these conditions whether they are agreeable to have certain concessions taken away from them. They will never agree to that. Where there is one man who will do so there are 500 who will not. A man generally says, "I will hang on for the time being, and probably something will turn up." We want men to-day to exercise leadership, and do things in the interests of the people.

If Mussolini had charge of affairs in Queensland, would we be in the position we are in to-day? Would Italy be in the position she is in to-day if Mussolini had fooled about with the conditions there when he first took office? I am not going to say that we require a Mussolini here. What we require is common sense on the part of a leader who will say to the people, "We realise that there must be a cutting down of costs all round."

Mr. GLEDSON: Why do you not try it on?

Mr. Edwards.

Mr. EDWARDS: How can I try it on? If I were in the position of the Premier, I would try it on, and take the chance of the crowd behind me kicking me out, because I have sufficient confidence in the people outside to know that they stand for decent common sense; and that is all I have enunciated. If hon. members opposite are sincere, let them get up and state their case. After all is said and done, they must realise, as any schoolboy realises, that, if 100 bags of wheat or 100 lb. of butter are produced at a certain figure and sent away at a loss, business cannot be extended or employment found for our people. All that I am asking the Premier is to have sufficient courage to fight this cause himself. Never mind asking the people outside to do it for him! He has had enough commissions and advisory boards to last for a long time. Their reports are to be found in such profusion that it would take three or four trains to carry them away. Let him go into the question himself, when he will find that there is only one way of solving it, and that is, to do the job himself and get the people back to work at a reasonable return. As our position improves and progress continues and our State develops gradually, he can improve their position.

At 4.43 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [4.43 p.m.] in reply: I have listened carefully to most of the speeches that have been delivered since the Bill was first introduced. It would appear that many hon. members on the opposite side have not taken the trouble to read the Bill or to attempt to understand its aims and purposes, or consider the object of the Government in introducing it. They have very largely taken up the attitude, "This is a Bill introduced by a Labour Premier and supported by the Labour Party, therefore it must be condemned." The attitude of the party opposite was very clearly indicated in the declaration of a former deputy leader of their party, Colonel Rankin, who, when he held that position, said, "We are not here to criticise; we are here to condemn." Realising the position of Queensland to-day, I say very definitely that, if we were confined to the mentality of hon. members opposite to find a way out of our difficulties, I should be very fearful of the future. But we realise that they are very largely politically cynical, that they represent only sectional interests in the community, and that they thrive by playing upon the baser passions that animate mankind. That is the aim and purpose of their activities very largely, and to that extent their speeches, which indicate that attitude, may be discounted.

The Leader of the Opposition dealt with the Bill from the point of view of individualism. He dived into the archives of the past, and sought from the lessons of history to prove that a form of collectivism or community effort for the encouragement of industry was doomed to failure. The Leader of the Opposition is a very interesting example of the mid-Victorian attitude of mind. He trots out old saws and political proverbs with all the air of announcing a new idea. We realise that the form of individualism for which he stands is the line of political thought and the policy that has led the world into the conditions that exist to-day. What is the position in Queensland,

in Australia, and in the world to-day? Is it the result of the Labour policy; is it the result of a Socialist policy; or is it the result of conditions over which Labour has never had any control?

Hon. members opposite, and particularly the hon. member for Murilla, may blame the previous Labour Government. The hon. member for Murilla is the political genius who assumed that he had organised the railway finances and had placed them on a sound basis by writing off £28,000,000 of capital indebtedness and transferring the interest charge to the Treasury Department. The whole thing was ridiculous. It indicates very clearly the attitude of the hon. gentleman generally towards life. He would say in effect that, if you could make a thing disappear temporarily from sight, you could delude yourself into believing that it no longer existed. However, I am dealing with more important things than the hon. member for Murilla. He and his ideas are only a mere incident in the scheme of things. By and by men who hold similar views will be referred to by historians as being the strange product of an age that did not represent the real aim and genius of the people.

That is very clearly indicated by the recent elections. Listening to the speeches of hon. members opposite, one would imagine that they had never been a Government. They have the audacity to get up in Parliament and lecture the present Government on what they ought to do with regard to industry. What did they do when they were the Government? They then had the opportunity to put any policy into effect. They had the opportunity to do all the things they say the present Government ought to do. They certainly did carry out a policy with very disastrous results to the people of Queensland. When the people had an opportunity of dealing with them they hurled them into that oblivion which awaits all Governments and individuals who are recreant to their trust and who betray the solemn pledges made to the people during election times.

This Bill is a serious attempt to provide for orderly planning in industry, and to mobilise the resources of Queensland in a manner that will enable the best results to accrue to the people of the State. I have never claimed, nor do I claim now, that this Bill is going to alter the economic structure of society. No Bill of itself can do that. The problem is much greater and much wider than can be dealt with by a mere Act of Parliament. The Bill does affirm the necessity and the desirability of organising the resources of the State so that by a system of orderly planning development can proceed along sound lines. Is there not scope for development in Queensland? Can anyone say that this State, with its great natural wealth and its small population, is at the end of its resources, and that nothing can be done to provide satisfactory employment for the people of the present and future generations? If that were to be seriously asserted as a fact, and it were true, it would indicate that we were incapable and unworthy of holding the country. I believe that our resources are great. In fact, we know them to be great; and we have sufficient faith in the State and genius of our people to realise that by a system of orderly planning public development can take place in a manner which will give

[Mr. Edwards.]

better results than has been the case in the past.

The Leader of the Opposition, when replying to my second reading speech, talked about continuity of policy. He suggested that the Government were not carrying out any continuity of policy, and that they were, in effect, simply seeking to destroy the work of the previous Government. There is nothing serious about a statement of that kind. It is not a statement worthy of a man who, despite the fact that he is now in opposition, has equal responsibilities towards the State. We know that, under the conditions under which public development has taken place in the past, there has been no continuity of policy. For example, Governments have planned railways which have never been proceeded with, while in other cases they have completed railways although it would have been better for the State if they had not been built.

Again, can it be said that we have had a system of orderly planning in regard to land settlement? I take the view that, no matter how much secondary industries may be established in Queensland, this State will continue for all time to be largely a primary producing State. It is desirable that that should be so. Primary production is the natural occupation of mankind. No one would desire for this State the industrialised type of civilisation which exists in many countries to-day. In any case, secondary industries are part of the general developmental problems of the State, and can only exist side by side with the development of its natural resources, and to a large extent that development is dependent on the consuming power of the people.

The Bill proposes to introduce a system of orderly planning so that we can achieve the best results possible for the people with the resources at our disposal, and in that way provide new activities for the people. Take the position of development in many areas in Queensland. For example, is the development of North Queensland to be left to the whims of a chance political majority in Parliament; or is it desirable that an organised scheme should be adopted, and so much of it as is possible carried into effect, irrespective of what Government might be in power? It might be possible to finance that development by methods other than those adopted in the past. Is it to be said that the only means by which development is to be permitted is by the Government borrowing money, thereby increasing the national debt? We are entitled to explore every form of activity to bring about the desired results.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the speech that I made at the gathering of the Highland Society last Saturday night. I have nothing to withdraw from the speech I made on that occasion. The speech was in entire accord with the general policy of the Labour Party. The Leader of the Opposition does not appear to realise that it is only by means of community service that individuality can be properly expressed. There is a vast difference between the conception of individual freedom as held by the Labour Party and the opinions held by our opponents in the direction of individual license. The Leader of the Opposition quite obviously stands for a form of individual freedom. To do what? To exploit the natural resources of the State for individual gain. On the other hand, the platform of

the Labour Party postulates that individual freedom and capacity can be developed to the fullest extent only to the degree that men are able to give national or community service. In no case was that more fittingly portrayed than in the old Highland clan system—the most democratic system that existed in that age, when all men had equal rights under the law, had equal obligations, and were equally entitled to share in the natural resources controlled by the clan. The chief of the clan was only the leader of his fellows; and the principle on which they acted was in entire accord with the principles of the Labour Party—each for all, and all for each; the injury of one, the concern of all. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition chose a rather unfortunate illustration from his point of view when calling attention to a speech which I made to a very distinguished gathering of people, who at all times have played a meritorious part in the life of this country.

Various hon. members have suggested that the Government should do certain things. It is extraordinary the amount of advice that a Labour Government gets. That advice is always of the same character. I remind hon. members that the Labour Party, in common with other parties, goes to the country with a definite programme. It obtains a mandate from the people if the members of the party secure a majority. The Bill now under discussion was one of the principal proposals placed before the people, who gave the Labour Government a mandate to put it into effect. To the extent that the Labour Government carry out their obligations to the people of this country, and to the degree to which they seek to give effect to the platform of the Labour Party, they are denounced in no unmeasured terms. Every base motive is attributed to them; every foul insult that degraded minds can think of is hurled at them. Why? Because members of the Labour Party are true to their principles and faithful to their trust. On the other hand, to the extent to which they are prepared to depart from the principles of the Labour platform and adopt the principles of their opponents, they are hailed as great statesmen and paraded before the public as men who put the nation before party. The critics of the Labour Party arrogantly assume to themselves the guardianship of public interests, and claim that to the extent that their policy is given effect to in the country national interests are protected and safeguarded. What is the position? Every country in the world to-day is suffering grievously from unemployment. "Abolish all restrictions in industry," says the Leader of the Opposition—the leader of the Country Party, which every time that it has been in power has adopted a sectional policy more than any other Government that has ever existed. At all times the Country Party has been sectional in its interest, in its policy, and in its administration; and has done more in the direction of restriction than any trade union movement ever attempted to do. We have to-day in existence a Dairy Control Board which arrogates to itself the right to say that 20 per cent. of the Australian produce shall not be exported. Does that not mean control of industry for the purpose of creating a scarcity and thereby artificially raising prices? What is the difference between the form of control and the form of Labour control, which says, in effect, "We have

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

only our labour to sell. We must find an employer, and we are going to combine to get the best terms possible." It is all restriction of industry.

Mr. MAHER: Do you agree with that?

The PREMIER: The hon. member for West Moreton, who belongs to the early Georgian periods, asks, "Do you agree with it?" I say definitely that it is a very dangerous policy; and it will be found to be so, because, to the extent that you hold perishable products, it is costing you interest on its capital value and storage charges at all times are mounting up. The New Zealand Food Board tried it a few years ago, and lost considerably by its efforts, the loss running into over £2,000,000.

Mr. MAHER: The speculator in London holds it.

The PREMIER: Of course he does, and that is what I object to. Speculation is individualism in its worst form. The hon. member could not have given me a better illustration. If he stands for individualism, he must stand for it with all its alleged merits and in all its detail. You cannot pick the eyes out of a policy like picking plums out of a pudding and say, "I will pick this, and this only." If the hon. member stands for individualism, he means the right of the speculator to speculate in anything on which he can make a profit. That is the old Manchester school—"Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. Pay the lowest price for wheat and flour and sell the bread to the people at as high a rate as possible."

Mr. MAHER: What is the difference between the producer and the speculator holding it?

The PREMIER: The hon. member stands for individualism. He believes in the speculator being permitted to do what he likes in order to earn a profit. He says, in effect, that this is the sole method under which industry can be carried on.

Mr. MAHER: I did not say that at all.

The PREMIER: The hon. member did not put it as clearly as that, but I am interpreting to intelligent people what the hon. member meant. What we stand for is the exact opposite of that. We agree that there should be orderly marketing, and also that produce should be held and the markets controlled. Abolish gluts at one period as far as you can, and do away with artificial scarcity. That is the whole basis of orderly marketing. It can only be brought about as the result of careful planning in industry, and should only be done in the public interests. Under a system of orderly marketing such as this Government believes in, the control of the marketing will be in the interests of the producers in the industry and in the interests of the general public. On the other hand, individualism, which hon. members opposite praise so much, means permission to the speculator to hold the commodity in a manner likely to give him individual profit, whether the public interest is adversely affected or not.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is clear that the Premier has taken a wrong view of what I said. He is trying to represent that I have advocated speculation, and is building up his case on that, and that is offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

The PREMIER: If to show the logical result of the hon. member's argument is offensive, I submit that the fault lies with the hon. member himself. Speaker after speaker on the opposite side argued in favour of removing restrictions on industry. What did they mean by that? It has been suggested, and very definitely argued in this Chamber to-day, that the restrictions placed on industry by the present Government are the sole reason for existing difficulties, and that, if they were removed, industry would resume a normal course and everybody would be employed.

Another phrase used by the Leader of the Opposition is that old one dealing with supply and demand. Let me deal with these two phases of the problem. What are the restrictions in industry, and what were the conditions obtaining prior to those restrictions in industry? Hon. members opposite cannot, I repeat, have it both ways. The White Australia policy, for example, is a restriction on industry. If all restrictions are to be removed, then, according to that idea, speculators should be able to exploit coloured labour. I suggest that no one will seriously advocate that in this Chamber; yet the White Australia policy and everything involved in that conception is a restriction on industry.

Again, we have an Industrial Court which determines wages and conditions of labour. That is a confirmation of the principle that no one individual owns all industry, and that there is a public interest involved as well as the interests of the owner of the capital and those who work in the industry. There is a public interest involved in all these things; consequently who is going to argue for a policy that removes those restrictions in industry?

I said that the Leader of the Opposition had a mid-Victorian attitude towards life. That conception of industry may have been quite all right when individuals owned industry. It may have been all right when industries were carried on in a small way and when the journeyman of to-day became the master of to-morrow. But we know that, with mass production and the development of joint stock companies and trading combinations, all Governments worthy of the name have been forced, whether they liked it or not—whether they were Conservative, Liberal, or Labour—to step in and place restrictions on those who sought to obtain control of industry.

Individualism in production is almost as extinct as individualism in other economic directions. No one individual can control a great industry. It is the machinations of individuals who combine to pool their capital for use in industry which control it; and, if they are allowed an unrestricted right of control, the public interest may be affected. With the results every Government is called upon to deal.

Take supply and demand. The Leader of the Opposition brought forward that question in the same way as people frequently quote Holy Writ as if it were something that could not be answered and it were blasphemy of the highest possible degree to argue against it. We know the operations of supply and demand and the economic laws governing them; and we also know that supply and demand are both subject

to control. We know that the supply of goods is practically unlimited, that the collective capacity of the world to produce is also unlimited, and that the difficulty to-day is that the supply is greater than the solvent demand. If we could balance solvent demand with available supply, our difficulties would be immediately overcome.

Other countries, such as the United States of America, have all these problems in the same degree at least as we have them. In Australia the evils of unemployment are laid at the door of the restrictions of Labour laws. At whose door shall we lay the trouble in the United States of America? There are no Factories and Shops Acts there, no legal restrictions of hours. Men can do what they like to some extent with their own businesses—to quote the phrase of the Leader of the Opposition. Yet unemployment is four times as great in the United States of America as it is in Australia, and the farmers of the Middle West are in a very bad position indeed. These things in each country are due to the same cause; and the same remedy can be applied when mankind is intelligent and brave enough to put it into effect.

I regret that the Opposition have taken up the attitude towards this Bill that their speeches disclose. It is no doubt due to a consciousness of their own failure. They must realise in their saner moments the conditions brought about in Queensland during the period they were the Government. They carried out their policy in their own way, with the result that unemployment increased enormously, and poverty of a dire kind became the lot of a large number of the people of this State. When a Government got into power which was prepared to do things—a Government which was ready to make an effort to clear up the wreckage left by the previous Government—then the efforts of hon. members opposite were directed into channels which may prevent the Government from being successful. Failures themselves—for they failed ignominiously and miserably—they cannot bear to contemplate the possibility of the success of another Government. If hon. members opposite were worthy of real notice in the community, some of the speeches made this afternoon would be more damaging to Queensland trade than anything else which could be advanced. If some of the speeches delivered by hon. members opposite were issued along with copies of the prospectus of a company being floated here, it would be the end of any such enterprise. It is a matter for very serious regret that, for political purposes and out of political malevolence, some hon. members are prepared to make statements which, if taken seriously, would be very damaging to the industries of this State. Fortunately, they are a discredited minority. Fortunately, the people outside rate them at their true value. The people of this country realise the facts sufficiently well for themselves to be able to discount those statements in their entirety. I hope the Bill will go through in its present form. I am satisfied that such a bureau will render valuable service to Queensland, and that it will be a means of enabling this Government and succeeding Governments to carry on the development of this country by a system of orderly planning, which will give the best results to the people of this State.

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

Consideration of the Bill in Committee made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

STATE TRANSPORT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, agreed to.

Clause 5—“*Establishment of State Transport Board*”—

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [5.18 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

“On page 3, line 4, omit the word—

‘three,’

and insert in lieu thereof the word—

‘five.’”

I do not think that a board of three is sufficiently representative in character to deal with the whole of the interests involved in the transport problem. Considerable attention is being given to the problem throughout the world to-day, and boards are being formed in the different countries in an endeavour to co-ordinate transport services. In speaking of the co-ordination of transport services, it is not suggested that a board should be established solely for the purpose of extending preference to one type of transport.

We all recognise that in this State as well as in other States in Australia there exist several forms of transport which did not exist several years ago. It was this fact that actuated the previous Government to introduce a Bill to provide for the formation of a State Transport Board with a view to co-ordinating all forms of transport. Similar measures have been taken in Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain, and, in fact, in every civilised country, because they recognised the importance of this step. They are all suffering, as we are, through the popularising of modern forms of transport.

Our railway system has cost an enormous amount of money. The indebtedness of the railways to the State is £64,000,000. The writing down of the indebtedness by £23,000,000 last session did not mean, and I never made any such statement, that the debt of this State was reduced correspondingly. It was purely a matter of bookkeeping, and that part of the indebtedness was transferred from the railways to the consolidated revenue. The Premier twitted me on several occasions with having said that our indebtedness had been reduced by the amount which the railway indebtedness was written down. I can quote from “Hansard” to show that even before I introduced the State Transport Co-ordination Bill, the present Premier, in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, made one of the finest speeches in this Chamber in favour of the capitalisation of the railways being reduced by a considerable amount.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That was not your scheme, though.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: He did not oppose my scheme.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He did.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: He did not oppose the principle of my scheme. What he objected to was whether a greater or lesser amount than £23,000,000 should be written off.

Mr. Morgan.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I was leading up to the fact that it was owing to this that we are discussing this Bill. This clause provides for the creation of a State Transport Board, consisting of the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner of Main Roads, and the Commissioner of Police; but, unless the various other transport interests have representation, the board will be a lop-sided one. What the Commissioner of Police has to do with the co-ordination of transport I do not know; neither do I know why he should be appointed to this board, whereas the commercial and local authority interests should be represented.

This is the first opportunity I have had of stating in this Chamber my sincere regret at the unfortunate absence of the Minister for Transport, who met with a most painful accident some time ago. I know the hon. gentleman took a very keen interest in this Bill, and no doubt he feels his absence to-day rather keenly. I trust that he will soon be restored to perfect health, and will be able to resume the duties of his most responsible office.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: When the Bill sponsored by the Moore Government was before Parliament, the hon. gentleman who is now Minister for Transport, speaking from the Opposition benches, said that he thought the local authorities should be represented on the State Transport Board. Hon. members will remember that the members of our board were the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner of Main Roads, two representatives of the commercial, business, financial, and other interests of the State, and one representative familiar with transport matters generally. We took the view that it would be unfair to restrict the representation only to sectional interests, and that it would be manifestly unfair to do anything detrimental to other forms of transport, unless action had to be taken in the interests of providing cheaper transport for the people and in the interests of the State generally.

The position with regard to transport is not dissimilar from the position in other walks of life where competition is prevalent. We do not discriminate in our legislation so far as manufacturing industries are concerned. For example, we do not stipulate that one firm shall work its employees forty-four hours and another firm of the same kind shall work its employees a longer number of hours. Our legislation aims at regulating those matters. That is what we should endeavour to do from the transport point of view, as discrimination should not be exercised in the interests of one section of transport. Our aim should be to place all forms of transport upon an equal footing. In the competition which then ensues it will be a case of the survival of the fittest.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is a long way away from a discussion of the clause, which deals with the establishment of a State Transport Board.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I am concerned to see that all forms of transport have equal representation on the board. The Commissioner for Railways will probably be

the chairman of the board, and the other two members mentioned in the clause—the Commissioner of Main Roads and the Commissioner of Police—have really nothing to do with transport. The Commissioner of Main Roads is interested in road construction, but neither he nor the Commissioner of Police is interested in transport. The clause does not provide for representation for the other forms of transport.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Why not have a representative of the Transport Unions?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It would be impossible to have every section represented on a board of this description; but the Bill makes provision for the appointment of sectional committees, and we would expect a representative of the Transport Unions to be appointed to a sectional committee.

When matters come forward for the consideration of the board, the Railway Commissioner, recognising that a large amount of money has been expended on the railways, would naturally look at the question from a railway aspect. That is the reason why I want the board to be enlarged. I recognise that every sectional interest cannot be represented on the board. When the original Bill was introduced, some people considered that the board should consist of representatives of local authorities, representatives of unions, and so forth, but that is impossible in a board of this description. The aim and object is to co-ordinate transport as much as possible in the interests of the people. All boiled down, it is the people who are concerned, and if the board was enlarged it would carry more weight, and the Minister would be more justified in adopting the recommendations of the board.

The CHAIRMAN: The clause makes provision for a board consisting of three members, and the amendment proposes to increase that number to five. I have given the matter a good deal of consideration, and in my opinion, as the amendment increases the number of representatives on the board, it must mean an increased charge on the revenue beyond the amount recommended in the message from His Excellency the Governor; therefore I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [5.33 p.m.]: The amendment will not necessarily increase the expenditure, because the Bill does not say that the members of the board shall be paid. The Bill provides that, if it is considered desirable, the regulations may provide that they can be paid fees.

The CHAIRMAN: I have given my ruling, and it must stand unless it is disagreed with.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [5.34 p.m.]: Had the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla been accepted, it was my intention to move an amendment providing that representatives of the local authority, motor transport, and producing interests should be appointed to the board. As the proposed amendment has been declared out of order, I move the following amendment:—

“On page 3, line 8, omit the words—
‘The Commissioner of Police’—

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

‘A representative of the motor transport interests of the State.’”

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

I have always contended that it is a mistake to put the Commissioner of Police on this board—not that I have any wrong opinion about the Commissioner, but his duty is to care for the life and limb of pedestrians, and to see that the traffic by-laws are carried out per medium of the police who are detailed for that duty. I cannot see that the Commissioner of Police has any interest beyond that under a State Transport Act, which is designed to co-ordinate all forms of transport service. The Commissioner is not a transport man at all, but is a custodian of the peace. He has nothing whatever to do with actual transport matters—that is, with the regulations that govern the loads carried on the roads—and he has nothing to do with the work of the Main Roads Commission. We should see to it that all interested parties should be represented. Despite the fact that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla was ruled out of order I think it would have been wise if the Government had widened the scope of the board. At any rate, now that we are tied down to three members, let us see to it that the interests involved are adequately represented. The Commissioner for Railways, as the representative of the main carrying corporation, undoubtedly should be on the board, also the Commissioner of Main Roads, who has charge of the construction and maintenance of the roads. The subscribing public—the motor transport, the commercial, and the producing interests—should be represented on the board, so that their viewpoint can be presented and their interests safeguarded. Under the clause as it stands the board is purely one of Government servants, who would be dominated by the party in office. The people who are contributing the money are the owners of transport services, and the producing and commercial interests should have some voice in the framing of regulations. As the principal contributors to the main roads fund, they should be represented on the board. The Commissioner of Police is only concerned about the life and limb of the community, which are matters entirely apart from transport, and he should not be a member of the board; but it is only fair that the interests involved should have some voice in the framing of regulations and the carrying out of the Act. I think all hon. members will admit the fairness of the case I have put up. It is a mistake to endeavour to confine the control of such a matter or if any such Government board to public servants. The people who are directly interested should be called in to give their advice; and I think that the community interested in transport—not only the owners of motor cars, but also merchants and traders—should have representation. That is a fair plea, and I trust the Government will see the justice of my contention. If they do so, they will satisfy the demands of the public.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [5.42 p.m.]: I can hardly grasp the real desires of the hon. member. We see evidences of a conflict of opinion amongst hon. members opposite. For instance, the hon. member for Murilla does not wish any sectional interests to be represented on the board, whereas the hon. member for Hamilton moves an amendment to provide that representation shall be given to motorists, although in a subsequent amendment it is suggested that the producing interests shall be represented.

The Commissioner of Police is a most important member of the board, because clause 21 takes away from him in his capacity as Commissioner of Police the power of recommending the making of regulations under the Traffic Acts and transfers it to the board, which will then co-operate with the Police Department. I do not think the hon. member can be serious. The clause is an attempt on the part of the Government to constitute a board of men who are directly responsible to the Government for the transport services of the State. The absence of the Commissioner of Police would defeat the whole of the objects of the Bill. We wish to bring about co-ordination and deal with a very difficult problem. If the amendment were adopted, we would have to take a vote of motorists throughout the State, which, to my mind, borders on the ridiculous.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [5.45 p.m.]: A conference of Ministers of Transport in each State was called by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth to consider the question of co-ordinating transport services; and a report was issued, in which a number of recommendations were embodied. Some respect should be paid to those recommendations, if we are anxious to co-ordinate transport services.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Did they represent the motor interests?

Mr. MOORE: They did. The conference was presided over by an independent chairman. There was one representative from the railways, one representative of road construction authorities, one representative of motor interests, and one representative of the general public.

The PREMIER: What conference was that?

Mr. MOORE: The conference called by the Prime Minister of Australia, which sat in February last.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That was not the original amendment.

Mr. MOORE: The amendment provides for representation on behalf of local authorities, motor transport, and producing interests.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is not the amendment.

Mr. MOORE: We thought it would be better to adopt these recommendations so that all the States would eventually be placed on a common basis in the co-ordination of transport. When the chairman ruled that an amendment to increase the number of members on the board to five was not in order, there was only one thing to do, and that was to move an amendment to provide that the Commissioner of Police should not be a member of the board. He is not interested in transport; he has no information on the matter; and has nothing to do with it. But the other interests mentioned are very vitally concerned, and they should be represented on the board. It is extraordinary that a conference should be called to give consideration to this very important problem of co-ordinating the transport systems and then the recommendations should be ignored. The matter was brought up at every Premiers' Conference that I attended. One conference was specially summoned to deal with the problem.

The PREMIER: Another one was convened recently.

Mr. Moore.]

Mr. MOORE: What is the use of convening a conference if a State deliberately decides to go against the recommendations arrived at after very full consideration? All the States should endeavour to provide for the co-ordination of transport upon a uniform basis. The different States were endeavouring to cope with the problem in different ways; and it was deemed advisable to call a conference for the purpose of arriving at a uniform basis of action. The Commissioner of Police is charged with the control of the traffic, but he has no actual interest in transport or in the administration of the transport services. An official of the Transport Workers' Union would have a greater knowledge of the subject than the Commissioner of Police.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The board will recommend the making of traffic regulations.

Mr. MOORE: It is not necessary for the Commissioner of Police to be a member of a board to administer an Act of Parliament. All that he has to do is to see that his officers deal with those who break the law.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No. Must he stand by until someone is killed?

Mr. MOORE: No one suggests that. The Commissioner of Police is not a member of any board to-day which has to do with the control of traffic. The Home Department makes the regulations for the control of traffic, and the Commissioner of Police, through his officers, carries out the law. If a person breaks the traffic laws by exceeding the speed limit, or in some other respect, it is his duty to prosecute him.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You know that the Commissioner of Police makes recommendations to the Home Secretary.

Mr. MOORE: The Commissioner of Police makes recommendations for the control of traffic on the roads, but he has nothing to do with transport, the necessity of transport, or the fixation of fees. That is quite outside his sphere of operations; but those matters are not outside the sphere of those engaged in motor transport.

The conference relating to transport matters was called, not to eliminate all forms of transport competing with the railways, but to co-ordinate all forms of transport and secure the confidence of the public and those owning the various forms of transport. The conference considered that the Transport Boards should inquire as to the most economical form of transport to operate in the various States, if it were better that a branch railway should be torn up and a road for motor transport substituted, or if motor transport should act as feeders to and from the railhead or railway stations. The whole idea of the transport conference recommending the creation of the Transport Board was that the interests of the people and the owners of transport other than railways should not be sacrificed in the interests of the railways.

It was also suggested that the boards should not be overweighted with Government representatives. That is why the Transport Board brought into being last year by our Government consisted of five members.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why didn't you give the motor interests representation on that board?

[Mr. Moore.

Mr. MOORE: We gave the commercial and financial interests representation. They embraced the motor interests.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The amendment which you had printed previously embraced representation for the financial and commercial interests.

Mr. MOORE: That amendment was printed a long time ago, but, after the Chairman ruled out of order the amendment moved by the hon. member for Murilla to increase the representation on the board from three to five, it was found necessary to alter the wording. The press printed an intimation from the Home Secretary that this Bill was to be dropped, but it has been brought on suddenly at the last minute. The idea of our amendments is to inspire the confidence of people outside in the board. This board is being appointed for the specific purpose of co-ordinating transport interests, and not for the purpose of sacrificing one set of interests in order that another set may gain an advantage. It would be infinitely better to give the commercial interests representation in preference to the Commissioner of Police. The appointment of three Government representatives on the board can be for one purpose only. The Commissioner for Railways will be imbued with one particular purpose—that of making the railways pay—and if he can eliminate all railway competition, the better for himself. The Commissioner of Main Roads is only remotely interested in motor transport. His chief interest is in the class of transport using roads under his control, and the wear and tear incurred by that transport. I am not objecting to him; but I do think the appointment of the Commissioner of Police is wrong. Why not give representation to the commercial interests so that the public will have some say and be able to put a case from their point of view? It seems rather hopeless to persuade the Minister; but one would think that an attempt would be made to give effect to the combined wisdom of the transport conference that was held recently. If the hon. gentleman objects, he can say that he is determined to constitute the board of Government members, but there is no occasion for him to suggest that the Opposition are dumping this or that interest in this amendment. We want someone on the board who will have an opinion independent of Government officials, who, after all, are imbued solely with the idea of doing what the Government of the day want. The same remarks apply to other spheres. Government officials are trained to regard matters from one point of view, and we cannot expect the Commissioner for Railways, for example, to look with favour on competition that will make the position of the railways more difficult. Exactly the same position arose in the forestry administration of the State, when Mr. Swain, probably quite justifiably from his viewpoint by reason of his training, looked at only one aspect of forestry.

The transport conference suggested that there should be a preponderance of outside representation on the State Transport Board. If we cannot get that, at least we can endeavour to appoint a representative in place of the Commissioner of Police, who is only remotely interested in transport matters.

Mr. WATERS: What about an employees' representative?

Mr. MOORE: Anything would be better than having three Government members. At

least the outside point of view on transport questions should be available on the State Transport Board. When co-ordination of effort is aimed at in transport matters, it is only reasonable to include representation of other than Government interests.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [7 p.m.]: The only reason the Minister gave as to why the Commissioner of Police should be on the Transport Board was the fact that he had to administer the Act. Does not that apply to every Act of Parliament and to every department? The Commissioner and his officers have to see that the law is not broken, and, if the contention of the Minister is right, then the Commissioner of Police should be on every board appointed by the Government. The police are doing exceptionally well, and it was never intended that the control of traffic should be taken away from them; but all the Commissioner has to do is to administer the Act. There is no reason why he should be a member of the State Transport Board. Will the Minister accept an amendment, or move an amendment, to omit the Commissioner of Police and appoint a representative of all outside interests on the board? I am not in favour of particularising any special interest, because so many people are concerned. The users of motor cars are just as much concerned as the owners of motor cars. Then primary producers, commercial, and financial interests are all concerned. The general public are concerned, and even the man in the street is concerned to some extent in the control of traffic. The Minister should agree that there should be some outside representation. We want to get away from the principle that the board should be composed entirely of public servants. I attended the conference where a certain agreement was arrived at between the States, and it was generally recognised by every Minister of Transport, whether a Labour Minister or otherwise, that all interests should be represented on the transport boards.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They have not done that in New South Wales.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: In Victoria Mr. Cain, the Minister for Railways before the Labour Government went out of office, introduced a Bill making provision for a board similar to the Act now in existence in Queensland. The Bill was framed on the Queensland Transport Co-ordination Act, and representation was given to different interests. The Commissioner of Police would be out of place on the board, and would be like a fish out of water. His duty is to administer the law, and he should not be bothered about anything else. He is purely in charge of the police, and will perform his duty better off the board. The traffic will remain under his control, no matter how the board may be composed. There should be someone on the board to represent the interests of the community generally. We should appoint someone to counteract, so to speak, the action of the Commissioner for Railways, if he wishes to do anything over the fence. I would like the Minister to move an amendment appointing someone outside the public service as a member of the board.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) [7.7 p.m.]: I intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton. We all regret that the Minister is not present to put the Bill through owing to the accident which

happened to him. We all know the keen interest he has taken in this measure.

I would prefer to see a local authority representative on the board in preference to a representative of the motor transport interests. The local authorities have the control of roads in the various districts, and should have representation on the board. The Bill proposes to co-ordinate the different forms of transport; and the local authorities are as much concerned with the upkeep of the roads as the Commissioner for Railways is with railway transport. The Commissioner of Police is doing excellent work in looking after the traffic and in preserving life in connection with transport generally, and will continue to do that work without representation on the board. Motorists find a great deal of the money necessary for the upkeep of the roads, and should, therefore, have representation on the board. I trust the Minister will accept the amendment.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [7.9 p.m.]: The amendment is one which the Minister should accept at once, as it will help him out of a very difficult position. The Minister for Transport, we know, met with an accident, but a lot of accidents nearly happened to this Bill. (Laughter.) The fate of this Bill was in the balance for a long time. There were a number of rows in caucus over it. At any rate, now we have the Bill before us and an amendment has been moved which will improve the Bill and help the Minister out of his difficulties.

We have three commissioners on the proposed board, one of whom is the Commissioner of Police. There is no objection to the Commissioner of Police personally—he is an excellent officer—but there has been a good deal of competition by motor cars with railway traffic. Trucks were running all over the country and getting business from the railways; and no doubt, if the Commissioner of Police was on the State Transport Board, he would be expected by the Commissioner for Railways to haul all these fellows up, with the result that hon. members opposite would be in trouble and incur a lot of unpopularity. Hon. members opposite realise that a lot of trouble was coming to them in that way, and that was one of the causes of their differences in caucus. We are offering them a way out of their difficulties by proposing an amendment which will not only improve the Bill but will also meet the objections of some of their members. Let the hon. gentleman accept the amendment, and his Bill will go through in a very short time.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [7.13 p.m.]: The constitution of this board is unfair. The Commissioner for Railways naturally will feel that he has to do his best to make the railways pay. To-day they are in a difficult position financially, and the Commissioner for Railways will no doubt insist on all kinds of things being done to recover his position. Nobody objects to the Commissioner of Police, and I think, wisely, the board is to consist of only three members. Surely, however, it is not right that every section of the community should be brought under the control of three public servants! They should have a representative to speak on their behalf. I am perfectly sure that the Government will save themselves a lot of trouble if they will agree to the amendment. The hon. member for Cunningham

Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

has very rightly sized up the position, and wishes to save the acting Minister trouble. As far as possible all interests should be represented on the board. The Commissioner for Railways will be tempted to view the matter purely from the aspect of railway control. Only the other day I saw a letter which had been addressed to a person warning him that the law did not allow him to convey carrots in his own motor vehicle. We are urging the people to go on the land, but we should take care that some protection is extended to them.

Mr. R. M. KING (*Logan*) [7.16 p.m.]: We should endeavour to consider all interests; and that purpose can be served by deciding not to overweight the board by governmental control. The letter referred to by the hon. member for Wynnum was addressed to one of my constituents. Carrots did not appear on the list of exempted goods that were not subject to the control of the Main Roads Commission. The persons responsible for the preparation of the list of exempted goods did not thoroughly appreciate the position. I am not concerned so much as to whether the representative is a local authority representative, a representative of motor interests, or a representative of the producers, so long as he is a representative of the general public. This representative, together with the other representatives stated in the Bill, will be able to perform good work on the board; but it must not be overweighted with governmental control. With all due respect to the Commissioner of Police, he is not interested in transport matters. Very frequently we have been told that the police have a very large number of duties to perform, and it is now proposed to add to their already heavy list of duties. The Commissioner of Police is charged with the control and regulation of traffic, and he is doing that very well; but the Bill deals with the co-ordination of transport systems.

In many cases traffic control is a matter for local authorities, unless they desire to hand that control over to the police. This amendment will make for the better working of the board and the carrying out of the provisions of the Act.

The report of the conference of Australian Railways and Transport Authorities held in Sydney in February last, which was signed by Mr. A. E. Heath, as chairman, contains this paragraph—

“My view is that the confidence of all the interests concerned in the administrative authority is absolutely necessary to the success of any scheme for co-ordination, and I am unable to see that this can be expected under any of the existing schemes. The boards or committees now functioning are all, in my opinion, overweighted by governmental interests. This seems to me to be utterly inequitable, and it could hardly be wondered at if the opinion should have been formed by other interests that the policy of the Governments is directed towards the elimination of road transport, rather than towards its co-ordination.”

This report gives the constitution of the Transport Board in Victoria. It consists of one representative of the Public Works Department, who is chairman, one member representing the Commissioner for Railways, one member representing the Tramways

Board, one member representing the Melbourne Municipal Board, and one member representing the motor omnibus interests. We are only asking that a representative of the public interests should be appointed instead of the Commissioner of Police.

The PREMIER: What objection have you to the Commissioner of Police?

Mr. R. M. KING: I have no objection to the Commissioner of Police as a man or as an official; but he is now being asked to carry out duties apart altogether from those which he should carry out. The police are being loaded with additional duties. They have sufficient duties already. The amendment will give greater satisfaction to the general public.

The PREMIER: What particular qualification had Mr. Douglas?

Mr. R. M. KING: He was a financial man.

The PREMIER: Was he one of your financial advisers?

Mr. R. M. KING: He was not. We did not know much about Mr. Douglas apart from the fact that he was a financial man; but he did good work on the board. The Premier might just as well ask why Mr. E. E. Forth was put on the board. He was interested in commercial and transport matters.

The PREMIER: He is a good judge of bacon.

Mr. R. M. KING: He had greater qualifications than that. The appointments by the late Government on the State Transport Board were justified by results. The Government should be just as reasonable as we were in that respect. The amendment has not been moved for the purpose of creating undesirable obstruction, but with a sincere desire to make it as workable as possible and get the best results from it. The Act will be a difficult one to administer, and will cause a good deal of heartburning; therefore, it is as well to have a board which will understand the difficulties to be encountered. This is only an appeal to reason, and we do not care whether the amendment is moved from the Government benches or from this side.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [7.25 p.m.]: Hon members on the Opposition benches have made out a very good case for outside representation of motor transport on this board; but I cannot agree with their remarks concerning the Commissioner of Police, whose inclusion in the board I think is needed to sit good and hard on the road hogs. His appointment to the board will certainly strengthen his hands and give him added prestige. The number of motor accidents that occur from year to year is simply staggering. Militarism is nothing compared with the huge toll of life taken by motor transport. In one year in the United States of America 30,000 persons were killed and 1,000,000 were injured as the result of motor accidents. At that rate it would only require two years to reach figures in excess of the casualties sustained by the United States in the Great War. It is a marvel to me that people take this as a matter of course, although these dreadful losses are sustained, particularly amongst women and children. How many prominent public men also have lost their lives through motor accidents? This craze for speed gains us nothing. I prefer that the Commissioner of Police

should be on this board because some strong action is necessary to deal with speeding. I look upon the use of petrol and the internal combustion engine as the most devilish discovery since the invention of gunpowder. I only hope that the Commissioner of Police will be a particularly active member of the board.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) [7.23 p.m.]: I differ from the hon. member for Fassfern, because I think there is an unanswerable argument against the inclusion of the Commissioner of Police on the State Transport Board. The police are the custodians of the rights of the people, and are empowered to take proceedings when necessary, so that the administrative head of the police force should not be placed in any position in which he might possibly act in favour of his own staff. No one can cavil at the Commissioner's ability and his general personality, but we have no right to place him in an invidious position. I have no doubt of the Commissioner's sense of what is right; but I do not think he should be placed in the position, and certainly the public will have just reason for complaint.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [7.35 p.m.]: Hon. members opposite first of all circulated an amendment providing for the appointment of five members to the board, and, when that was ruled out of order, they say they want the general public to come in. The amendment is confined to one section—the motor section—and, if it is carried, that is the only section that will be represented. Had hon. members opposite taken up the stand that the Commissioner for Railways, who may be in conflict with other methods of transport, should be removed from the board, I could understand them, but, when they ask for the removal of the Commissioner of Police, I say they cannot have read the Bill. The Commissioner of Police is one of the most essential members of the board. Under this measure the board will take over the framing of regulations under the Heavy Vehicles Act, under the Traffic Act, and under the Machinery and Scaffolding Act as it applies to transport facilities in this State. The whole of the police force will be the body to do the field work. Although the police do control traffic in certain definite sections of this State and local authorities in the other sections, the whole of the provisions in regard to transfers, licenses, etc., and other provisions, will be administered by the police. I claim that the Commissioner of Police is the most capable man to advise the board on all matters of traffic regulations and on all matters affecting the welfare of the pedestrians and of the public, because he has at his command the records from which he can draw information. The Bill also provides that the board may call to its assistance, in the form of a committee, any body of men who possess a practical knowledge on any matter. The members of the board cannot be conversant with all matters appertaining to traffic control, and, if the motor interests, the producing interests, or any other interests in the State are likely to be affected, their views can be placed before the board through these committees. If the board functions as we hope it will, it will call to its aid, in the form of committees, the most expert advice it can get. The removal of the Commissioner of Police will get them nowhere, because they will have to substitute

a sectional representative, and the amendment does not say how we are to appoint him. The whole measure would be nullified if the amendment were accepted.

Question—"That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 5 (*Mr. Russell's amendment*) stand part of the clause"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barber | Mr. Mullan |
| " Bruce | " O'Keefe |
| " Cooper | " Smith |
| " Copley, P. K. | " Stopford |
| " Copley, W. J. | " Taylor, G. C. |
| " Foley | " Waters |
| " Funnell | " Wellington |
| " Gair | " Wienholt |
| " Gledson | " Wilson |
| " Hayes | |
| " Hynes | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " King, W. T. | " Conroy |
| " Larcombe | " Keogh |
| " Llewelyn | |

NOES, 21.

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barnes, G. P. | Mr. Nimmo |
| " Barnes, W. H. | " Peterson |
| " Costello | " Plunkett |
| " Deacon | " Roberts |
| " Edwards | " Russell |
| " Fadden | " Taylor, C. |
| " Kenny | " Tozer |
| " King, R. M. | |
| " Maher | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " Maxwell | " Clayton |
| " Moore | " Nicklin |
| " Morgan | |

PAIRS.

| AYES. | NOES. |
|-------------|---------------|
| Mr. Collins | Mr. Grimstone |
| " Dash | " Sizer |
| " Bedford | " Walker |
| " Pease | " Brand |
| " Williams | " Sparkes |
| " Bulcock | " Daniel |

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [7.40 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 3, lines 9 to 19, both inclusive, omit the words—

'(2.) The Commissioner for Railways may from time to time appoint, with the approval of the Minister, any officer of his department to perform the duties and exercise the powers of the Commissioner for Railways as a member of the board. Such appointment may be cancelled at any time by the Commissioner for Railways, and the Commissioner shall thereupon resume his duties and powers as a member of the board.'

'(3.) The provisions of subsection two of this section shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to the Commissioner of Main Roads and to the Commissioner of Police.'

The Committee has approved of the constitution of the board by the appointment of the three commissioners, who the Minister has said are specially suited for the position; yet now he proposes to allow these men with special qualifications to delegate their powers to others. We might have altogether incompetent men appointed to act as delegates, yet Parliament has to take the responsibility of their actions. The Minister said that the board would frame regulations and the Commissioner of Police would see that they were carried out properly; but, if the members of the board delegate their

Mr. Nimmo.]

powers to others, the object of the provision will be defeated. It would be quite a different matter if the power of appointment in the case of absence through sickness or otherwise were left in the hands of the Minister. I strongly object to the clause. The members of the board should be there at all meetings, or the Minister should say who is to act in their stead.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [7.43 p.m.]: It is rather extraordinary that, having agreed to the principle that three commissioners shall constitute the board, the Committee should be asked to say that the commissioners may delegate their powers to other persons, and, therefore, may not constitute the board at all. It would be infinitely better that the people should know who the board shall be, and who are responsible. It is a great mistake to give this power of delegation. Who would take notice of a board consisting of members whose powers had been delegated to them in this way? The Government themselves would not. The three commissioners were supposed to be on the board by reason of their special qualifications; and it is extraordinary that they should have the power of delegation on such vitally important matters as to who shall carry produce or passengers on certain roads, what roads shall be prohibited for such traffic, and the whole question of the transport services of the State. This is a principle to which I attach the greatest importance. It is of great importance to the community, especially to producers. The board can delegate its powers of inquiry to anybody, and the evidence can be submitted to the proper board. It is essential that the board appointed to deal with such an important matter should sit to deal with those matters. If the members of the board are unable to devote any time to the matters to be considered by the State Transport Board, then the Government should appoint such members as will be able to give those matters the fullest consideration. It is entirely wrong to leave the whole position in the air by giving the members the right to delegate their authority to someone else.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [7.46 p.m.]: The intention of the clause is to allow the Commissioner for Railways to appoint an officer to act for him should he be called to North Queensland, and to allow the Commissioner of Police to appoint someone to act for him should he be called to Western Queensland. Hon. members opposite would not suggest that in these circumstances an acting Commissioner for Railways or an acting Commissioner of Police should not be appointed in the absence of the respective heads of the departments. The whole clause simply means that the business of the board will not be held up during the temporary absence of some of the members from the metropolitan area.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [7.48 p.m.]: This power is not generally given to heads of departments. Could the Minister appoint another Minister?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Am I not Acting Minister for Transport now?

Mr. DEACON: That is because the hon. gentleman is already a Minister, but he could not delegate his authority to a member on the back bench. It is proposed to

[*Mr. Nimmo.*

give to the members of the board powers that are not given to heads of departments.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes.

Mr. DEACON: Not to the same extent.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do you suggest that the work of the board should be held up during the temporary absence of some of its members?

Mr. DEACON: Extraordinary powers are being conferred, and the members of the board should not have the right to change the personnel of the board.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why object to the power being delegated to an acting Commissioner for Railways?

Mr. DEACON: There is nothing to say that the power will be delegated to an acting Commissioner for Railways; anybody could be appointed. The whole position is very uncertain. It is unusual for a Government to introduce a Bill to provide for the constitution of a board and allow the matter to be uncertain as to who shall constitute the board. No one will know who will be actually charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the board. We cannot take the reply by the Minister seriously at all.

Amendment (*Mr. Nimmo*) negatived.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—"Registrar of vehicles; secretary to board"—agreed to.

Clause 7—"Duty of board to make investigations, etc."—

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [7.52 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 3, line 43, after the word—
'direct'

insert the words—

'and to make of its own motion such investigations and inquiries as it may consider desirable in order to secure the co-ordination of all methods of transport in the State. In making any such investigations and inquiries and in making its report to the Minister the board shall give consideration, among other factors, to all or any of the following factors, namely:—

(a) The question of transportation generally in the light of service to the community;

(b) The needs of the State for economic development;

(c) The impartial and equitable treatment of all conflicting interests.'

This amendment is similar to an amendment which was moved by the present Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, when the late Government brought down the State Transport Co-ordination Act last year, and which I, as Minister in charge of the Bill, accepted. The board may investigate many matters relating to transport which may not be submitted to them by the Minister. Owing to this amendment being inserted in the original measure, the board suggested to me that there should be a thorough investigation into all non-paying railway lines, and that each should be dealt with on its merits. It was suggested that, in the interests of the State, and in the interests of

the district concerned, some lines should be closed down and good main roads substituted. Propositions such as that provide a field for investigation. Owing to the changed circumstances in the intervening years, there is no necessity now for some branch railways which were built some years ago. The Commissioner for Railways might be very anxious for such an investigation from the point of view of the interests of the people in the district as well as of the finances of the State. The board could also inquire into rates and fares. The Commissioner for Railways might be granted a monopoly of certain traffic, but he should not have the right to make charges beyond what are fair and reasonable. To do so would be extorting money from the people. If the board resolved to abolish any competitive traffic with the railways, then it should have the power to investigate whether the rates and fares charged by the Commissioner were fair and reasonable. The Minister will be merely accepting an amendment that the Labour Party were in favour of last year. It was on the motion of the leader of that party that it was included in the State Transport Co-ordination Act.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [7.56 p.m.]: I do not want the Committee to think that the hon. member for Murilla is asking me to accept what he accepted when Minister for Transport. Section 15 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act provides—

“The board shall, as soon as practicable after its appointment, furnish to the Minister a report setting out the steps which it considers should be taken to secure the co-ordination of all methods of transport in the State.”

That meant a report to the Minister on a distinct matter. The present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, moved the insertion of the words which were accepted by the then Minister for Transport. I am now asked to accept an amendment that will give power to the board to institute inquiries without consulting the Minister. These inquiries might be useless or might be inquiries which, for obvious financial reasons, could not be given effect to. I am, however, prepared to meet the hon. member for Murilla half way, and to accept an amendment providing for the insertion after the word “direct” on line 43 of the latter part of the amendment, reading—

“In making any such investigations and inquiries and in making its report to the Minister the board shall give consideration, among other factors, to all or any of the following factors, namely:—

(a) The question of transportation generally in the light of service to the community;

(b) The needs of the State for economic development;

(c) The impartial and equitable treatment of all conflicting interests.”

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: We do not object to that. It is practically one and the same thing. Will you move that amendment?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member withdraws his amendment, I will move the amendment in that form.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [8 p.m.]: I ask the permission of the Committee to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES, (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [8.1 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

“On page 3, line 43, after the word—

‘direct’

insert the words—

‘In making any such investigations and inquiries and in making its report to the Minister the board shall give consideration, among other factors, to all or any of the following factors, namely:—

(a) The question of transportation generally in the light of service to the community;

(b) The needs of the State for economic development;

(c) The impartial and equitable treatment of all conflicting interests.’”

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [8.2 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

“On page 4, lines 21 and 22, omit the words—

‘and any committee appointed as aforesaid.’”

Subclause (4) reads—

“For the purpose of any such inquiry and investigation, the board and any committee appointed as aforesaid shall have the powers, authority, and protection of a commission under ‘The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929.’”

The amendment proposes to delete the words “and any committee appointed as aforesaid.” Subclause (3) provides that the board may employ the services of any person for the purpose of assisting the board in any investigation—

“and may, with the like approval, appoint committees comprised of such persons as the board may, with the approval of the Minister, determine, to report to the board on any matter submitted to any such committee by the board.”

The board is protected under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, but it is here proposed to give the same powers and protection to any committee “appointed as aforesaid” by the board. That seems to be too broad altogether. We are quite willing to give the board that power, but we do not consider it right to give the same power to any committee appointed by the board. These committees can go into so many matters that, if they get the same protection as the board, it will make the subclause altogether too wide.

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [8.5 p.m.]: I hope the Minister will accept the amendment. This is a very drastic provision, inasmuch as the three members of the board can delegate their powers to practically anyone in the office. Any person or committee appointed can investigate the affairs of a motor business and demand to see the income tax returns of the business in the office of the Commissioner of Taxes. I am sure the Minister does not intend anything like that

Mr. Nimmo.]

to happen. Surely the three members of the board can make these inquiries without delegating the power to a person or committee?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [8.7 p.m.]: I cannot accept the amendment in view of the powers given under subclause (3), namely—

“The board may, with the approval of the Minister, employ the services of any person not employed in any Government department for the purpose of assisting the board in any investigation or inquiry made by the board under this Act, and may, with the like approval, appoint committees comprised of such persons as the board may, with the approval of the Minister, determine, to report to the board on any matter submitted to any such committee by the board.”

The board can use the services of a person who has the capacity to make special inquiries to assist the board. The board, or whatever committee it may appoint, will be able to take evidence on oath under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts. We have to assume that the committee appointed will be composed of capable men selected for their special knowledge of the subject to be inquired into. The idea that the power will be delegated to some clerk is too stupid altogether. All that is wanted is that the board shall get any information that is necessary. If that information is given willingly, it will be all right; but, if not, the evidence can be obtained on oath. As the matter is so important, I cannot see that there is anything wrong in delegating the power to any committee.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [8.9 p.m.]: I do not think the Minister has given a sound reason for the rejection of the amendment. Personally I do not object to the board having the power given under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts; but I object to any delegation of powers by the board to a committee of individuals in any locality in Queensland. The board is a permanent body, but the committees which may be appointed by the board will not be permanent. They will simply investigate questions of local interest, which are of such a nature that jealousy will probably enter in with respect to competition in business. After the members of these committees have investigated a man's business and seen his income tax returns, their job will be finished, and they may not be appointed again in their lifetime to perform similar duties. That being the case, we are violating the secrecy of income tax returns and striking at the roots of privacy in business matters. The members of these committees will be armed with this ammunition; and, when they have finished their inquiries, they can enter into competition with the businesses which they have investigated, as they know the true position as shown in the books of the businesses they have investigated. It is a power that Parliament should not give to any outsider. It can be used for the advantage of the individual on the committee even to the extent of blackmail. It would be all very well to give the powers conferred by the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts to a permanent board, but not to a committee appointed for a week or a fortnight to make a particular inquiry.

[*Mr. Nimmo.*]

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [8.11 p.m.]: I support the amendment. It is one thing to have a permanent board whose interests have nothing to do with outside competition, and to give that board these powers; but it is a totally different thing to appoint committees in various parts of the State to inquire into the business of other people. Those committees will be appointed for only a short time, and thereafter may use the information obtained for their own benefit. I do not mind the board itself having this power, because the members of the board have their own work to carry out and are not interested as possible competitors; but the appointment of interested persons—and probably interested persons will be appointed to inquire, for instance, into the motor business in various parts of the State—will enable them to acquire information which might be very valuable to them. They could use the information obtained for the purpose of victimisation or for their own benefit after the job is completed. There is no limit to the scope of their inquiries. They can violate the privacy of any man's business. There is no necessity for such a power, and it is not right that any such person should possess it. If it becomes necessary for the board to make such inquiries, they can delegate authority to a member or members of the board. The Minister has said that they will probably appoint many committees to go into various questions in districts, and the conferring of these powers will give such committees undue authority, enabling them to get information which they might use to their own benefit or the detriment of a competitor.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [8.14 p.m.]: Perhaps it would be as well if I read to the Leader of the Opposition a provision from the Act which he himself passed when he was Premier. Section 16 of “The States Transport Co-ordination Act of 1931” reads—

(1) The board may delegate to the Commissioner of Main Roads or to the Railway Commissioner or to the Commissioner of Police or to any person or authority any of its powers, duties, functions, or authorities under this Act or the regulations, and the person, corporation, or authority to whom such delegation is made may exercise and discharge the powers, duties, functions and authorities delegated as fully and effectually as the board could have exercised and discharged the same.

(2) A delegation may be made in respect of any particular matter or of any class of matters or generally, or may be limited to any part of the State, and may be made subject to or on such terms and conditions as the board thinks fit.

(3) Every delegation under this section shall be revocable at the will of the board, but no delegation shall prevent the exercise of any power, duty, function, or authority by the board.”

Section 12 (*d*) provides, *inter alia*—

“For the purposes of any such inquiry or investigation the board shall have the powers, authorities, and protection of a commission under ‘The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929.’”

Mr. R. M. KING: That is all right.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have just pointed out that section 16 gives the board power to delegate any of its powers, duties, functions, or authorities to the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner of Police, or to any person or authority. Hon. members opposite now object to the very power which they agreed to confer under the State Transport Co-ordination Act passed by the late Government. They cannot point to one instance in which that power was abused.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [8.17 p.m.]: Clause 7 (3) does not provide that the board alone shall exercise these powers under "The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929." The clause provides that the board may appoint committees to report to the board on any matter submitted to it by the board. These committees will have power to make inquiries under "The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929." The State Transport Co-ordination Act provided for the constitution of advisory committees. If an advisory committee was set up in Brisbane, it would probably be comprised of representatives from the Transport Union, the motor interests, the Brisbane City Council, or other interests. That committee would meet probably once a month to report to the board on certain matters. Why should such a committee have power to investigate the business affairs of any individual or firm? The State Transport Co-ordination Act did not provide that these committees should have power to make inquiries under "The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It did. I read the section.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Minister did not read it; I defy him to prove it. The Minister is merely endeavouring to bluff us. I do not think that he thoroughly understands the Bill. The State Transport Co-ordination Act does not in any way provide what the Minister is attempting to make out. The committee clothed with authority to make inquiries did not have any powers under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts conferred on it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Read section 16.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The late Government intended to have committees appointed in the Northern, Central and Southern divisions representative of sectional interests. They would only meet occasionally, and submit to the State Transport Board whatever resolutions were carried at their meetings. It would be left to the board to make the final decisions. Under this proposal a representative of a motor firm could, under a pretext, have inquiries instituted into a motor business being carried on in one of those divisions by a rival. By this means he could obtain information as to whether the business was a profitable one or not, and upon the information so obtained decide whether it would be profitable to start in opposition. The point is that his knowledge would be gained by an investigation carried on by a friend. That is wrong.

To-day we discussed a Bill appertaining to private enterprise. The Government claim that private enterprise had failed, while we claim that undue interference and other factors are responsible for the restriction of the operations of private enterprise. Here

is another interference with private enterprise which we should not tolerate. The three members of the board are men whom we can trust, and we would not object to them looking into the books of a business if it were necessary; but, every Tom, Dick, and Harry should not be empowered to scrutinise the books of business people and inconvenience them.

Mr. R. M. KING (*Logan*) [8.23 p.m.]: I cannot allow the explanation given by the Secretary for Mines on section 16 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act to go unchallenged. He stated that the Moore Government gave protection to any committee or person to whom the State Transport Board delegated powers. That is not so. Section 16 reads—

"The board may delegate to the Commissioner of Main Roads or to the Commissioner for Railways or to the Commissioner of Police, or to any person or authority, any of its powers, duties, functions, or authorities under this Act or the regulations, and the person, corporation, or authority to whom such delegation is made may exercise and discharge the powers, duties, functions, and authorities delegated as fully and effectually as the board could have exercised and discharged the same."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You said "powers" didn't you?

Mr. R. M. KING: Yes, such powers as are delegated. Sub-section (2) reads—

"A delegation may be made in respect of any particular matter or of any class of matters or generally."

Section 12 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, to which the Minister referred, does not say anything about the delegated authority having the protection of a commission under "The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929." Section 16 gives the power of delegation only, but does not give the protection to which I have alluded. In the clause now under consideration, the Minister has seen fit to give that protection to any delegated authority; but he is entirely wrong when he suggests that the State Transport Co-ordination Act gives the same protection to a delegated authority. If it had been the intention of the Moore Administration to apply "The Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910 to 1929," to any delegated authority mentioned in the State Transport Co-ordination Act, then section 12 (d) would have specifically stated that fact. It was never intended that any committee should have the license to libel that a royal commission would have.

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [8.23 p.m.]: I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Logan. What is the idea of inserting the extra words in the clause in this Bill? If the Minister is correct in his assumption that the State Transport Co-ordination Act gave the protection of a commission to any authority delegated by the board to make inquiry and investigation, then there is no reason for the insertion of the extra words in the present Bill. I think, however, that the words have been put in, probably on the advice of the parliamentary draftsman, specifically to give that protection, which was never contemplated by the Moore Administration.

Mr. Tozer.]

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [8.30 p.m.]: Let the Minister have it that he is right; is it a just thing to do it now? Is it a fair thing to give a committee vitally interested in a particular business in the area the right to make an investigation and then use the information obtained for its own benefit or for the benefit of its friends?

Mr. WATERS: You gave the same power.

Mr. MOORE: If we did, is it right? Hon. members opposite, when they came into power, said they were going to do what is right; and when they do something they cannot defend they say: "You did it." The Government are giving a committee definite power to victimise. The committee will have the right under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts to obtain secret information and use it for its own purpose. The committee will only be there for a short period to investigate a transport matter, and after the investigation is completed the committee will have no concern with the board at all, but it will have secured the information, and that information may be very valuable to it. We do not mind the board having the power. The board is not interested, but these other people have local knowledge, and they may use their powers wrongfully. In my opinion, the power is not delegated to a committee under the present Act, but allowing, for argument's sake, that it is so delegated, we say that is wrong, that it was never intended, and that it ought to be wiped out.

Question—"That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 7 (*Mr. Tozer's amendment*) stand part of the clause"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barber | Mr. Lacombe |
| " Bruce | " Llewelyn |
| " Conroy | " Mullan |
| " Cooper | " O'Keefe |
| " Copley, P. K. | " Smith |
| " Foley | " Stopford |
| " Funnell | " Taylor, G. C. |
| " Gair | " Wellington |
| " Gledson | " Wilson |
| " Hanlon | |
| " Hayes | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " Hynes | " Copley, W. J. |
| " Keogh | " Waters |
| " King, W. T. | |

NOES, 23.

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barnes, G. P. | Mr. Nimmo |
| " Barnes, W. H. | " Peterson |
| " Clayton | " Plunkett |
| " Costello | " Roberts |
| " Deacon | " Russell |
| " Edwards | " Swayne |
| " Kenny | " Taylor, C. |
| " King, R. M. | " Tozer |
| " Maher | |
| " Maxwell | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " Moore | " Fadden |
| " Morgan | " Wienholt |
| " Nicklin | |

PAIRS.

| AYES. | NOES. |
|-------------|---------------|
| Mr. Collins | Mr. Grimstone |
| " Dash | " Sizer |
| " Bedford | " Walker |
| " Pease | " Brand |
| " Williams | " Sparkes |
| " Bulcock | " Daniel |

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8—"Traffic routes"—agreed to.

[*Mr. Moore.*

Clause 9—"Power of board as to heavy vehicles"—

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [8.38 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 4, line 52, after the word—
'Gazette'

insert the words—

'if such passengers or goods are conveyed for remuneration or reward or in the course of any trade or business.'

This is quite a simple amendment, and its meaning is clear. The object is to enable people engaged in private business to use their cars in their own interests without being interfered with. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment, because it is necessary to create a spirit of independence which is so essential, and that there will be no interference with persons using cars on their own private business, and who are not receiving reward or remuneration in the course of trade or business.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [8.40 p.m.]: There is something in the amendment; but, after discussing it with the parliamentary draftsman, I think that the hon. member will find that all he desires to achieve is provided for by clauses 13 and 14. Clause 13 reads—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in 'The Heavy Vehicles Acts, 1925 to 1931,' the board shall have power to exempt from the requirements to be registered under the said Acts any vehicle which in the opinion of the board is engaged solely in carrying passengers or goods not in competition with any existing facility."

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [8.42 p.m.]: What the Minister says is quite correct, but the method provided there is cumbersome and objectionable. The State Co-ordination Transport Act affected only persons who were plying for hire and getting remuneration for carrying passengers or the goods of other persons. It did not interfere with the man who carried for himself. The Heavy Vehicles Act does affect the latter person. If each individual must make application to the board for exemption, it may be effective but it will be cumbersome. It would be better to make it clear that the Bill does not apply to such cases. The ordinary person does not know that he has to get exemption, and that if, by any chance, he lives on a traffic route, he will be liable to penalties whether he plies for hire or not. I know that ignorance of the law is no excuse; but it seems to me that the proper way to deal with the question is to make it clear that the intention of the Bill is not to interfere with the person who is running a truck or other vehicle for his own convenience, perhaps to run produce to the railway, even if he runs along a main road. If the board could make a regulation of general application giving exemption to all such persons, it would be a different matter; but I do not think clauses 13 and 14 are meant to enable the board to make such a regulation or to recommend the issue of such an Order in Council.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Section 21 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act contains practically the same principle.

Mr. MOORE: The State Transport Coordination Act applies only to vehicles plying for hire, but this Bill will apply to every motor vehicle. A person who utilises a motor vehicle to convey produce to the railway will come under the provisions of the Bill. A general exemption will be quite all right, but I do not think the Bill makes any provision for a general exemption. It will be necessary to make an application in each case. The position should be made clear.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [8.47 p.m.]: Under this Bill it will be necessary for individual applications for exemptions to be lodged, and that will mean a considerable amount of irritation and inconvenience in country districts. The Bill should definitely state that exemption is granted in these cases.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) [8.48 p.m.]: Motor trucks are becoming a very popular mode of conveyance in primary producing districts. A farmer may be engaged during week days in the carriage of his produce, and on Saturday evening he will probably take his family to a picture show, and on Sunday to church. Will the owner of these vehicles be subject to the provisions of the Act?

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [8.49 p.m.]: The Minister must surely appreciate how difficult it will be for every person in country districts to apply for exemption from the provisions of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There will be no need for them to apply for exemption. They will not be required to register.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Bill should definitely say so. The owner of a Ford truck might desire to take his family for a run on a Sunday afternoon.

At 8.50 p.m.,

Mr. O'KEEFE (*Cairns*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is quite wrong to hold the owners of these utility trucks in suspense as to whether they are liable to prosecution if they do certain things. There would be no harm if the Minister accepted the amendment, as it would place the position beyond doubt. If he does not do so, the people must submit their case to the board under clause 13. That places them in a very difficult position. Although it is not usual, it might so happen that a farmer desired to take his family for a motor run on a Saturday afternoon or Sunday; but under this clause he is first required to secure the consent of the board.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [8.52 p.m.]: The amendment should receive serious consideration. We realise the effect in the country districts of the administration of the Heavy Vehicles Act. It is all very well for the Minister to say that farmers and others owning 1 or 2 ton trucks will not require to register; but, after the passage of that Act, a number of deputations waited on me in the North. One was in reference to a policeman who stopped a man driving his truck, and, because he had a case of benzene in the truck, informed him that he would have to be prosecuted. The matter was only rectified after two months' investigation and correspondence. Another difficulty arose when the owner of a truck conveyed two members of a football team who had missed

the train to a nearby town. He was prosecuted, and, although he defended the case, was fined. The position would be clarified by the acceptance of the amendment. If it is not accepted, then serious annoyance and inconvenience will be caused by correspondence with headquarters in Brisbane, and at the same time a hardship will be inflicted on the owner of the motor vehicle. In outlying centres the Act is left to the police to interpret. Many members of the force are unfit to interpret statutes, and very often the interpretation is not in accordance with the spirit of the Act or the intention of the Legislature.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) [8.54 p.m.]: Many cases similar to those cited by the hon. member for Cook arise in the country. In one particular case a man was conveying his family in a motor truck from Dalby to the seaside, but was held up at Toowoomba because he carried a camp stretcher and some bedding. The police told him that he could not carry those articles. I have known cases in which permission has been refused to carry a bag of cement that had been consigned to the nearest railway station and had to be carted a distance of 5 or 6 miles to the place where it would be eventually used. Similarly with regard to tanks. These restrictions interfere with business and add considerably to costs.

Question—"That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 9 (*Mr. Edwards's amendment*) be so inserted"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 23.

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barnes, G. P. | Mr. Nimmo |
| " Barnes, W. H. | " Peterson |
| " Costello | " Plunkett |
| " Deacon | " Roberts |
| " Edwards | " Swayne |
| " Fadden | " Taylor, C. |
| " Kenny | " Tozer |
| " King, R. M. | " Wienholt |
| " Maher | |
| " Maxwell | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " Moore | Clayton |
| " Morgan | " Russell |
| " Nicklin | |

NOES, 25.

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Barber | Mr. King, W. T. |
| " Bruce | " Larcombe |
| " Cooper | " Llewelyn |
| " Copley, P. K. | " Mullan |
| " Copley, W. J. | " Smith |
| " Foley | " Stopford |
| " Funnell | " Waters |
| " Gair | " Wellington |
| " Gledson | " Wilson |
| " Hanlon | |
| " Hanson | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| " Hayes | Conroy |
| " Hynes | " Taylor, G. C. |
| " Keogh | |

PAIRS.

| AYES. | NOES. |
|---------------|-------------|
| Mr. Grimstone | Mr. Collins |
| " Sizer | " Dash |
| " Walker | " Bedford |
| " Brand | " Pease |
| " Sparkes | " Williams |
| " Daniel | " Bulcock |

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [9 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 5, lines 6 to 16, omit the words—

'(2.) Provided that nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prevent the board from prohibiting the carriage of passengers and/or goods by

Mr. Deacon.]

any heavy vehicle as aforesaid in any one or more cases, and to allow such carriage by another or other heavy vehicles to be used under the same circumstances:

(3.) Provided further that the terms and conditions imposed by the board to be observed by the owners or users of heavy vehicles in connection with the use of such heavy vehicles need not be the same, but may be varied by the board in its absolute discretion."

It will be possible to have two heavy vehicles of the same class running in competition on the same road, and one may be singled out and allowed certain privileges while the other may have penalties imposed on it. It is very hard to understand why one man should have exemption from certain conditions while another is compelled to carry them out. Is there any reason for it? I would like to know from the Minister what it is, as it is not explained in the Bill. I do not see why there should be any differentiation.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [9.5 p.m.]: Both subclauses are rather extraordinary. Sub-clause (2) seems to give the board power to give a monopoly to one man by saying that one man cannot run his vehicle while another man can do so. Cheapness of carriage is generally brought about by competition; but, if we are going to destroy competition and allow one man to carry goods to the railways under certain conditions while another man under the same circumstances with a similar vehicle is treated differently, it is an extraordinary position. It seems most extraordinary that, in the case of two men using similar vehicles for service on the same run, one man may be given terms and conditions which enable him to run while the other man has terms and conditions imposed upon him so that he cannot run. I have never known before such discrimination between individuals under the same conditions when carrying goods or plying for hire in any way. The owners of motor vehicles plying on the same route should pay the same rate. We should not tell one man that he can ply at half the rate which the other man has to pay. This clause gives a tremendous power of discrimination. A man with a motor lorry might offend the board, which might in consequence impose any disability upon him that it likes. It might make the terms and conditions such that he could not carry on at all. People running on the same route with the same class of vehicle should pay the same rate.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is what we will do under this clause.

Mr. MOORE: No; this allows the board to discriminate between similar vehicles running on the same route.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It provides that a certain number of vehicles may be allowed to run.

Mr. MOORE: If the clause provides that the board may limit the number of licenses that may be granted on a route, I have no objection to it; but the board is given the power to discriminate between individuals. The clause does not say that the board may limit the number of licenses granted on any particular route.

At 9.10 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

[*Mr. Deacon.*]

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [9.10 p.m.]: Like the Leader of the Opposition, I feel that this clause is absolutely contradictory and to some extent paradoxical. There is a feeling amongst motor truck owners with whom I have come into contact that preference will be extended to certain of them. I have a number in my electorate, and two or three have already approached me and suggested that amongst the owners who ply for hire between Brisbane and Toowoomba such preference will be given. I do not know how the rumour has arisen, but I have received a letter in support of what I say. It is addressed to me, and reads—

"I hereby endeavour to obtain any knowledge offering in regard to the new Transport Bill. I am the owner of an International truck which does transport business connecting with Marburg, Minden, Colana, Plainland, Laidley, and Forest Hill. I have heard that there will be some retrenching done, and that a certain number of trucks will be prevented from plying to different places, and as there are four trucks, including ours, touching Laidley, I am led to believe that ours might fall under the axe should any retrenching be done. I would like to avoid this, as we are local people (all the other truck owners coming from Brisbane). To my mind we should get the preference in this district, and as this business is keeping my young brother and a man who has a wife and family in employment, I would beg you to do all in your power to help to retain the connection for us should anything drastic occur."

Hon. members will see that there is a chance of favouritism or undue discrimination. It seems to me that this extraordinarily worded clause is dangerous and should be deleted, unless the intention of the Government is clarified.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [9.13 p.m.]: The Minister may desire the clause to be included in the Bill for the purpose of meeting such cases as arise on the road from Thallon to St. George, which has been declared a State highway. People may desire to have their goods consigned from Brisbane to St. George or vice versa by the railway. Goods sent to St. George are transported to Thallon by rail. The Commissioner may desire to enter into a contract to pick them up and deliver them at St. George or along the road, charging freight right through to their destination. Moreover, many persons now take the train to Helidon and there take a car to Toowoomba. The Commissioner may desire to be in a position to offer such persons a through ticket from Brisbane to Toowoomba by this route, entering into an agreement with certain motor owners to carry his passengers from Helidon to their destination. The Commissioner will have the power to enter into an agreement with certain persons to carry goods or passengers, and no one else will be permitted to engage in this traffic on the same route.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [9.15 p.m.]: The Minister seems very disinclined to say why these subclauses have been placed in the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The State Transport Co-ordination Act contained the same provisions.

Mr. DEACON: We should be given some reasons for the subclauses. The transport policy of this Government is very different from the transport policy of the late Government. The hon. member for Murilla has given one explanation of the provision, but it might very well be used to favour certain persons. A non-unionist might be debarred from plying on a certain route, and there might be unfair discrimination against others. The Minister should accept a reasonable amendment, and thus remove any grounds for victimisation or preference. If he is not prepared to accept a reasonable amendment, then we are compelled to waste a little more time by discussing the matter further. Under this provision it will be possible to exercise political influence in favour of friends of the Minister. They could be given the sole right to a particular road. Is it fair to discriminate in this way? Every owner of a vehicle who pays the same license fee should have the same right to use the road. I do not say that any member of Parliament would deliberately allow himself to be used in order to secure political patronage; but we know very well that sometimes they are misled, especially when they are young and innocent and do not know the ways of the world. They might influence the Minister in a direction which he should not take. That might occur under this clause; therefore, it would be preferable if these two subclauses were omitted. They do not improve the Bill, and without them the clause would give sufficient protection to the railways against competitive systems of transport.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [9.22 p.m.]: I dislike this clause very much, as it creates a power under which anything might be done. There is a danger of it being used to the detriment of the community generally. Bills of this class all go in the direction of hampering industry. The Government might just as well try to stop the flow of the Brisbane River as to stop the use of motor vehicles. An impetus to motor transport was given by the railway strikes. To harass people in this way will do no good, and will only cause them to exercise their minds as to how they can evade the law of the land.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [9.24 p.m.]: The Minister must recognise the opportunity for "graft" and victimisation under this clause. Those opportunities should be removed. The hon. gentleman will recollect that in his early childhood he was taught the little prayer: "Lead us not into temptation." He should not allow any person to be led into temptation. He has an opportunity to remove that temptation. Some people can be refused licenses under the provisions of this clause, while licenses can be granted to other people.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Why did your Government include a similar provision in their Bill?

Mr. KENNY: If the hon. member for Cairns says that the Moore Government gave that power, let him prove his statement. Under the clause as it stands, a certain set of conditions can be forced upon one individual and an entirely different set of conditions on another. We know the policy of the Government in the matter of preference to unionists; and we know that in the business community to-day girls are being forced to join a union.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KENNY: Under this Bill we can force the owner of a heavy vehicle to obtain a union ticket in, say, the Australian Workers' Union before he can obtain a license under the Act.

Mr. FUNNELL: What is wrong with that?

Mr. KENNY: Why should I be obliged to subscribe to the funds of a union with which I am not concerned, in order to get a job?

Mr. P. K. COPLEY: But you would accept any benefits that the union could get.

Mr. KENNY: I have never held a union ticket in my life, and I have never accepted any benefit from any union.

Taking an extreme view of the position, the board could refuse a license to an individual if his political views were opposed to those of Labour. Not only is wide power given to the board, but that power can be delegated even to officials in the Main Roads Commission or the Railway Department. How do we know that the owner of a heavy vehicle will get justice under these circumstances? If the Minister does not believe in "graft," he should remove the opportunity for it by accepting the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. J. Stopford, *Maryborough*) [9.29 p.m.]: I would remind the Opposition of the second paragraph of section 23 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, which provides—

"The regulations may prescribe or the board may determine in respect of any particular license, or of any class of licenses relating to any area, route, road, or district or of any other class of licenses whatsoever or generally, what terms and conditions shall be applicable to or with respect of the license."

That is the same power expressed in slightly different words. It gives the board power to determine the terms and conditions applicable to each district.

Mr. MOORE: But it does not give power to discriminate between people in one district.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It gives power to discriminate in the matter of licenses to meet the exigencies of each particular district.

We realise that broad power must be given, and that we must trust the board to bring about some co-ordination. There has been too much overlapping of authority. The Brisbane City Council had the power, and prior to that the Brisbane Tramways Trust had power, in the matter of specifying the particular routes along which motor buses would travel.

There is nothing in this clause to say that there shall be differential treatment as regards the fees paid. I can read nothing of that kind into the clause; but what I do read into it is that the number of licenses may be limited. We contend that, as we have millions of pounds of public money invested in our railways, we have some right to limit the number of vehicles allowed to compete with the railways. Take the tramway system. Bus licenses are restricted to those which act as feeders to the tramways. The provisions are necessary, and the present Act gives the board the same powers. Take a man pioneering a new route not in competition with a railway, say from Cracow to Eidsvold. Should he be subject to the

Hon. J. Stopford.]

same conditions as the man who runs a motor vehicle parallel to a traffic route? We recognise that principle in relation to farmers' products. A farmer is exempted as far as conveying his produce to the nearest railway is concerned; but, when he commences to cart along a road running parallel to the railway, he is subject to the conditions imposed on other motor vehicles. Half the economic waste of the world is due to the overlapping of services; and, when we get down to real organisation in the distribution of supplies, the world will get nearer to solvency. I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [9.33 p.m.]: The Minister has given a new interpretation of the clause. If the board can limit the number of licenses, why does the clause not say so? Subclause (3) fixes the terms and conditions in regard to licenses; but it does not say anything in regard to the limitation of licenses. It gives absolute power to give a license to one person and refuse a license to another. The opportunity is given to the board to do an injustice, and that is what we object to. Why should these powers be put in if it is not intended to use them? We have fully discussed the matter, but for some reason which the Minister has not explained, the Government have evidently decided to retain subclauses (2) and (3). If they are retained, they will be construed in strict accordance with their wording.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

The House adjourned at 9.36 p.m.
