Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 1932

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER, 1932.

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

QUESTIONS.

"GOLDEN CASKET" PRIZES WON BY SHILLING SHARE TICKETS.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. In the case of shilling tickets in the 'Golden Casket,' what prizes are paid to the Casket agents for distribution?

"2. Is any provision made to safeguard the interests of ticket shareholders?"

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

"1. Any prize not exceeding £100 value, won by a share ticket, is collected by the Casket agent who sold such ticket for distribution to the shareholders.

"2. Yes."

WATER BORING PLANT FOR MAREEBA TOBACCO-GROWERS.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) asked the Premier—

"In view of the fact that the tobacco-growers in the Mareeba district have been paying 24s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons for water from the Railway Department, which charge has since been reduced to 13s. 8d. per 1,000 gallons, will he urgently reconsider the decision of the Cabinet and make available to the district a boring plant for the purpose of finding supplies of water?"

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

"It was the Moore Government which decided against the expenditure of public funds in boring for water in the Mareeba district. The provision of suitable water facilities for settlers is engaging the attention of the Department of Public Lands."

COMPLETION OF NEW IPSWICH RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Minister for Transport—

"Does the Government intend in the near future to proceed with the erection of the new Ipswich railway station, or will the platforms be used for other purposes?"

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

"This matter will be considered when funds are available."

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR UNEMPLOYED CHILDREN OVER SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE.

Mr. DANIEL (*Keppel*) asked the Treasurer—

"Having regard to the allowance of £60 for all children under the age of

sixteen years who are maintained by the taxpayer, will he consider extending that allowance to cases where children over the age of sixteen years are maintained by the taxpayer because of the inability of such children to obtain employment?"

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

"By the Bill to amend the Income Tax Acts, which was passed last week, the deduction of £60 in respect of each child under sixteen years of age has been extended to embrace invalid children over the age of sixteen years who are wholly dependent on the taxpayer. It would be impracticable to extend this concession as indicated by the hon. member."

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF FUND AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND BALANCES.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Labour and Industry whether I can expect answers to the following questions before the House rises. These questions were addressed to him on 26th November—

"1. What was the balance of the Unemployment Relief Fund at 31st October, 1931, and 31st October, 1932?

"2. What was the balance on same dates of the Unemployment Insurance Fund?"

The PREMIER: You can expect anything you like.

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 his inquiries have been successful, and whether he has answers to the following questions which I addressed to him on 18th November:—

"1. Has he received a letter of protest from certain rotational relief workers in the Gooboorum shire complaining of the deduction from their first pay of £1 5s. each for an Australian Workers' Union ticket, and that they received only five weeks' pay for eight weeks' work, and then had to stand down for three weeks before being eligible for intermittent work or rations?

"2. If so, has he replied to such letter, and what action has he taken in the matter?"

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

"The information is still being obtained:"

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulation No. 231 under "The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1930."

Regulations under "The Public Curator Acts, 1915 to 1924."

Regulation under "The Art Union Regulation Act of 1930."

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) [10.37 a.m.]: I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide for the regulation of the conditions of industries by means of conciliation and arbitration, to establish an Industrial Court and define its jurisdiction, and for other purposes."

This is a complete measure, and not an amending Bill. There is a greater need for the wages and conditions of the workers to be protected during times of stress and industrial depression than during normal times, consequently, during the election campaign the Labour Party promised from the hustings that, if returned to power, it would restore to the workers of Queensland the industrial protection which had been so ruthlessly taken from them by the previous Tory Government.

The Bill carries that promise into effect. It will restore to the workers that measure of protection which was afforded them under "The Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1916 to 1925." It was generally conceded that that Act represented the accumulated knowledge and experience of arbitration in this State and in other countries over the past twenty years, and was regarded as the most perfect instrument of its kind in operation in the world up to the time we left office in 1929. This Bill practically re-enacts those Acts, and restores the provisions that were abolished by the Moore Government. I have given more than the average amount of attention to industrial conditions and to their application to the industrial workers of Queensland. I found that there was a general desire, not only on the part of the workers, but also on the part of decent employers, to have an Industrial Arbitration Act that would give a fair measure of justice to both the employer and the employee. This Bill is calculated to do that. The alternative to a measure of this kind is to sow seeds of discontent which must inculcate in the minds of the working class people a spirit of discontent, revolt, and revolution. Any person who has given this matter consideration must admit that the alternative to arbitration is direct action. After all, direct action is a form of revolution. Away back in the early nineties members of the Labour Party foresaw that they would be able to secure a fair share of the wealth workers created by means of an arbitration tribunal which would do justice to both employer and employee.

It might be as well if at this stage I were to give a brief review of the history of arbitration in this State. The first legislative attempt to deal with disputes and to fix wages was under the old wages board system, which was introduced into this Parliament in 1908. I had some experience of the operations of wages boards. As compared with the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 and the amending Act of 1925, this system was most ineffective, and in some cases farcical. I remember the occasion when the ex-Treasurer, the hon. member for Wynnum, exercised his prerogative and held up the determination because the chairman gave a fair measure of justice to the carters

of the Central Division by awarding them something like decent conditions.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You are making a statement which is not correct.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That is only one of the faults which I have to find with the wages board system.

The first Arbitration Act was passed in 1912 under the title of "The Industrial Peace Act of 1912." That measure was an improvement on the wages board system. It had certain definite though restricted powers.

In 1916 the Labour Government introduced a consolidated measure which gave a wider jurisdiction than the 1912 Act. That Act provided for the statutory fixation of a basic wage and for the statutory recognition of an eight-hour day. Sundry amendments to that measure at a later period prescribed for a 44-hour week, subject to certain conditions.

The amending Act of 1925 altered the constitution of the court. That amendment provided for the appointment of a Board of Trade consisting of a judge, who was president, and two members.

In 1929 the Moore Government repealed the then existing Act, and enacted an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. That measure was one of the most retrograde and reactionary Acts of Parliament in the history of industrial arbitration in this State. That Act left this State in the position of being the only State in the Commonwealth which did not provide for a statutory eight-hour day. All the protective conditions for the workers that were built up by the Labour Party during their fourteen years of office were ruthlessly sacrificed.

Mr. KENNY: There were no strikes during that period.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: There was a lot of discontent and many strikes. The effect of that legislation was to starve the people into subjection, to intimidate and bludgeon them into accepting conditions which were not a credit to any civilised community. Any person who has made a study of that Act must admit that it was designed chiefly with a desire to smash unionism in Queensland. It provided for the establishment of an Industrial Court, consisting of a judge and two conciliation commissioners. The court had the power to fix a basic wage and also to lay down the hours to be worked in industry. It contained an important departure from similar measures, inasmuch as there was no statutory recognition of the eight-hour principle, while the fixation of hours was left to the court. In accordance with the principles of the Nationalist Government, an elaborate system of boards was prescribed, presided over by a conciliation commissioner. The defect of that system is easily recognised. As was pointed out in the debate when the Bill was being discussed, these boards could not possibly operate, and the Government were obliged to take power to constitute the members of the court as a board so that they could deal with disputes and make awards. The Bill which is to be founded on this resolution is based upon the experience of the measures passed in 1916 and 1925, and anything of a helpful nature contained in the 1929 Act has been included in the Bill.

The Bill will provide for the constitution of an industrial court consisting of a judge as president, and two members. The members will be appointed for seven years, and judicial functions will be given to the president and to each member. The president or any member sitting alone shall constitute the court; that is to say, each member of the court will have authority to deal with disputes and to make awards in the ordinary way. Except as prescribed, all jurisdiction and powers of the court may be exercised by the president or any member sitting or acting alone. If more than one member is sitting at the same time exercising judicial functions, each member shall constitute a court.

The court is given rather wide jurisdiction. It is to have the power and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in addition to the powers under this Bill, similar to those in the 1916-1925 legislation. Where the court is constituted by the president sitting with another member or members, the decision of the president upon any question arising as to jurisdiction or as to the construction of the provisions of the Act shall prevail and be the decision of the court, similar to the power given in the 1916-1925 legislation.

The full bench of the court will have power and authority to make a declaration as to the cost of living, standard of living, basic wage for male and female, and standard hours. The formula for arriving at the basic wage is continued. On the declaration of the basic wage, awards will be adjusted by the registrar as in the 1929 Act. Those will be subject to appeal, which is a new provision. In other words, immediately there is an alteration in the basic wage, the registrar will automatically alter the various awards coming within his department, without going to the trouble and expense of waiting for the various parties to make application for a variation of those awards.

The 1929 Act enabled the court, in making a declaration in regard to the basic wage and standard hours, to take into account the probable economic effect that the declaration would have on the community in general and also on the industry or industries concerned. That provision is also included in this Bill. We are living in abnormal times, and the Government are very careful that they will not do anything that is likely to add to unemployment. In normal times there is no occasion for that provision.

Mr. MOORE: It is part of the Premiers' Plan; you cannot get away from that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: In previous years the court to some extent took into consideration the question of capacity to pay. That has been one of the principles underlying arbitration ever since arbitration was instituted in this country. It is definitely laid down in the Bill that the court shall take into consideration the probable economic effect, not only on the particular industry on which the court is adjudicating but also on other industries and on the community generally.

A recognition of the 44-hour week, as in the 1916-25 legislation, is also included in this Bill, except in regard to certain prescribed industries. Under the 1916-25 Acts there were certain excepted industries. We have also added a proviso that the court shall not be required to observe the 44-hour week declaration if it is of the opinion that in respect of any industry or calling, whether the industry or calling immediately concerned, or some other industry, substantial unemployment will result, or the community

in general will be prejudicially affected. We are introducing industrial legislation which will affect the whole industrial life of this State; and it is essential that provision should be made for certain discretionary power to be left to the court in dealing with an abnormal position that may occur with the application of the 44-hour week to various industries. Having in view the fact that the re-enactment of the 44-hour week provisions may unduly dislocate industry, which may affect the Treasurer's Budget, it is provided that the 44-hour week direction shall operate as from 1st July, 1933. That is to say, we do not intend to apply the 44-hour week until the end of the present financial year. That practice was followed in connection with the introduction of the 44-hour week in 1924. If my memory serves me aright, the Bill providing for a 44-hour week was carried in October of that year, and it did not take effect until the following July.

The Bill provides that awards, decisions, and declarations under the repealed Act shall continue until superseded by this measure. This is merely a machinery clause to make sure that existing awards and conditions shall operate until they are superseded by other awards.

The provisions of the 1916-25 Act in regard to jurisdiction have been re-enacted. The 1929 Act gave power of appeal to the Full Court—a superior court—where questions of jurisdiction were raised. We have decided to discontinue that proviso; and we have provided that the jurisdiction of the court in all industrial matters, whether original or by way of appeal, shall be exclusive. There is full power to the court to extend or vary industrial agreements, decisions, or directions. Such decisions shall not be reopened except by application by the Crown or a party thereto or an industrial union affected by the decision. Full power is given to members of the court to state a case for the opinion of the full bench. Any member, on the application of any party bound by the decision or award or interested in the award, shall state a case for the opinion of the full bench; and the decision of the court shall be conclusive and final.

The court will have power to appoint committees to hold conferences and summon witnesses. We give power to industrial magistrates to convene conferences and subpoena witnesses to appear before them. That will allow the courts to deal expeditiously with industrial disputes.

The provisions with regard to the power of registration of industrial unions have been re-enacted with very little amendment.

Industrial boards will no longer operate. That is a departure from the 1916 and 1929 Acts. These boards were of very little use under our old Act. I think there were only one or two occasions on which they were used, and they were never used under the 1929 Act at all. Litigants seem to prefer to have their cases dealt with direct by the Industrial Court without any intervention by industrial boards. We, therefore, thought it was essential from the point of view of dealing expeditiously with disputes and giving decisions that industrial boards should be deleted altogether.

The provisions dealing with industrial agreements are re-enacted from the 1916-25 Acts. This will give power to Government employees, whether railway, police, or public servants, to enter into agreements and awards. The conditions are pretty well the same as those in the 1926 Act.

We have also made provisions for authorised strikes. We agree that the workers should have the right as a last resort to refuse to sell their labour under the conditions and arrangements offered by the employer. This re-enacts the same provisions as appeared in the 1916-25 Act.

Mr. BRAND: That means that they can strike against an award of the court?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: After they have conformed with certain conditions—that is, the taking of a ballot and the union concerned has authorised it.

There are the usual provisions as to the recovery of fines, the inspection of records to be kept by employers. The powers of production and inspection are practically the same as in the 1916-25 Act.

The Crown may intervene where, in the opinion of the Minister, public interests are likely to be affected by the decision of the court. This is a re-enactment of the old Act.

Apeals from industrial magistrates will be heard by the full bench of the court.

Section 64 of the 1929 Act provided for extensive powers to be given to the Governor in Council in the direction of amending or adding to this or any other Act. We think that was something which should never have been included in an Act of Parliament, so we have decided to discontinue it.

The Commissioner of Prices will be an officer of the court. That provision is similar to the provision in the repealed Act.

The usual machinery and rule-making provisions are also the same as in the 1916-25 Act.

Mr. BRAND: Are you making provision for penalties for unlawful strikes?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: This Bill lays downs certain conditions which must be fulfilled before employees can go on strike and before employers can lock employees out. Instances have come to my notice, particularly in connection with the shipping companies, where members of the Waterside Workers' Federation have been locked out and victimised by employers. In my own electorate of Townsville 500 or 600 decent citizens, responsible men who have contributed towards the civic financing of the town—men with all the responsibilities of citizenship on their shoulders—have been victimised to some extent by the shipping companies. We have the same condition of affairs in Brisbane. This is something in the nature of a lockout.

I have also made provision to give relief to members of the Waterside Workers' Federation. They will be entitled to attend at the usual picking-up places, and it will be an offence against the Act if they are debarred from so doing; and a stiff penalty of £100 is provided in that connection.

I think I have dealt with the whole of the salient features of the Bill. The Bill is really a re-enactment of the 1916-1925 Act, which worked satisfactorily, and which secured contentment amongst employees and employers. I believe that the re-enactment will bring about a better outlook in industry for employees, and to some extent will give further security to employers. There is not

much in the Bill which the Opposition can logically attack, because we merely give to organised labour, that is, to industrial unions, that protection to which it is entitled and which it receives generally from Governments throughout the civilised world. We have taken the action necessary to repeal the provisions of an Act which took away from the workers of Queensland something which they had enjoyed for many years. We bring about a statutory eight-hour day. We bring back the statutory 44-hour week. We are making it possible for the courts to give preference to unionists. We also bring within the ambit of the court all the citizens of the State who have been excluded from it. One of the worst and most despicable actions of the previous Administration was to deprive nearly 50 per cent. of the industrialists of the State of access to the court.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What rot!

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Hon. members opposite were careful about the employers' unions, but they took away from the workers of Queensland that moral right which is recognised in every other civilised country.

Mr. KENNY: You are not giving them back that right now.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The Bill gives them the right to go to the court and secure an award. We told the people on the hustings that, if returned, we would give them access to the Industrial Court and the right to state their case before a properly constituted tribunal. This Bill is the fulfilment of that promise, and returns to the workers that protection and the rights which were so ruthlessly filched from them by the previous Tory Administration. In my second reading speech I shall have the opportunity of replying to the observations of hon. members opposite. I am convinced that they have no honest logical argument why this Bill should not be introduced; and the amendments of the law which are now presented are in the best interests not only of the workers but also of the general community.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) [11.4 a.m.]: I have an amendment to move upon the resolution, and I am encouraged in my determination to submit it by the remarks of the Minister, in which he laid great stress upon his desire to secure justice between employers and employees. He has, however, missed one point, which my amendment will cover, for it will ensure justice between union officials and members of unions. Since the hon. gentleman seeks to obtain justice all round, he must give favourable consideration to my suggestion. I move the following amendment:—

> "After the word—
> 'jurisdiction'
> insert the words—
> 'to provide a simplified form of appeal in the case of persons prevented by the actions of union officials from obtaining employment.'"

As the Minister has been a union official he is well aware of the very great powers wielded by union officials. Furthermore, it must be recognised that these are days of monopolies so far as the unions are concerned, because compulsory unionism amounts to a monopoly in certain forms of employment in that the work is monopolised by members of the union. If, through any unjust cause, a worker is debarred membership in a union, he is prevented from earning a livelihood in Queensland, and sometimes in Australia.

I have been prompted to move the amendment because of a certain happening in connection with a coalmine in my electorate. Prior to the defeat of the late Government at the polls, tenders were called for the working of the mine on tribute. Two or three tenders were received from the members of the local branch of the union, who desired to work the mine on tribute from the State. The tender agreement contained a clause extending an option until after polling-day. That meant that the option had not been exercised by the successful tenderer up to the time of polling-day. The elections resulted in a change of Government, and there followed a change of policy in respect of the working of this mine. The new Government decided to work it as a State mine, and the action of the previous Government in calling for tenders was set aside.

As you know, Mr. Hanson, cavils are held by the coalminers from time to time to determine the working places of the miners. A cavil was held. It was stated by the new Government that all the employees engaged in the mine were to be allowed equal rights in the conduct of the cavil. In the meantime the local secretary of the union had refused to accept the dues or the levies of the parties who had been concerned in the successful tender. The award provides that only financial members of the coalminers' union can take part in a cavil. The coalminers associated with the successful tender tendered their subscriptions, and offered to pay any penalty or fine that would be inflicted upon them. They offered to make themselves financial in every respect; but the action of the local official in refusing to accept their levies or dues precluded them from taking part in the cavil. These men had been associated with the coalmining industry for many years, and to debar them from working in a coalmine practically meant condemning them to possible starvation. The matter was placed before me as their parliamentary representative, and I appealed to the Secretary for Mines on the subject; but he pointed out that the men concerned were unfinancial. I pointed out why they were unfinancial, but he said that he could not help that—that he was simply doing what a private coalmine owner would do. I again pointed out that the mine was a State mine, that it was not exactly on all fours with a private mine, and that, from a constitutional point of view, every citizen in the State of Queensland had equal rights in regard to securing employment in that mine.

Only the other day the Premier placed great stress on the doctrine that all citizens of Queensland possessed equal rights concerning our national wealth. Yet here we have men debarred from participating in what is one of Queensland's natural resources in connection with a calling with which they have been associated all their lives! I could not get any further satisfaction from the Secretary for Mines, so I went to the Premier. He promised to go into the matter and see what could be done. I have heard nothing from him since. I then asked a question in this House from the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill. On the

31st August I asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

> "1. In the event of members of a union being, in their opinion, unjustly expelled from it or deprived of the advantages of membership by its officials, is there any authority to whom they can appeal for redress, or any other method by which they can obtain it?
>
> "2. Have they a right to information as to the cause for such treatment, and to whom are they to apply for it?"

These miners were denied any information of any kind from the officials. The reply of the Minister was—

> "1 and 2. I know of no cases in which members have been unjustly expelled from a bona fide industrial union; that being so, I cannot advise the hon. member on the question raised by him."

The reply shows a very blind faith in human nature. According to the reply of the Minister, union officials are infallible, and can do no wrong?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: What?

Mr. SWAYNE: So far as I know, infallibility is claimed by only one man of a particular faith on earth, but union officials are now placed on the same level.

I will point out how utterly incorrect the Minister is. A case came before the Supreme Court last week, where the late secretary of the Federated Clerks' Union sued the officials of the union for damages for wrongful dismissal, and the court awarded damages. This fact should show the Secretary for Labour and Industry that he is quite wrong in his opinion that union officials can do no wrong. There is no getting away from the fact that a very grave injustice can be perpetrated by union officials, but apparently there is to be no remedy so long as the present Government are in power. Union officials are dictators and irresponsible, and can do whatever they like.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are speaking of Terrica House now?

Mr. SWAYNE: I am speaking on behalf of the rank and file of the unions.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Have you got your credentials with you?

Mr. COSTELLO: You have no credentials.

Mr. MOORE: The past records of the hon. member for Mirani provide his credentials.

Mr. SWAYNE: Hon. members must realise that nobody is infallible; therefore, some simple means of appeal should be provided. On looking through the Act, although I was refused the information by those who could give it to me, I find that there is an appeal to the court, but how can a few miners living in an isolated part of the State 500 or 600 miles from Brisbane, who are almost destitute through the action of the union, invoke the aid of the Industrial Court? I ask the Minister now if the power to do what I desire to effect by my amendment is already in the Bill. I do not know, because we were only supplied with a copy of the Bill an hour or so ago. And if not, will he embody some clause in the Bill affording a simple and cheap means for members of a union to appeal against what they consider to be unjust and harsh treatment by union officials? Personally, I think it would be better to allow these men to have recourse to the nearest industrial magistrate. There appears to be no reference to that in the Bill. In view of the power of life and death, as it were, which is held by union officials in outside places, there should be some easily attainable and cheap method of appeal from decisions which virtually debar men from earning a living. The Minister may say that it is a Federal matter, and that the State Government have nothing to do with it; but I would remind him that there are coalminers in Queensland working under a State award.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Where?

Mr. SWAYNE: At Howard. Before long other miners will be working under a State award. It is the duty of Parliament to make Acts of Parliament as watertight as possible so that there will be no infliction of wrongs, and my amendment is an instruction from the Committee to the Minister that, before the Bill becomes law, some simple and easily attainable means of obtaining redress for unjust actions on the part of union officials shall be incorporated in it.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) [11.17 a.m.]: I do not propose to accept the amendment, because ample provision has been made to deal with the situation outlined by the hon. member for Mirani. The Bill provides that, where it appears to the court—

> "that the rules of an industrial union or their administration do not provide reasonable facilities for the admission of new members, or impose unreasonable conditions upon the continuance of their membership, or are in any way tyrannical or oppressive,"

the court shall order the registration of the union to be cancelled. That provision will cover what the hon. member is desirous of achieving.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [11.19 a.m.]: I am sorry the Minister does not propose to accept the amendment. The provision which the Minister quoted has always existed, but it is absurd to say that that will cover the case submitted by the hon. member for Mirani.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: It certainly does not cover employees under a Federal award.

Mr. MOORE: Nor does it cover employees who are kept out of a union because of the tyranny of union officials. Men may do something which runs counter to the administrators of a union, and the union will not allow those who are aggrieved to take any action to obtain justice. We say that these people have as much right to legal protection as anyone else. They should be allowed to go to a court to see whether they shall be refused admittance to a union, blacklisted in different places, and harried from post to post. The Government should allow these people to place their case before the court. At any rate, some action should be taken where they are not able to obtain work because they have offended some union official. We know that at the present time men have to pay high fees before they can join a union, and a man who has been out of work for a long period has not the necessary money to enable him to join the union.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: They charge a premium.

Mr. MOORE: That is so. For that reason it is absolutely essential to have some such provision as the amendment. Are the Government going to hand over the government of this country to union administrators and give them the right to say whether or not a man shall have the right to earn his living or whether he and his family shall starve?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You were prepared to hand that right over to the employers.

Mr. MOORE: We gave everybody the right to work irrespective of who he was. Everybody is entitled to that right. The Minister is introducing a Bill that is going to make a close corporation, and is only going to allow the right to work to the individual who is prepared to submit to a political organisation; who is prepared to subscribe funds to a political organisation; and who is prepared to subscribe funds to support a newspaper with whose policy he does not agree. They are the only men who will be able to get work. No man will be able to get work unless he is prepared to sink his individualism and crawl to the officials of the organisation. Unless he does that, he cannot be a member of the union. That is the condition under which he is to be allowed to work in a country like Queensland. The hon. member for Mirani proposes that he shall have an appeal to a police magistrate or some court, where he shall be allowed to put his case. He should be allowed to go before a judge, instead of being intimidated and tied down as he is under present conditions.

There is no freedom in this country at all. The individual who offends an official of a union may be absolutely starved and harried out of the country, and never allowed to get a job at all. He will be blacklisted throughout Queensland, and, as soon as he gets a job, he will be pushed out. I have seen that happen under the 1916 Act, and I know individuals to whom it has happened. The hon. member is prepared to place the duties of the Government in the hands of an outside organisation and allow them to decide whether a man shall be allowed to earn his living or not. It is absolutely essential that some protection shall be placed in a measure like this so that the individual shall have an opportunity, the same as a criminal has, to state his case before a judge or an industrial magistrate. He should have the opportunity of being judged by a Government official, and not by a member of an outside organisation on whom there is no responsibility at all.

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

AYES, 24.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Nicklin
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Nimmo
,, Brand	,, Plunkett
,, Clayton	,, Roberts
,, Deacon	,, Russell
,, Edwards	,, Swayne
,, Fadden	,, Taylor, C.
,, Kenny	,, Tozer
,, King, R. M.	,, Wienholt
,, Maher	
,, Maxwell	*Tellers:*
,, Moore	,, Costello
,, Morgan	,, Daniel

NOES, 26.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Llewelyn
,, Bruce	,, Mullan
,, Bulcock	,, O'Keefe
,, Cooper	,, Pease
,, Copley, W. J.	,, Smith
,, Foley	,, Stopford
,, Funnell	,, Taylor, G. C.
,, Gair	,, Waters
,, Gledson	,, Wellington
,, Hanlon	,, Wilson
,, Hayes	
,, Hynes	*Tellers:*
,, Keogh	,, Conroy
,, Larcombe	,, Williams

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Sizer	Mr. Dash
,, Grimstone	,, Collins
,, Walker	,, Bedford
,, Peterson	,, Copley, P. K.
,, Sparkes	,, King, W. T.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [11.23 a.m.]: Now that the Parliament of Queensland has agreed to the victimisation of the individual by Act of Parliament, there are a few other things I would like to say a word or two about on the introduction of this Bill.

If ever it was necessary for the party in power to exercise discretion in regard to industry it is to-day. That is shown by this Bill, which is the most drastic measure that has ever been introduced into the Queensland Parliament so far as arbitration and industrial conditions are concerned.

It goes infinitely further than the Act of 1916, which recognised that there were certain conditions and industries in regard to which it was impossible that they should be subject to compulsory restrictions and definite conditions.

This Bill applies to every possible section of the community without any exemption, and also ignores the Industrial Court, and provides that there shall be a definite statutory 44-hour week——

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: No.

Mr. MOORE: But that there shall be a maximum of 48 hours in some cases. This Bill does not leave any discretion to the court.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The exceptions under the 1916 Act are repeated in this Bill.

Mr. MOORE: The exceptions are not the same, if they do not go to the court and apply for it. Under the 1916 Act certain definite exemptions were made. Section 5 (i.) reads—

> "Nothing in this Act applies to any State child within the meaning of 'The State Children Act of 1911,' or to persons engaged in domestic service, or to persons employed in work such is usually carried on in farming operations on dairy farms, fruit farms, or agricultural farms; but this restriction shall not be construed to exclude from the provisions of this Act persons employed (*a*) in any capacity on farms in the sugar industry, or (*b*) in butter factories or cheese factories."

The Act further provides in section 10 that employees shall not be worked on more than six out of seven consecutive days, and continues—

> "Provided that in the callings following, namely, carting trade, the removal

of house refuse and nightsoil, parcels deliveries, employees on coastal, river, and bay vessels, and musterers and drovers of stock, the court in its discretion may determine the maximum daily or weekly hours."

There was some restriction there, but there is no restriction at all here.

The Minister went on to talk about the action of the late Government in outlawing 50 per cent. of the people of the State industrially. We did not exclude 50 per cent. of the people. We only took the opportunity afforded by the Act passed by the Labour Government, which made it possible to exclude any section or calling if the conditions of the country made it necessary to do so—a thing which the previous Labour Government had done themselves before we came into power. Moreover, the number who were supposed to be industrially outlawed was only 12 per cent. of the employees of the State. It is no use for the Minister to talk about 50 per cent., because it is absurd to suggest such a thing. It is all very well to talk about bringing all sections of the people under this Bill and to talk about the horrors that occurred to those who were industrially outlawed; but we have to recognise that the only country in the world that has gone in for compulsory industrial arbitration is Australia. For twenty-five years Australia has experimented with it, and, after all the experiments, although people have come here from other countries and studied our legislation, not another country has adopted it. All of them preferred to continue to conduct their industrial undertakings by agreements between those who were engaged in the industries; and none of the things which were supposed to be likely to happen here have happened in those countries.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The inference to be drawn from your remarks is that you would like to revert to the law of the jungle.

Mr. MOORE: I did not suggest anything of the sort. Most other countries call it not the law of the jungle but the law of common sense, and they say it is the law of stupidity that we have here, under which hon. members opposite would have every employer and every employee do the same thing in the same way.

One of the things we must recognise is that there is to be no appeal under this Bill, and that the constitution of the court will, therefore, be a most important factor. The Minister has said nothing as to the constitution of the court except that it is to be composed of a Supreme Court judge and two members appointed by the Government. Since the court will have such tremendous powers in connection with the industries of Queensland and all sections of her people—in particular the employers and employees of the State—the constitution of the court is a vital factor for our consideration. If it is to be constituted on the same basis and principle as the previous one, in which the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union was to be one member and the employers were to be denied any representation whatever, what confidence can there be in the tribunal? One of the main factors to which attention must be paid, if we want to get confidence in industry and have all industries working together for the benefit of the community and those engaged in them, is that people will go to the court feeling that they will get a fair deal and that the members of the court will be able to see both sides of the question, and not only one. Unfortunately, we do not know what the constitution of the court will be, although it will be endowed with enormous powers and there is to be no appeal. I do not know whether it was significant, but it was noticeable, that the Minister did not reply when we asked by interjection whether the president was to have a determining voice or the only voice on a question of jurisdiction, or whether there was a chance of his being outvoted by the laymen on the court. I hope that in all questions of jurisdiction the president will have the final say, because it will be a farce if the lay members can outvote him.

Then the hon. gentleman dealt with the question of the 44-hour week. He is following the wonderful example set by Mr. Theodore some years ago, when we had every member of the Cabinet going up to the Trades Hall and pointing out that a 44-hour week would be a very pleasant thing if Queensland could afford it, but unfortunately she could not. He pointed out that, if a benefit was to be extended to one section of the community, another section of the community would have to pay for it. He was compelled to introduce the legislation, and he adopted exactly the same course as is being adopted in this Bill. He postponed the operations of that part of the Act for a period of twelve months to enable him to get out of the road so that the burden might fall on the shoulders of someone else.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: We have no intention of getting out.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman may not have the opportunity of deciding the matter. He may not be able to prevent it. He may have no desire to go out; but, if the Government continue as they are doing to-day, they will be pushed out. The hon. gentleman is not prepared to accept responsibility for his actions. He intends to postpone the part of the Bill which relates to the statutory 44-hour week, hoping that some miracle may happen, that the financial position of the State may improve, or that something else may turn up to enable him to escape responsibility for his action to-day.

Mr. WATERS: Are you in touch with Lyons?

Mr. MOORE: I am not, but I could not be in touch with a better man.

I take the greatest exception to the action of the Government in endeavouring to nullify the protection that was given to a section of the workers by the Federal Government because they were prepared to obey the laws of the country at a time when another section of the community was not. The Federal Government provided for the protection of the industrial conditions of these workers for the patriotism they had displayed in coming to the rescue of the community when another section of the community was not prepared to obey the laws of the country but was prepared to hold the community up to ransom.

There is another factor to which I wish to draw particular attention. When the Sugar Agreement came up for discussion with the Federal Labour Government, I visited Canberra and Sydney, but it was not possible to arrive at an agreement

embodying the industrial conditions at that stage. Mr. Scullin definitely told me that he would not accept an agreement involving the embargo unless I was prepared to write a letter on behalf of the Government to the effect that the industrial conditions in the industry would not be interfered with legislatively. This Bill is a legislative interference with those conditions. It definitely provides that a 44-hour week must be the practice in the sugar-mills. That is legislative interference with the industrial conditions of the industry. I wrote a letter, in which I pledged the Queensland Government that it would not interfere with those conditions legislatively during the operation of the agreement. I undertook to leave those matters to the consideration of the Industrial Court; but this Bill does not leave them to the court. The 44-hour week is being introduced by statutory enactment. The relevant clause provides for the exemption of employees engaged on coastal boats, of domestic servants, persons engaged in the feeding of stock, and those employed on farms where continuous work is necessary.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Are you referring to the hours?

Mr. MOORE: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The judge has discretionary powers in connection with hours.

Mr. MOORE: The clause does not provide for that.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I say it does.

Mr. MOORE: I should like to be perfectly clear on the point. So far as I can see, the statutory 44-hours must apply to all industries except those specifically exempted.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: It is left to the discretion of the court in all cases.

Mr. MOORE: Clause 10 provides—

> "Provided that (notwithstanding the foregoing provisions in paragraph (*a*) hereof) for employees in the callings following—namely, railway gatekeepers in the employment of the Commissioner for Railways, employees on coastal, river, and bay vessels, musterers and drovers of stock, employees on farms engaged in feeding or attending to stock, or such other necessary services as the court in its discretion may determine, and employees engaged in domestic service, the court in its discretion may determine the maximum number of working days and hours in any week."

The employees engaged in a sugar-mill cannot be regarded as "employees on farms." The employees on farms are specifically exempt. I repeat that I, as Premier, had to write a letter in which I practically pledged the Government not to interfere with the industrial conditions in the sugar industry legislatively, and that anything that was done would be left entirely to the Industrial Court. This Bill is a negation of the promise that I made. It does not seem to me to be a fair thing at all.

The other point which the Minister brought forward was the question of legalising a strike on the authorisation of a union.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You cannot get away from it like that. You are side-tracking.

Mr. MOORE: Side-tracking what?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Are you satisfied with that part of the Bill that you read?

Mr. MOORE: No.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Paragraph (*a*) must be read in conjunction with the clause you read. Paragraph (*a*) states that employees shall not be worked more than eight hours on any specific day, and proceeds—

> "And provided further that (notwithstanding the foregoing provisions in paragraph (*a*) hereof) the court shall not be required to observe the direction contained in the paragraph (*a*) as aforesaid if it is of opinion that in respect of any industry or calling (whether the industry or calling immediately concerned or some other industry or calling) substantial unemployment will result or that the community in general will be prejudicially affected. . . ."

Mr. MOORE: No one can say that substantial unemployment will result if forty-four hours a week are worked in the sugar-mills.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You are shifting your ground. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. MOORE: I am not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: Where it should come in is in the proviso above that, but it does not appear there.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You are shifting your ground.

Mr. MOORE: I am not.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You are reading out a paragraph which is not paragraph (*a*), but is read in conjunction with it.

Mr. MOORE: We will discuss that on the second reading. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows what is in his own Bill. Apparently he has been told what to put into it.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: The proviso you read has no connection with paragraph (*a*) at all.

Mr. MOORE: The other part of the Bill to which I strongly object is that which legalises a strike upon the authorisation of the industrial union concerned. The ostensible object of this Bill is to eliminate industrial disputes and to make it possible for industry to be carried on continuously under agreements or awards as provided. Yet, under this authorisation to industrial unions, the Bill gives power to strike against an award of the court after the court has taken evidence and gone fully into the question. It makes a strike or a lockout legal. We cannot expect to secure peace in industry if strikes are legalised in this manner. We should not enact legislation which will enable a party to an industrial dispute to say, "We are not going to abide by this award," and then legalise that party striking against an award of the court. The whole position is entirely wrong, and cannot be justified. The whole basis of arbitration as conceived by the Government is to make it enforceable against one section only, that is, the employer. This Bill makes it almost

impossible to enforce an award against a union, because it omits that part of the present Act which gives power to attach the funds of a union if a fine is imposed for a breach of the Act.

We have not had time to go through this Bill; but I certainly think that the position is being made infinitely worse. The present Act is infinitely better for the carrying on of industry and protecting the interests of the community. This Bill provides for no exemptions whatsoever. It enacts that any twenty employees in any industry can make application to the court for an award, and it prescribes that the maximum hours of labour per week shall be forty-eight, no matter what may happen. Although the 1916 Act was supposed to be the most progressive legislation enacted at that time, it allowed the court discretion in this respect. We must recognise that in the present position of affairs every endeavour should be made to get those who are out of work back into employment. If we are going to make the conditions more difficult to get men out of work back into industry, it will not be for the benefit of the community; and the consequent disturbance of industry will make the position infinitely worse than it is to-day. The Government who passed the Act of 1916 had come in flushed with victory, Labour having been returned in 1915 by a big majority; yet they recognised there were some industries that could not be bound down hand and foot by restrictions. Recognising that, they made suitable provision, and also provided that in any untoward or unforeseen circumstances the Governor in Council should have an opportunity of exempting any calling or any particular class of people when it was considered necessary in the interests of the community to do that. The Government should have the power; but that power is absent from this Bill. At any rate, the Minister in charge of the measure has not mentioned it.

Then the Bill contains that tyrannous provision regarding preference to unionists, which is unjustifiable under any circumstances whatever. The principle of handing over to an outside organisation the right of an individual to work for his living is entirely wrong, and is one to which we have always objected. We endeavoured to guard against it so that we might give freedom to the individual to get employment where he could under conditions prescribed legally by Acts of Parliament. We did not give the opportunity to any union organiser or official to say that this or that individual shall not have the right to make a living and shall be victimised by union officials. It is almost a criminal thing to hand over that right to an outside organisation. Even the burglar and the murderer have a right of appeal; but, unfortunately, the aggrieved person in the industrial sphere is given no opportunity to obtain redress. The principle is entirely wrong.

The action of the Government in placing their employees under the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court is entirely one for themselves. It is their point of view, if they think that the Government cannot be fair to their employees and give them proper conditions to work under without being dictated to by a tribunal which has not the responsibility of raising the money necessary to pay the Government employees. As representatives of the people, the Government should be fair and reasonable, and set an example as decent and reasonable employers. It is not right that any Government should be dictated to by any authority of their own appointment to fix the conditions of Government employees. Such an outside authority has no responsibility in regard to finance; yet it can dictate to the Government as to what they shall do. In a time of difficulty and stress, when it is hard to know how to make ends meet, I cannot imagine any Government accepting dictation from a body created by themselves—a body which is given greater powers than the Government possess. It is not fair, reasonable, or just. The Government have to do what they think is best in the interests of the whole of the people. As it is, they are carrying out the dictates of a section of the people in the interests of that section. They are not carrying out what every Minister pledges himself to do—to serve the State in the interests of the whole community. We have had hon. members opposite actually saying that they are in Parliament in the interests of a section of the people; yet, when a Minister receives his commission, he definitely pledges himself that he will study the interests of the whole of the community irrespective of any sectional interests! This Bill is definitely sectional, and hands over power to outside organisations and authorities. Yet the people are expected to have respect for a Government which is not prepared to carry out what is best in the interests of the community. The extraordinary thing is that, after all the talk on the hustings, and after all the talk that immediately they were returned they were going to restore the 44-hour week, they are postponing it until 1st July of next year, hoping that something may happen in the meantime; and when the industrial outlaws to whom they gave the opportunity of going back to the court—the pastoral employees—went to the court, what did the court do? It recognised that the position was such that we were entirely justified in doing what we did, and the court refused to grant the conditions laid down until next March; and if the conditions are the same then as they are to-day, probably the court will refuse the conditions asked for, recognising that the employers are not receiving the amount of money to enable the wages to be paid.

At the present time we have all sorts of restrictions placed upon industry. The one thing we want to-day is to give industry freedom; to enable it to expand and employ more people. Opportunity should be given to enable the employers and employees to come to an agreement by which further employment may be given, and under which industry may be able to carry on. It is not a question of making profits to-day. It is a question of carrying on at all. I know provision is made in the Bill for rationing. That is one of the extraordinary things in the Bill that I cannot understand. The Government recognise rationing. They recognise that it is more humane to keep people in work at a lower rate than to put people out of work; yet, when private employers attempt to do that, they are hounded down as men who are trying to exploit the employees. It is a contradiction in terms. They do not seem to be able to realise that they are doing in a modified way what other countries and the Commonwealth have done in a general way; and they think that, because they are doing it in a modified way,

they will escape the responsibility of their action.

I am strongly opposed to the introduction of this Bill. There is not sufficient protection in it. The Act already on the statute book gives both the employer and the employee ample protection. That is all that is desired. It gives freedom to the individual to work—not under the Order in Council passed by this Government, which I do not think was legal. That Act gave freedom to the individual to get a job and conduct his own business in his own way. Everything is amply and adequately provided for, consequently I intend to vote against the introduction of the Bill.

Question—"That the resolution (*Mr. Hynes's motion*) be agreed to"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 26.

Mr.	Barber	Mr.	Mullan
,,	Bruce	,,	O'Keefe
,,	Bulcock	,,	Pease
,,	Conroy	,,	Smith
,,	Cooper	,,	Stopford
,,	Copley, W. J.	,,	Taylor, G. C.
,,	Foley	,,	Waters
,,	Funnell	,,	Wellington
,,	Gledson	,,	Williams
,,	Hanlon	,,	Wilson
,,	Hynes		
,,	Keogh		*Tellers:*
,,	Larcombe	,,	Gair
,,	Llewelyn	,,	Hayes

NOES, 24.

Mr.	Barnes, G. P.	Mr.	Morgan
,,	Barnes, W. H.	,,	Nicklin
,,	Brand	,,	Plunkett
,,	Clayton	,,	Roberts
,,	Costello	,,	Russell
,,	Daniel	,,	Swayne
,,	Deacon	,,	Taylor, C.
,,	Edwards	,,	Tozer
,,	Kenny	,,	Wienholt
,,	King, R. M.		
,,	Maher		*Tellers:*
,,	Maxwell	,,	Fadden
,,	Moore	,,	Nimmo

PAIRS.

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr.	Dash	Mr.	Sizer
,,	Collins	,,	Grimstone
,,	Bedford	,,	Walker
,,	Copley, P. K.	,,	Peterson
,,	King, W. T.	,,	Sparkes

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) presented the Bill, and moved—

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

Question—"That the Bill be now read a first time"—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr.	Barber	Mr.	Llewelyn
,,	Bruce	,,	Mullan
,,	Bulcock	,,	O'Keefe
,,	Conroy	,,	Pease
,,	Cooper	,,	Smith
,,	Copley, W. J.	,,	Stopford
,,	Foley	,,	Waters
,,	Funnell	,,	Wellington
,,	Gair	,,	Williams
,,	Gledson	,,	Wilson
,,	Hanlon		
,,	Hanson		*Tellers:*
,,	Hynes	,,	Hayes
,,	Keogh	,,	Taylor, G. C.
,,	Larcombe		

NOES, 24.

Mr.	Barnes, G. P.	Mr.	Nicklin
,,	Barnes, W. H.	,,	Nimmo
,,	Brand	,,	Plunkett
,,	Clayton	,,	Roberts
,,	Costello	,,	Russell
,,	Daniel	,,	Swayne
,,	Deacon	,,	Taylor, C.
,,	Edwards	,,	Tozer
,,	King, R. M.	,,	Wienholt
,,	Maher		
,,	Maxwell		*Tellers:*
,,	Moore	,,	Fadden
,,	Morgan	,,	Kenny

PAIRS.

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr.	Dash	Mr.	Sizer
,,	Collins	,,	Grimstone
,,	Bedford	,,	Walker
,,	Copley, P. K.	,,	Peterson
,,	King, W. T.	,,	Sparkes

Resolved in the affirmative.

Second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for a later hour of the sitting.

DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clause 1—"*Short title and commencment*"—

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [12.5 p.m.]: This clause gives the Governor in Council power to bring the Bill into force on a date to be proclaimed. I give the Minister credit for the best intentions, because I realise that he is really enthusiastic, and his work with the Department of Agriculture is to a very large extent a labour of love. A vote was not taken on the second reading of this Bill, so I now take the opportunity of saying that I am entirely against it. I suggest to the Minister that he should not bring the Act into force too quickly. He should allow at least a year's grace, so that it might be thoroughly thrashed out by the breeders' associations, the show societies, and the various farmers' organisations consisting of practical men. By that time he will have sufficient evidence to act upon, and will be able to decide definitely whether the Bill is desirable or not.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—"*Interpretation*"—agreed to.

Clause 3—"*Districts*"—agreed to.

Clause 4—"*Inspectors*"—

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.7 p.m.]: I am not quite clear as to whether it is the intention of the Minister to appoint additional inspectors, or whether the additional work will be carried out by the existing officers. The present number of inspectors can carry out the new duties in addition to their existing duties and give adequate attention to them. If it is proposed to impose additional taxation for the purpose of creating a larger body of inspectors to administer the Act, we shall have a lot more to say about the matter. I should like some information on the point.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.8 p.m.]: It is my intention, as far as possible, to carry out the additional work with the existing officers. It may be necessary to appoint one or two additional officers because of the contraction of the present districts, so that the work may be carried out effectively. I do not seek to disguise the fact that it may be

necessary to appoint some additional veterinary officers in connection with the health survey.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [12.9 p.m.]: We have far too many inspectors, and I fear that we shall shortly reach the position existing in New South Wales in connection with the Tick Board, in connection with which there is a large body of acting inspectors, sub-inspectors, honorary inspectors, inspectors, chief inspectors, and inspectors to inspect the inspectors. There are too many altogether. The Minister has already dealt with the matter in reply to the hon. member for Cunningham, otherwise it was my intention to move an amendment to restrict the number of inspectors to that already employed by the department.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [12.10 p.m.]: I do not doubt the Minister's statement, but it is perfectly clear that the Bill really aims at the appointment to the public service of a number of additional officers. Every Bill brought down this session has gone in the direction of making new appointments. Knowing as we do that the Government are dictated to by outside influences, can anyone say that the Minister is simply going to say that the present number of inspectors is sufficient? The Minister said that it might be necessary to appoint one or two more; but we shall find that the one or two will grow tremendously because political influence will be brought to bear, and the hon. gentleman will become a tool for those who require jobs.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are thinking about Terrica House.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am thinking about the attitude of hon. members like the Minister, who would dodge their responsibilities by not paying interest.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I pay my debts, though.

HON. W. H. BARNES: We have evidence in every Bill that has been brought down this session of the two objects of the Government—increased taxation and the creation of more billets.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.12 p.m.]: We know that the Minister will appoint as many new inspectors as may be necessary under this Bill. There is no necessity at all for new appointments. It is an extra load for the producers to carry, because it is they who must find the money. No additional inspectors are wanted, for they will not be of benefit to the producers. The present staff of inspectors can easily administer the provisions of the Act without neglecting any of their present duties.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If they can, I assure the hon. member that they will do so.

Mr. DEACON: What we require is kindly administration of the Act, especially when the Government are taking more out of the producers than they can afford to pay. The Minister is aware that the dairying industry is facing a bad time. We are taking more money out of the industry by this legislation and, if additional inspectors are appointed, it will arouse a good deal of feeling. The Minister knows that some time before the Moore Government took charge the public service was overloaded in every direction. It is overloaded still in certain directions. The Minister states that he will not appoint any more inspectors than are necessary, but additional inspectors under this Bill are quite unnecessary. The Minister's predecessor cut out a lot of unnecessary officers in his department. There were men there for whom there were no jobs. Their positions were abolished, while others resigned or retired from the service, and their positions were not filled. The Minister can carry on that policy. He still has room, as every Minister has, for cutting down his staff. There is not a department in the State which is not still overloaded, and the State cannot afford it. Here is an opportunity for the Minister. His party and others will press for new appointments.

At 12.15 p.m.,

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. DEACON: It would be infinitely better for the Minister to say frankly that there is no necessity to make any fresh appointments.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.16 p.m.]: A rather remarkable statement has been made by the hon. member for Cunningham, more particularly when I recall the legislation that he and other members of the late Cabinet supported quite recently in this Chamber. I refer to the Banana Industry Protection Act, which was piloted through Parliament by my predecessor as Secretary for Agriculture. It may be of interest to quote section 11 of that Act to show how opinions change when hon. members are once again in opposition—

> " . . . The salaries of the chief inspector, the agent, the secretary, and other persons appointed under this Act shall be paid out of the fund."

Mr. DEACON: We knew what the intention was under that Act.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We know that the late Government made quite a considerable number of appointments——

Mr. DEACON: Outside the department.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The industry was levied to provide the money for the payment of those salaries. As a Minister of the Crown, the hon. gentleman must have signed the necessary authority for those appointments.

Mr. DEACON: Were not the appointments made outside the department?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Of course they were. The whole position merely shows the different attitude adopted at different stages of an hon. member's political career. I desire once again to give hon. members the assurance that I propose to create a board, which will consist of two representatives of the dairying industry, nominated by the dairying industry itself, and one representative from my own department. That means that the industry itself will have control of this fund by virtue of the fact that it will have two representatives on the board as against one departmental representative. The amount of money which we will raise under this scheme is not sufficient to warrant the making of any additional appointments of any magnitude. Furthermore, the provision of equipment and facilities is of more importance in the initial

stages of a scheme than the appointment of new officers. It is obvious that with an income of only £5,000 per annum, and with the money controlled by the industry itself, not many officers can be appointed if at the same time the necessary equipment is provided. My mind runs in an entirely different direction—in the direction of assisting dairy factories, in employing capable veterinary officers, not exceeding two in number, and in the purchase of the necessary vaccines and dosages from Royal Park. Those avenues will probably absorb the greater portion of the fund. I do not desire to lay down grounds for the appointment of officers. I say quite frankly that, if there is to be a State-wide survey, it may be necessary to appoint perhaps two more officers; but they will not be appointed until we have surveyed the whole activities of the field officers in the dairy branch. If I can use the officers I have, I most certainly will do so, because every pound spent on salaries obviously diminishes the amount of money available for equipment and other essential activities.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—"*Licensing of bulls*"—

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.20 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 2, lines 37, omit the word—

'twelve'

and insert the word—

'eighteen.'"

The clause provides that a license fee must be paid for every bull over the age of twelve months, but I would point out that a bull twelve months old is very rarely used. If he is being used, he should not be used. As a general rule, stud breeders have a number of bulls about that age. The breeder may keep the calves twelve months or a little older to see how they develop, and he may not use them at all. It will be a heavy burden on the studowner to ask him to pay a license fee on all bulls twelve months old, or to pay a license fee on bulls that are not used. Usually a bull does not start service until he is eighteen months old. It looks as if the twelve months must be a printer's error.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [12.23 p.m.]: I hope the Minister will accept the amendment, because a bull twelve months old is a mere calf. Those who have had experience in the dairying industry know that a dairyman who desires to keep a bull for himself would not castrate that bull until it was twelve months old, even though it was not up to quality. A farmer may keep half-a-dozen bulls till they are twelve months old in order to choose the best for his own purposes. Under the Bill he would have to pay a license fee for each, and out of them there might be only one or two worth keeping.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.25 p.m.]: I desire to assure the hon. member for Cunningham that it is not a printer's error, and that definitely and specifically twelve months is set down as the age after which a license has to be taken out in respect of the bull.

Mr. MOORE: Why make it so young?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It may interest the Leader of the Opposition to know that I did not definitely fix on twelve months, but the conference which met and discussed the matter with me unanimously decided that twelve months was the right age. There were hon. members opposite present at the conference who can confirm my statement.

The real reason why I am not prepared to accept the amendment and desire to stand by twelve months is that we are prepared to give a health service with reference to licensed bulls. It is possible that in a number of cases, if an additional six months was allowed, a bull might be found to be diseased. It is desirable to provide service at the earliest possible age, and we propose this at the age of twelve months. It is uneconomic to allow a bull to go to eighteen months when he could give service at twelve months old, and it might be discovered that he had to be eliminated. That is the reason why I stand by the twelve months. I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.28 p.m.]: If there is anything wrong with bulls, as well as other animals, it generally does not show itself until they are more than twelve months old. On the average, a very small percentage of animals would show signs of disease at twelve months old, if they were tubercular or lumpy, for instance. We sometimes see disease in odd cases at a younger age, but very rarely.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do show societies have a twelve months old bull class?

Mr. DEACON: Take the case of horses, for instance. A veterinary surgeon who is examining a horse will not say anything definite until the horse is over two years old; he will not give a certificate, because it is hard to detect any unsoundness or disease before that age. It is only when the horse is three years old that he will give a certificate. The same thing applies to cattle. No veterinary surgeon could say for certain whether a bull twelve months old was sound or unsound except in rare cases. He might give a provisional certificate to the effect that nothing could be detected. After a further trial from twelve to eighteen months, if the animal is unsound there is a greater possibility of some symptoms showing. I realise that the trouble and responsibility of administration in this matter will fall heavily on the Minister; and the amendments we are moving are tendered in a friendly spirit and with a desire to improve the Bill. It is not a matter of party feeling, and I trust the Minister will accept the amendment.

Amendment (*Mr. Deacon*) negatived.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.29 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 2, line 39, after the word—

'to'

insert the words—

'the nearest clerk of petty sessions or to.'"

It would be much more convenient for people in the country to allow them to apply to a clerk of petty sessions for a license, and save them having to write to Brisbane. If the Minister does not care to allow the application to be made to the clerk of petty sessions, perhaps he will agree to its being made to the stock inspector or some other officer of his department.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.31 p.m.]: There is no need for the amendment, because, although ordinarily the official head or the permanent head of the department is designated as the officer to whom applications must be made, he has power to delegate his authority, and the department obviously must be prepared to allow clerks of petty sessions or other suitable officers to accept applications. The machinery already in existence will, of course, be used. Any officer of the department may be appointed to accept applications, and will accept them.

Amendment (*Mr. Deacon*) negatived.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [12.32 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 2, line 45, omit the word—
'first'

and insert in lieu thereof the words—
'thirty-first.'"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: To save time, I will accept the amendment.

Amendment (*Mr. Edwards*) agreed to.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [12.33 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 2, line 47, omit the words—
'five shillings'

and insert in lieu therof the words—
'two shillings and six pence.'"

It is obvious that in the present condition of Queensland it is essential to keep up production as much as possible, and not hinder it more than is absolutely necessary. The Minister, in his second reading speech, said that certain funds were being found by the State to assist the dairying industry. That may be true, but it would have been fair for him to add that the industry has paid an enormous amount of money into the consolidated revenue. It should be sufficient to charge a nominal fee of 2s. 6d. for registration under present conditions, and thus set the scheme going. The Minister can consider the question of increasing the fees when prices rise and conditions improve. If he were the owner of a farm, he would realise that all the little payments that have to be made by the farmers aggregate an astounding amount. I know of a number of established dairies that have not been able to pay expenses during the past eighteen months. In many cases they were compelled to purchase fodder for pigs, etc., because of the long, dry spell over the growing period of the year. If the Minister requires proof of my assertion, he need only ring the Agricultural Bank, when he will ascertain that what I am saying is absolutely true. In view of these circumstances, it is only fair and just that we should endeavour to lighten the burden of taxation upon this industry until prices improve at least. In many cases the dairymen are paying out more than they receive.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.38 p.m.]: It is our aim to reduce taxation in this industry as much as possible. A reduction of the fee by one-half should not preclude the operation of this Bill. It would be quite a simple matter to provide for an increased fee if it were found necessary from administrative experience.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We would have to introduce an amending Bill.

Mr. DEACON: There would be no difficulty about that. The Opposition would be very pleased to assist the Minister in that direction if the circumstances justified it. The dairyman and people on the land generally have to meet a lot of taxation commitments that can be legally avoided by other sections of the community. People on the land, as a class, pay more taxation in proportion to their income than any other section in the State. It is very difficult for them to avail themselves of the exemptions provided. The State will profit by the increased production and the improvement in the herds, and it should share in the cost of the campaign.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The State will share in the cost.

Mr. DEACON: The £5,000 should be more than is required. Much of the administration of the department is now provided out of the consolidated revenue. It will only require a certain amount of money to administer the Act, and it seems to me unnecessary to raise £5,000 to cover the cost of its administration this year; £2,500 should be ample. There would be no difficulty in raising the lesser sum by the issue of a precept, if that were necessary. The Minister ought to be content with that amount, for no additional appointments will be required to carry out the provisions of the Act this year. It is better to start in a milder way than to impose a harsh tax. If that is done, there will be a great deal more grumbling than if the Minister started on the smaller scale suggested.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*) [12.41 p.m.]: I desire to press the amendment on the Minister. Quite a number of people are engaged in dairying operations in my electorate, and many of them are experiencing difficulty in purchasing bulls. This Bill will add to their burdens. Only a week ago I was speaking to a man who takes a considerable interest in the Royal National Agricultural and Industrial Association, both as a judge and in other ways, and he told me of the enormous difficulties under which those engaged in dairying and breeding are labouring. He makes it a business to rear bulls, and a fee of 5s. on twenty-five or thirty bulls will add considerably to his overhead expenses. If the Minister cannot see his way to accept the amendment, he might discriminate by making the fee 5s. each in respect of the first five bulls, and reduce it to 2s. 6d. in respect to all in excess of five. This is a matter of distinct interest to many people in my district who have paid considerable attention to the development of the dairy industry.

Amendment (*Mr. Edwards*) negatived.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [12.43 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 2, line 47, insert the following new proviso:—

'Provided that such fee shall not be payable in respect of a license for a bull which is registered by any recognised pure bred breeders' association.'"

I have been fogged for some time as to what the intention of this Bill is, and as to what the Minister is driving at. If we take the object to be progressive advancement of the dairying industry, then it seems to me that those men who are doing their best to improve their herds, and are improving their herds by using purebred sires, should be

exempted from taxation because they are doing what they can in the direction desired. I think they should be exempted from any taxation. I find on inquiry that, for example, the Illawarra Breeders' Association makes a charge of 15s. for registering a bull. With that charge goes the inspection of the beast as regards quality, type, and health. I am afraid that, if we are going to tax the beast again, we are getting back to the dreadfully uneconomic double-banking that is so prevalent through the whole of our administration. Where a man has taken the trouble to buy a pure bred sire and use it in his herd, it is only reasonable that he should be encouraged; and that encouragement can be given by providing that, so far as this Bill is concerned, he shall not be called upon to pay additional taxation. I commend my amendment to the Committee.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Murilla*) [12.47 p.m.]: I support the amendment. If the Minister is sincere in his statement that this legislation is brought forward with a view to improving the breed of dairy cattle, he should accept the amendment, which merely provides that where a bull is registered by one of the recognised herd societies it shall be exempt from this taxation. Those who are connected with stud breeding know that herd books are in existence for different breeds of dairy and beef cattle.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Beef cattle are not affected.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It is no use the Minister saying that; because if a dairyman desires to put a beef bull in his dairy herd he can be prevented from doing so under this Bill. That will inflict considerable injury in my own district, where many producers only milk their cows for four or five months of the year and look for a great portion of their revenue to the sale of steers. However, I am not dealing with that point now. We are considering the position of cattle that are registered dairy cattle. Different societies exist for different breeds of cattle, as for example Illawarra, Jersey, Friesian, etc. To be eligible for registration under the auspices of these societies, the cattle must prove their suitability by pedigree and by a test from a health point of view. If they pass that test, why should the Government interfere further? Should not that satisfy the Minister? The only way in which a registered beast might be condemned would be because it did not satisfy the requirements with regard to conformation. That is a ridiculous thing. If the Minister is genuine in his statement that he desires to improve the dairy herds of this State, he will accept the amendment. I think the only reason the Bill has been introduced is to get revenue and put a further burden on the dairy people; but, if the Minister is sincere and revenue is only a secondary consideration, he will accept the amendment. He will not penalise the man who goes in for a first-class animal. The Minister stated that he is desirous of stopping the scrub bull from being used—the bull that will deteriorate instead of improve a herd. The amendment provides that the man who is prepared to spend money to get the best animal possible will not be called upon to pay a license fee. Why put a tax upon the man who is doing everything possible to improve his herd? However, I think the hon. gentleman wants revenue irrespective of whether a man has spent £1,000 to improve his herd or not. He is put in the same category as the man who has not spent one shilling in improving his herd but who uses what is known as a scrub bull. The Minister will be wise if he accepts the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [12.53 p.m.]: If the facts were as stated by the hon. member for Fassifern and the hon. member for Murilla, there would be an irresistible case in favour of accepting the amendment; but, unfortunately for their arguments, the facts are not as stated by those hon. members. The hon. member for Murilla suggests that, because a stud breeder has done certain things which undoubtedly have tended to raise the standard of the dairy herds in Queensland, he should be exempt from the license fee, which is not a taxing fee but a service fee of 5s. The hon. member suggested that we should leave it at that point. We cannot do that, because that only embraces two sides of the triangle, and we must close the triangle in order to make the scheme a success. These studs are the nuclei from which the sires of our dairy herds are generally drawn and will be drawn in increasing numbers in the future. While these very capable and competent breeders, many of whom are friends of mine, can go to a certain point—they have demonstrated an infinite capacity to go to that point—there is a point beyond which they cannot go, and that point is the veterinary service. We are proposing to give a veterinary service both in the interests of the purchaser; and it would be quite an unfair imposition on the fund to provide the stud breeder with a veterinary service for which he makes no contribution and at the same time impose a license fee of 5s. on the dairyman. For these reasons I do not propose to accept the amendment. I believe we can give the stud breeders value greatly in excess of the amount they will be called upon to pay, and at the same time protect the legitimate dairyman, who turns to the stock breeder to replenish his bulls from time to time.

Amendment (*Mr. Wienholt*) negatived.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [12.56 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 3, line 7, omit the word—
> 'twenty'
>
> and insert in lieu thereof the word—
> 'five.'"

Sub-paragraph (vi.) provides—

> "If any bull over the age of twelve months is unlicensed the owner of such bull shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."

I think a penalty of £20 is excessive. The omission to license a bull might not be deliberate; it might easily escape the knowledge of the owner. Again, bulls which have been reared with their mothers might be running in the scrub at the time. Seeing that the Bill is designed for educational purposes more than anything else, there ought to be some reduction in the fine. It may be said that it must not exceed £20, but people may be fined very heavily. When police magistrates see the penalty is not to

exceed £20, they will naturally think that it is rather a serious offence, and will be inclined to impose the maximum penalty. The farmer or breeder of cattle is not a man who breaks the law; generally speaking he observes the law. If the Minister will accept the amendment it will improve the Bill, as there will then be no drastic penalty. It would encourage breeders and have a good effect.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [12.59 p.m.]: A penalty of £20 seems to be out of all reason having regard to the offence committed. If an owner fails to register, a penalty of £5 is ample; £20 might be more than the value of the animal. The value of the animal should count in estimating the penalty. It is only a trivial thing; the omission to license may have been only for a few days. The penalty inflicted is higher, for instance, than the fine imposed in a case of assault.

At 2 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. DEACON: In introducing a Bill which affects every dairyman in the State, the Minister must remember that he cannot administer the measure harshly, and at the start, at any rate, he should not fix his fine on a high level. His object ought to be to get the officers of his department in contact with the dairymen of the State, and, if his fine is high, it will cause a good deal of feeling. It would be a good idea to keep the fine on a low level or his scheme will be most unpopular. I do not think it will ever be popular; but, if the fine is made high, it certainly will not have the desired effect. In times like the present there are such difficulties in the way of a dairyman that he will be prevented from replacing his old bull with a better one, and, bearing this fact in mind and remembering also that the people in the bush are a law-abiding people who do not seek to break the law merely for the sake of doing so, the Minister would be well advised to make his scheme as palatable as possible. The people whom the Bill will affect are ordinary sensible people, who have the same desire as the Minister—the improvement of their cattle—and to realise that desire the Minister will have to work in harmony with them. It would, therefore, be much better if he kept his fine at a much lower level. I know that the Minister will reply by referring to much higher fines in other measures; but this is quite a different thing, and I advise the hon. gentleman to keep his fine low. We have no desire to hamper the Bill or to do anything but what will help to make it successful and assist the Minister's scheme. The Minister knows the people who will be affected, and, if he went into one of the large dairying districts of the State, I feel sure that he would realise that the feelings of the people are likely to be roused by the fixing of too high a fine. The Minister should give the utmost consideration to the opinions of an hon. member who represents a very large dairying district, particularly when that hon. member has had a long experience in the industry himself. He should accept the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [2.5 p.m.]: I am afraid that those hon gentlemen who are pleading for a reduction in the stated amount have not studied the clause very carefully. I would remind them that the amount of £20 is not an irreducible minimum, as they would have us infer from their arguments, but it is the maximum. Hon. members opposite have a very poor opinion of the integrity of magistrates.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They appear to think that the magistrate will inflict the maximum fine of £20. Some of the legislation passed by the Government of hon. members opposite contained very drastic penalties for failure to comply with certain prescribed orders. Under the Banana Industry Protection Act it was provided that any person who offended against the Act should be liable to a penalty not exceeding £5 for the first offence and not exceeding £20 nor less than £5 for the second or any subsequent offence.

Mr. DEACON: You will notice that the maximum fine for the first offence is £5.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do hon. members opposite anticipate that the magistrates will inflict the maximum fine of £20 in every case?

Mr. EDWARDS: It has been done in some cases.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It would have to be a very glaring case. A high fine must be prescribed to meet cases of absolute insubordination and absolute failure to recognise the obligations conferred on the individual under the Act. There are countless instances where penalties imposed by the late Government were higher than the penalties set out in this Bill. The Bill does not prescribe a minimum fine; that is left entirely to the magistrate. I do not propose to accept the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [2.8 p.m.]: I rather regret the attitude that has been adopted by the Minister. We have no other purpose in view than a desire to assist the Minister. He is prepared to search through "Hansard" until he is able to discover something with which to combat the arguments from this side. There is no comparison between penalties imposed in respect of the spread of disease in bananas and a penalty imposed for failure to register a bull just over tne age of twelve months.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The penalty applies to the failure to register any bull.

Mr. EDWARDS: There can be no comparison.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They can both be spreaders of disease, and that is the point that must not be lost sight of.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman must know that thousands of these bulls will not be inspected for twelve months after registration. The Minister has stated that the magistrate will exercise his discretion, but he is guided entirely by the seriousness of the offence, and the seriousness of an offence is emphasised by the maximum penalty imposed. He must be guided by the evidence placed before him, and the inspector can be depended upon to attend to that. The people concerned are entitled to a little more consideration. The hon. member for Cunningham has pointed out that they are honest people with no desire to evade the law.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then they have nothing to fear.

Mr. EDWARDS: So the Minister says; but he knows as well as I do that a dairyman might overlook the need for registration, particularly during the difficult times with which he is at present beset, and he might be prosecuted at the hands of an officious inspector. He is liable to be fined up to £20 for failing to register a bull calf that may be only thirteen or fourteen months old.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No inspector can prosecute without my sanction.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman knows that most inspectors furnish reports from their viewpoint and in the interests of the department.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have frequently turned down recommendations for prosecutions.

Mr. EDWARDS: The power of determining the penalty will not rest with the Minister, but with the magistrate. That is the angle from which the Minister should view this penalty. Magistrates very often have not the full circumstances placed before them, and they must decide on the evidence that is produced. The amendments which have been moved are not extreme, and were arrived at with a view to assisting the Minister to make the Bill a good and workable measure.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [2.12 p.m.]: One aspect of the bull breeders' point of view which the Minister should recognise is that breeders keep many of their animals for a time after they are twelve months old in order to see how they develop. It is possible that a breeder with ten calves might register each animal immediately it reached the age of twelve months; but, through a little oversight, he might neglect to register one or more animals. The penalty in such a case is excessive. Clause 18 prescribes lighter penalties for more serious offences. The object of the Minister could be achieved by providing a penalty of even £5. A penalty of £50 would not have any greater effect in ensuring that those concerned attended to their obligations. It does not matter what opinion the Legislature may have; an offender appearing before a magistrate is treated according to the severity of the penalty prescribed. Many of our Stock Acts prescribe penalties of only £2, and they have the desired effect. A little liberality on the part of the Minister in the matter of penalties for the first two or three years of the administration of the Act would contribute to its successful working and the attainment of the object he has in view.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay* [2.15 p.m.]: I, too, enter my protest against the heavy penalty provided in this clause. A bull which is only twelve months old will not be a menace in the district, and the weather may be such that the owner does not feel inclined to sterilise him immediately; yet, if an unregistered bull over twelve months old is found on an owner's premises, the onus is on the owner to prove the age of the bull to the satisfaction of the inspector. The Minister should be more lenient in the matter, especially at a time when dairymen are suffering great disabilities. The hon. gentleman does not think that any magistrate will inflict the full penalty; but in many instances these cases may be decided by local justices of the peace who have not the same knowledge and training as a police magistrate. The Minister will not lose by the acceptance of the amendment, and he would be acting in the best interests of the dairymen if he accepted it. As a rule, dairymen do all in their power to conform to the law; but, should circumstances arise whereby they are not in a position to register a bull on the specified date, the Minister might extend some leniency, and he can do that by accepting the amendment.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [2.17 p.m.]: It is to be regretted that the Minister has not accepted the amendment. This is entirely new legislation, and it is legislation in respect of which the farmers themselves will pay for the organisation which is being created. Surely it is asking too much to ask them to find money to pay inspectors who may later on be responsible for a fine of £20 being inflicted on a dairyman? At the age of twelve months many a bull is only a poddy. No bull goes to work before he is fifteen or eighteen months old, and in some instances he is unsexed after that age for the reason that the owner considers him unsuitable. If every owner has to keep a birthday book for his bulls, it will be a little bit over the fence. If the clause provided that the penalty will operate in the case of an unlicensed bull over the age of two years, the Minister might have a case; but the penalty of £20 in the case of a twelve-months old bull is too extreme. It may happen that an inspector will encounter a farmer when the latter is not in the best of humours; and the attitude of the inspector may goad the farmer into consigning the inspector to a hotter place than his farm, and, by way of reprisal, the inspector may urge the magistrate to impose the full penalty as a salutary punishment. He will resort to intimidation so that he can do his job. The farmer is going to be educated up to the standard that he must keep a birthday book for every bull calf that is born. It would be wise to provide a smaller penalty in the case of the farmer who omits to register a bull calf at the age of twelve months. I can quite understand a £20 penalty if it applied to a bull two years of age or over; but the Minister should not harass the farmers in this direction.

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [2.21 p.m.]: The registration fee is only 5s., and, if the penalty were made 10s., that would be an increase of 100 per cent. on the registration fee, which would be a very high penalty; yet the Government are fixing the penalty at anything up to £20. If a case comes before a magistrate, he will ask the inspector what is the penalty under the section, and the inspector will say, "Anything up to £20." The magistrate will then say, "Evidently the legislature considered this a rather serious offence, because it has provided for a very high penalty."

Again, it will depend a good deal on the humour of the magistrate as to what fine he inflicts. If he had a bad night the previous night, or if he has had a very busy morning, it will affect his decision so far as the penalty is concerned. Another thing that will affect the penalty will be the demeanour of the defendant. If the farmer is a day over twelve months in registering his bull, he will be subject to a penalty. It is advisable not to provide a high penalty or give the magistrate the discretion of inflicting a high penalty when it is not a serious offence. It cannot be argued that it is a

serious offence to omit registering a bull-calf when it is twelve months old. Yet if the farmer does so he may have a conviction recorded against him, and if he is brought before the court on any subsequent occasion he will be told that he had been convicted for an offence under this measure. The man has to admit that he has been convicted, and that is a record against his character. As the registration fee is only 5s., surely a penalty of £5 will be sufficient?

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

AYES, 25.

Mr.	Barber	Mr.	Llewelyn
,,	Bruce	,,	Mullan
,,	Bulcock	,,	O'Keefe
,,	Conroy	,,	Pease
,,	Cooper	,,	Stopford
,,	Copley, W. J.	,,	Waters
,,	Foley	,,	Wellington
,,	Gair	,,	Williams
,,	Gledson	,,	Wilson
,,	Hanlon		
,,	Hayes		*Tellers:*
,,	Hynes	,,	Funnell
,,	Keogh	,,	Taylor, G. C.
,,	Larcombe		

NOES, 21.

Mr.	Barnes, W. H.	Mr.	Plunkett
,,	Clayton	,,	Roberts
,,	Costello	,,	Russell
,,	Daniel	,,	Swayne
,,	Deacon	,,	Taylor, C.
,,	Edwards	,,	Tozer
,,	Fadden	,,	Wienholt
,,	Kenny		
,,	King, R. M.		*Tellers:*
,,	Maxwell	,,	Brand
,,	Moore	,,	Maher
,,	Nimmo		

PAIRS.

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr.	Dash	Mr.	Sizer
,,	Collins	,,	Grimstone
,,	Bedford	,,	Walker
,,	Copley, P. K.	,,	Peterson
,,	King, W. T.	,,	Sparkes

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [2.29 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 3, lines 10 and 11, omit the words—
>
> 'Provided the owner obtains a certificate of exemption from the Minister.'"

Paragraph (vii.) reads—

> "A license shall not be required under this Act for a bull which is used solely for the breeding of beef cattle, provided the owner obtains a certificate of exemption from the Minister."

It is wrong to confuse dairying cattle with beef cattle. I propose to omit the concluding words of the paragraph. If the paragraph goes through in the way it is worded, it will mean that, although this is called a "Dairy Cattle Improvement Bill," it will put the obligation on beef breeders all over the State to register their bulls unless they apply for certificates of exemption.

This is one of the provisions in the Bill which will cause many people in the country to object to it. The very fact that everybody with a bull will have to register unless he gets an exemption from the Minister does not make for the successful working of the Act, and, seeing that it is a Dairy Cattle Improvement Bill, it would be better to confine the registration strictly to dairy bulls. I would make a man register a bull of a beef breed if used in connection with dairying; but, if a man is breeding cattle solely for beef, I fail to see any reason why he should have to register. I take it that beef cattle do not come under the Bill at all, and it would, therefore, be better to leave out the proviso altogether.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [2.32 p.m.]: The amendment is well worth the consideration of the Minister. The clause as it stands now is really unworkable. For instance, in the dairying industry there are men who have beef bulls, but do not use them for dairying purposes. Some of them are breeders of beef bulls. The Minister should confine his attention solely to dairy farmers who use bulls for dairying purposes. There are others who are breeding beef cattle, and surely it will suit the Minister's purpose if he excludes them. It is not necessary to include all cattle within the operations of the Bill. Why should the owner of a beef bull have to get an exemption from the operations of a Bill dealing with dairy cattle? There may be a case for including a dairyman who has a beef bull and who breeds calves himself; but there is none for including the man who merely has a beef bull and breeds for beef purposes. If anybody is using a beef bull with his dairy herd, he can be routed out by the inspector and fined. I agree that any bulls that are used with dairy cattle should be licensed. It is absurd to insist that the owner of a beef bull must submit proof that it is a bull of that type and obtain a certificate of exemption. The Minister does not seem disposed to accept the amendment. He merely sits in his place with an unfriendly look.

Mr. MOORE: I don't see why the Government should interfere with the owner of beef bulls at all.

Mr. DEACON: The Government have no right to impose restrictions upon the owners of beef bulls merely because those owners reside in a dairying district. Why should the owner of a beef bull be detrimentally affected by a measure which deals with the dairying industry? The owner of the beef bull is minding his business, and the dairyman is minding his. The provision is not right. It will cause inconvenience and trouble. An inspector might call at any time and ask if a bull is registered, or if the owner has a certificate of exemption. It is all unnecessary. It will only lead to worry and trouble. The Minister will not make his own work any easier by insisting on restrictions like this. He is merely bringing trouble on himself—not that I care a hang in view of the way he is disregarding our overtures to-day. We came here to-day prepared to treat the Bill as a non-party measure, to do our best to improve it, to help the Minister, and give him the benefit of our experience. The hon. member for Albert, who is one of the leaders in the dairying industry, has pointed out that it is unnecessary that the owner of a beef bull should obtain a certificate of exemption.

This is one of those hopeless clauses that the Labour Party always include in a Bill for no reason at all. Why should they want

to spoil a measure which the Minister contends will be for the benefit of the dairying industry? Why create friction and trouble amongst people who are not concerned? I thought that the Minister would immediately accept the amendment upon its being moved by the hon. member for Albert. It is very reasonable, and it is the right thing to do. Every cattleman, every dairyman, and everybody who knows anything about the business would definitely say that the amendment should be accepted. If the Minister will not accept it, then it is his responsibility, and all I can say is that I hope he will suffer for his sins.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [2.39 p.m.]: I am glad to see that even the hon. member for Cunningham recognises quite a lot of merit in this Bill. It was quite refreshing to hear him say that, if I were to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Albert, the Bill would be quite a good one. It will be quite a good one as it stands. The assumption appears to be that we propose to register or exempt all beef bulls in the State. That is a wrong assumption, and is not the intention of the Bill, which definitely and specifically provides for the proclamation of areas. Quite obviously these areas will be the dairying areas of the State.

Mr. DEACON: There is not one area in which the beef and dairying interests are not intermixed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member admitted that a person who used a beef bull in a dairying district should be exempt. I agree with him. I have no desire to make this a beef bull Bill, because I am not interested in that question at the present time. The problems associated with beef cattle are entirely different from the problems of general dairying practice. It would be stupid and futile to include beef bulls within the scope of this Bill. When the districts are proclaimed, any man engaged in beef production will be exempt. There is no desire to harass individuals.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The beef bull owner must register and then apply for exemption.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He will apply for exemption. The clause provides that a license shall not be required for a bull used solely for the breeding of beef cattle; but the amendment seeks to exclude that portion of the clause which provides that the owners of beef bulls shall obtain certificates of exemption. There will be no difficulty in obtaining such a certificate.

Mr. KENNY: What about all the questions he will be asked?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If a man is engaged in the production of beef cattle, the one major issue will determine the question. Under these circumstances there is no necessity for the amendment.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [2.43 p.m.]: I look upon this clause as a fatuous, stupid sort of thing. The whole Bill is more or less like that. Simply to gratify the vanity of the Minister we are wasting a lot of time discussing whether a bull shall be registered, or whether a man who keeps a beef bull shall not be exempt from the operations of this Act, while the State is heading for financial disaster. What right has the Minister or anyone else to step in and say that I have no right to keep a beef bull in a dairying district? If I pay my rates and have a right to the property I occupy, I have a perfect right to grow a beef bull or whatever I like upon it.

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: Don't we prohibit a man from growing bananas in certain areas?

Mr. MOORE: That is a different thing altogether. That is done to eradicate disease. This is not a question of whether a beef bull is diseased or not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS interjected.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman is always sticking his nose into Bills that do not concern him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are sticking your nose into butter now.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman was hauled over the coals the other day because he interfered in matters which did not concern him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS again interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Secretary for Public Works must obey my call to order.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I did not know whether you were not calling the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOORE: The desire of this clause is to secure more license fees. Here is a clause which states a license is required for every bull over the age of twelve months, and now we are dealing with a proviso that the owner of any beef bull must apply for a certificate of exemption from the Minister to allow him to keep it on his own property. It is not the Crown's property, but is the man's own property. He has to pay rates and taxes on his property, and he is entitled to use it in the way that he thinks best, either to grow crops or to run cattle. He can even run goats on it if he desires. Yet the Minister comes along and says, "You must keep the sort of bull which I say is required."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You know you are deliberately misconstruing the position.

Mr. MOORE: The whole Bill goes to show that the Minister requires a man to keep a bull which shows definite dairying characteristics.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That applies to the dairying industry. You are confusing the two.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman is confusing the two. The hon. gentleman should know that one of the best dairy herds in Queensland is composed of Devons; yet the Minister says that a man must not keep a bull which does not show definite dairying characteristics. Just this morning we had the introduction of a Bill that does not say that the capabilities of men shall be recognised, because under that Bill the same amount of money must be paid to all men. On the other hand, in this Bill, if a bull does not conform to the Minister's ideas, he shall not be registered. The Minister can find a distinction in the case of a bull, but he cannot differentiate when it comes to men.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is a different form of production.

Mr. MOORE: Yes; one is a form of production where the people are disorganised and scattered all over the country; consequently they can be dictated to by a Minister who has a fad. A man should be allowed to manage his business in his own way. The business of the Department of Agriculture and Stock is to devise means for the prevention of disease. Why should it be necessary to get exemption for this or for that? Certain functions should be undertaken by the Government. They should protect the industry from disease, and give the requisite assistance to people who desire to improve their herds by herd testing, for which a charge can be made if necessary; but, when you get past that point and interfere with the individual as to the type of bull he shall keep, you are making a farce of the whole position.

This is not a question of a Bill to improve the dairying industry, but a Bill to satisfy the academic desires of a Minister, who, on taking up office, is desirous of bringing forward as much legislation as possible. The Minister has not to fill in a license; it is the outside people who have to do that or else render themselves liable to a penalty of £20. Yet all the time this country is getting into greater difficulties. The monthly returns of the financial position show our difficulties in their true perspective; but, instead of trying to overcome these difficulties, we are wasting time in deciding whether a man shall register a bull or whether he shall get an exemption.

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

AYES, 24.

Mr.	Barber	Mr.	Larcombe
,,	Bruce	,,	Llewelyn
,,	Bulcock	,,	Mullan
,,	Conroy	,,	O'Keefe
,,	Cooper	,,	Pease
,,	Copley, W. J.	,,	Taylor, G. C.
,,	Foley	,,	Wellington
,,	Funnell	,,	Williams
,,	Gair	,,	Wilson
,,	Gledson		
,,	Hanlon		*Tellers:*
,,	Hayes	,,	Keogh
,,	Hynes	,,	Waters

NOES, 21.

Mr.	Barnes, W. H.	Mr.	Nicklin
,,	Brand	,,	Nimmo
,,	Clayton	,,	Roberts
,,	Costello	,,	Russell
,,	Daniel	,,	Swayne
,,	Deacon	,,	Tozer
,,	Fadden	,,	Wienholt
,,	Kenny		
,,	King, R. M.		*Tellers:*
,,	Maher	,,	Edwards
,,	Maxwell	,,	Plunkett
,,	Moore		

PAIRS.

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr.	Dash	Mr.	Sizer
,,	Collins	,,	Grimstone
,,	Bedford	,,	Walker
,,	Copley, P. K.	,,	Peterson
,,	King, W. T.	,,	Sparkes
,,	Smith	,,	Morgan
,,	Stopford	,,	Taylor, C.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—"*Duplicate license*"—agreed to.

Clause 7—"*Precept to Board by Minister; amount of precepts*"—

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [2.54 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 3, line 27, omit the words—

'five thousand'

and insert the words—

'two thousand five hundred.'"

My idea is to reduce the dairymen's expenses. The Minister will admit that at the present time the dairymen of this State are paying quite sufficient taxation. This fund will certainly be sufficient if the amount is reduced to £2,500. The Council of Agriculture has issued a precept on the Butter Board for the sum of £4,000. That is a tax on the dairying industry, and to increase that by another £5,000 is over the odds altogether. It means that the cost of dairy production in this State is becoming too great. People everywhere are realising that the cost of production must be cut down, and that they must be relieved of costs to give them an opportunity of producing at a profit. Unless that is done, there will be no progress in the industry. It may be said that this is only a small amount when spread over the State; but we are putting men out of employment by imposing further taxation on the dairying industry.

Mr. FOLEY: That is the object of the Bill—to cut down costs.

Mr. EDWARDS: The object of the Bill is simply to harass the dairymen of the State. The Minister laughs; he is only new to his job. He will take this money from the people; but not one-tenth of the work proposed will be carried out—it could not be accomplished. In the big areas it is no use increasing expenditure to carry out the work required. We cannot carry on the work that is necessary now. Men come into the towns from miles and miles away and are unable to get a permit for their stock. That proves that we are not able to carry out our present legislation. The only thing the Government will do will be to collect the money. I think £2,500 would give a very fair start, seeing that the Butter Board is already paying the Council of Agriculture £4,000 in connection with butter and cheese.

The Minister will be well advised to accept the amendment. The dairymen of the State are over-burdened with taxation, and are only getting low prices for their products.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Secret commissions.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, and cheap beer, which the hon. member sells—and sour beer at that. I hope the Minister will take a broad view of this matter. As one who has been brought up in the dairying industry, I know that the dairy farmers are carrying greater burdens than they should be asked to carry. We know from the Agricultural Bank what is taking place in many of the country districts to-day. One might say that 5s. is not much for registering a bull. Many of them cannot pay 5s. to the Agricultural Bank. They have given orders to the bank, which means that from month to month many dairymen's families are not getting the clothes they need because the Agricultural Bank has orders upon the proceeds of sale of their products. I hope the Minister will do all he can to reduce the

cost of production and help these settlers to go on with the development of the country.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [3 p.m.]: The Minister does not appear to be going to accept the amendment. My reading of the clause leads me to believe that the Department of Agriculture desires to be the master and not the helper of the primary producer. The whole object seems to be to "Take it out of the farmer!" I do not altogether agree with the amendment, but it is an improvement on the clause. The clause has the effect of taxing the man who has no interest in this scheme. Many men have paid up to £200 for a bull of a decent class. That expenditure goes to improve that man's herd; and, if the tax is levied on the Butter Board or a factory, he will probably pay much more than the man whose herd does need improvement because the former's cream cheque will be the bigger.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE interjected.

Mr. KENNY: I am an individualist every time. If we had more individualism throughout Queensland we would not be in the mess we are in to-day. Instead of being individualists, we are content to follow a leader like a mob of sheep, whether he is right or wrong. The individual who is looking after himself and endeavouring to develop his herd along sound lines is paying the bigger contribution because he is a bigger supplier; and the Minister, therefore, is proposing to tax him to a greater extent than the man who is not improving his herd. This clause should not have been included in the Bill. If the Minister cannot collect what money he needs by means of the tax of 5s. per bull, he ought not to have the right to go to the Butter Board or a butter factory and penalise the dairy farmer who is a big supplier.

Amendment (*Mr. Edwards*) negatived.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—"*No license fee when precept issued*"—agreed to.

Clause 9—"*Powers of inspector*"—agreed to.

Clause 10—"*Further powers of inspection*"—

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [3.4 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 3, line 50, omit the word—
> 'satisfy'
>
> and insert in lieu thereof the word—
> 'inform.'"

The word "satisfy" is very wide. The clause requires the owner to satisfy an inspector regarding the age of a bull. A lot will depend upon the temperament of the inspector. He can say that he is not satisfied, and, upon repeating that opinion in court, the defendant is liable to a fine up to £10. It should be sufficient for the farmer to inform the inspector as to the age of the bull. It might be contended that some inspectors will be misled; but the Bill also provides that anyone who obstructs, hinders, prevents, or interferes with an inspector shall be liable to a fine of £10. Surely every dairy farmer is not to be regarded as an untruthful member of society or as a criminal? He will have his herd book, and will have no difficulty in informing the inspector as to the age of the bull. The Minister should accept the amendment.

[*Mr. Edwards.*

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [3.7 p.m.]: The Minister should accept the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I desire to hear argument on the matter.

Mr. EDWARDS: Human nature is human nature the world over; and it is rather drastic to say that a person clothed with a little authority must be satisfied on a certain point. It should be sufficient for the dairyman to say that the bull is such and such an age. It would then be the duty of the inspector to prove that he has been supplied with false information. The Government are definitely condemning every dairyman before he is found guilty, because they say that the dairy farmer must satisfy the inspector. One never knows what goes on from time to time even with regard to inspectors. They are only human, the same as anyone else. The two meet in the bush, and the farmer has to satisfy the inspector about the age of the bull. There might be very good reasons why the farmer is unable to convince the inspector on the point. No one would be so foolish as to say that a bull is one year old when in fact it is two years old. The Minister would be well advised to accept the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.10 p.m.]: The phrase "prove to the satisfaction" is the usual expression adopted in clauses of this description. There is no material variation in the phraseology in this clause as compared with the phraseology of other clauses. "Satisfy" indicates that the inspector must be convinced. Obviously an inspector could be "informed" and go away quite "satisfied," but, on the other hand, he might be "informed" of the age of the bull by the owner of a bull and go away "dissatisfied." In that event the object of the clause would be defeated. It is true that power is contained in another clause to meet such a case; but it is obvious that, when an inspector goes to do a job, he must come away satisfied.

Mr. C. TAYLOR: He might be wrong then.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is true that an inspector might go away satisfied with the wrong information. I want the inspector to be armed with power to obtain all the information that is available. I do not want to restrict his activities in this regard, and I, therefore, decline to accept the amendment.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [3.12 p.m.]: Surely hon. members on the Government benches realise by now just what dairymen have to suffer. The Minister requires at least three, and perhaps half a dozen, speeches before he is satisfied about our contention on this clause. What chance has the farmer of satisfying the inspector sent out by the department?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Inspectors are reasonable men.

Mr. DEACON: If the inspector is as reasonable as the Minister, the farmer must make three or four speeches to satisfy him. We have made two speeches giving good and sufficient reasons for the amendment, but the Minister requires more. What chance has the farmer got against the inspector? The offence which may be created under the Act is that the farmer

failed to satisfy the inspector, and, that being so, he is liable to a fine of £20.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If he refuses to satisfy the inspector.

Mr. DEACON: The Minister has required all this talk to satisfy him. We can, therefore, take it for granted that the inspector, who will not be as intelligent or reasonable as the Minister, will require more talk to convince him. He has to make a job for himself and keep it going, because, if he does not do so, he will soon be on the road looking for work. He goes to the farmer and says, "You have to satisfy me about this, or you will go up." The farmer might have to spend a day with the inspector in order to satisfy him. Hon. members can quite understand the feelings of a farmer when an inspector says, "What is the age of that bull?" He says, "Eleven or twelve months." The inspector replies, "You have to satisfy me about the age of that animal." What has the farmer to do then? Has he to produce a birth certificate signed by a midwife? What more can he do? I hope the Minister will understand that in these circumstances midwives do not always attend. (Laughter.) Hon. members generally will see the additional burden that is being placed on the farmer by imposing this penalty. The farmer may tell the truth, and the inspector may say, "I am not satisfied, and I am going to summon you"; and the man may be fined £20. Under the circumstances the farmer would be justified in committing an assault on the inspector on the spot. (Laughter.) That might be one way of satisfying the inspector. (Renewed laughter.) All these things are an aggravation, and farmers generally are not people who should be treated in this way. They are decent law-abiding people, willing to give all the information they possess. That should be sufficient.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [3.16 p.m.]: The Minister reminds me of the cow in the bail who will not let her milk down. (Laughter.) You cannot get anything from the hon. gentleman. He says that the inspector must be satisfied. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Cunningham regarding a midwife's certificate, he might be content with a certificate of birth signed by a justice of the peace. Better still, he might create a calf clinic at which all calfs must be registered within forty-eight hours of birth. (Laughter.) Under those circumstances the farmer would be protected, and would have some proof that the calf was born on a certain day. Suppose an inspector comes along and says to a farmer who has an eight-months old bull that has been particularly well fed, "I am not satisfied that bull is only eight months old; it looks more to me like being twelve-months old," how can the farmer satisfy him? He can only give the inspector the benefit of his knowledge.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.18 p.m.]: I really thought the Minister would have accepted this amendment. The inspector may be the most reasonable man in the world, but he may not be the most highly qualified man; and it seems to me to be bad law to insert a provision that the farmer must "satisfy" the inspector. If the farmer gives the information at his command and that information is wrong, then he is subject to a penalty.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the information would be all right.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I think so, too; but I think the Minister might easily accept the amendment providing that the farmer must "inform" the inspector. That would create the goodwill which is so necessary to ensure harmonious relations in the dairying industry. I think it would be only reasonable to substitute the word "inform" for the word "satisfy." The clause would still have the same result.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [3.20 p.m.]: I would ask the Minister to make it clear to the dairymen of this State what he considers would be the information necessary to satisfy an inspector.

I think the Minister is absolutely unreasonable. The hon. gentleman is getting some kudos from a certain section of the community for the stuff he is putting up, which is largely camouflage; and he is taking up an unreasonable attitude in this connection. I asked a very reasonable question, and it is information that the dairymen are entitled to have. It is unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to sit in his seat and absolutely refuse to answer a reasonable question. Let him look at the matter more broadly and give the dairymen a chance to know what information is necessary to satisfy an inspector.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.23 p.m.]: The question submitted by the hon. member answers itself, and there is no occasion for me to answer it. It is apparent to the lowest intelligence. Any individual knows what constitutes satisfactory information. The most satisfactory information is the date of the birth of the calf in question.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is impossible.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It may be impossible in some instances.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is impossible in hundreds of cases.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: An approximate statement would be satisfactory. It cannot be assumed that the inspectors are unreasonable men.

Mr. EDWARDS: I say definitely that a lot of them are.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I would remind the hon. member that for three years he sat behind a Government, and had an opportunity of correcting the derelictions of inspectors.

Mr. EDWARDS: I know of cases, and you do, too.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I know only one case that the hon. member brought under my direction, which was corrected, and the hon. member cannot deny it. Satisfaction reposes in truth, so far as it is possible to furnish it, and the inspector would be required to satisfy himself as to the truth of the information furnished. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred information would meet the case, but in the hundredth case mere information might not meet the case, and it is to meet that hundredth case that I desire the word "satisfy" rather than the word "inform."

Hon. F. W. Bulcock.]

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [3.25 p.m.]: It is as well to consider the meaning of the word "satisfy." I have here a dictionary in which the word "satisfy" is stated to mean—

> "To carefully follow the wants, wishes, or desires of; to comply to the full extent with what is wished for; to make content; to comply with the rightful demands of."

If an inspector can require a farmer to comply with the full meaning of the word "satisfy," he will be something in the nature of an autocrat. It might be very hard "to make him content," or to satisfy him fully in respect of his requirements. I think the Minister is quibbling over a small thing, and it would not hurt him to accept the amendment. The Minister might act reasonably in the matter, and accept the amendment of the hon. member for Gympie.

Amendment (*Mr. Tozer*) negatived.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—"*Offences*"—

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.28 p.m.]: This clause imposes a penalty on the owner or person in charge of a bull who refuses to state his name or address or the name or address of the owner of the bull, or states a false name or address. If the owner of a bull fails to produce the license or certificate of exemption for the bull within forty-eight hours of the making of the requisition by the inspector, or refuses to satisfy the inspector as to the age of the bull, he is liable to a penalty not exceeding £20.

I consider the penalty of £20 is excessive. Clause 12, for instance, provides—

> "Any person who in any way obstructs, hinders, prevents, or interferes with any inspector in the exercise of any of the powers conferred or the discharge of any of the duties imposed on him by this Act shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds."

A penalty of £10 is little enough in that case. If we could bring clause 11 and clause 12 into line and provide a penalty of £10 in both cases, it would be more satisfactory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.29 p.m.]: I understand the original idea of the hon. member was to reduce the penalty to £5, but that he now suggests that it be reduced to £10.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am quite willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [3.30 p.m.]: Then I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 4, line 13, omit the word—
> 'twenty'
>
> and insert, in lieu thereof, the word—
> 'ten.'"

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—"*Obstruction, etc.*"—agreed to.

Clause 13—"*Powers of Minister*"—

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [3.30 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 4, lines 23 to 25, both inclusive, omit the words—
> 'which is not well grown according to age, sound of constitution, and manifestly showing dairy characteristics.'
>
> and insert in lieu thereof the words—
> 'which is not sound of constitution and showing dairy characteristics.'"

In order that an animal may be a useful bull, it is not necessary that he should be what may be termed a well-grown animal. Very often during unfavourable seasonal conditions a calf may not grow as it should. I have seen that on many occasions. Growth may be hindered by lack of feed, lack of water, or perhaps sickness. The animal may be perfectly sound, but not a well-grown animal. It would be undesirable to have him destroyed, because stock bred from him would not be affected by his lack of growth. If the Minister reconsiders the matter, he will see the common sense of my suggestion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.33 p.m.]: I am prepared to meet the hon. member half way. In view of what he has said, I suggest that he move an amendment to the clause so that it will read—

> "any bull which is not well grown according to age or season . . ."

That will enable the inspector to take into consideration such circumstances as drought conditions.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [3.34 p.m.]: I do not know that that will meet the case. For instance, all sicknesses are not detrimental to an animal as a sire. Epidemics occur amongst animals as well as amongst human beings, and a bull might be prevented from attaining full growth. I have had such an experience recently. I purchased a pure-bred bull from one of the best herds in the State. That bull was neglected for some months during the wretched time that we experienced. When he came to my place, he was approaching the age of two years; and I am satisfied that an inspector would have been in favour of his destruction. The animal is not yet fully grown according to age, but no one would think for a moment of ordering his destruction. There are many circumstances that interfere with the growth of what might become one of the best animals in the State. If the Minister thinks that his suggestion will meet the case, I am prepared to move an amendment to that effect.

Amendment (*Mr. Edwards*), by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. EDWARDS: I move—

> "On page 4, line 24, after the word—
> 'age'
>
> insert the words—
> 'or season.'"

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [3.37 p.m.]: The hon. member for Nanango has pointed out that other factors apart from seasons may interfere with the growth of an animal. A well-bred bull may not disclose the physical characteristics that one would expect, having regard to his ancestors, yet, as a sire, he is quite all right. Consider a well-bred animal that has a long line of well-bred

sires. There will be some animals that for some reason or other will not have the appearance that could justifiably be expected of them in view of the breeding that is in them. A bull may break away and get into an adjoining holding and fail to develop because of adverse circumstances. The Minister is taking power to condemn these animals. He is taking far too much power. We are not going to improve our dairy cattle along these lines. Ministers of the Crown are not permanent officials. The next Secretary for Agriculture may not know very much about dairy cattle, and the next official in charge may not be a very good judge. It is the official in charge who will have power to condemn for the dairy stock. I think it would be much better to insert the words, "sound constitution and showing dairy characteristics." That would improve the Bill and would make for better results. However, we must take just what we can get.

Amendment (*Mr. Edwards*) agreed to.

Clause 13, as amended, agreed to.

Claues 14—"*On refusal of license bull to be emasculated*"—

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [3.40 p.m.]: This clause seems to assume that, because the license or certificate of exemption is not granted, there is something against the bull. The Minister may have seen several articles in agricultural journals referring to beef strain cattle which were also being used for dairying purposes. It is possible that somebody primarily engaged in beef cattle raising but engaging also in dairying might ask for exemption in regard to his bull. It might be a red polled bull, and the Minister might say "I will not grant you exemption on the ground that the herd is being used for dairying." I am not sure what the attitude of the Minister will be in such a case. I know of a red polled herd, and also a pure bred Hereford herd that are milked for dairying purposes, although the major occupation of the owners is beef-cattle raising. No doubt quite a number of red polled herds are being used for dairying. As a matter of fact, in England I saw a pure bred Shorthorn herd used for dairying purposes. In such a case a man might apply for exemption, which the Minister might refuse on the ground that the herd is being used for dairying. If the Minister refuses that exemption, I am sure that he does not necessarily want to condemn the bull. In a case of that kind exemption would be refused on the ground of the bull's vocation rather than his personal qualification. If the Minister refuses to grant a certificate of exemption, he must still be able to grant a license; the license covers the other.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.43 p.m.]: The fear of the hon. member for Fassifern will not be realised. We must consider the vocation of the animal. It is quite possible that red polled herds are being used for dual purposes.

Mr. DEACON: There are a lot of such cases in Australia.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We must endeavour to meet those cases on their merits. My own viewpoint is that, where a man has a herd, even though it is not defined as a dairy herd, he is using it for dairying in conjunction with beef-cattle growing.

Mr. WIENHOLT: Would you exempt the owner?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If the owner was for the major part engaged in rearing beef cattle, I would exempt him.

Mr. WIENHOLT: If he were doing both?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I would have to consider which was the major occupation. If he were engaged in dairying and the rearing of beef cattle, and demonstrated that the latter occupation was his major occupation, I would have no hesitation whatever in exempting him.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [3.45 p.m.]: The Minister has given no answer to the question that was raised. There are breeds of cattle which are used for dual purposes in cases where dairying is the main occupation. For example, red polled cattle may be used for dual purposes, but mainly for dairying. Yet under this Bill the Minister can say to the owner of such a herd, "You will not be allowed to use red polled cattle." If we had started on those lines, the Illawarra breed would not have been developed. It was the desire of people to have a dual purpose beast that brought about the breeding of the Illawarra. Although dairying is their main occupation, some people want steers that they can sell, and they must show some beef characteristics. There are types of cattle which can be used profitably for dairying and still have beef characteristics, although not to the same extent as the pure-breed beef type. As a matter of fact, the first prize for the best fat bullock at the Brisbane Exhibition some years ago was won by a dairy bred bull reared on a farm at Maryvale. It was reared as a poddy from a dairy herd and took first prize against the whole State as the best fat bullock in the show. Can the Minister get over that? The hon. gentleman is not as expert to judge a matter of this kind as the men who are actually engaged in the business, nor are his inspectors. So long as a man is satisfied with his prospects and is earning a living on his own place, that should be sufficient for the Minister. The hon. gentleman cannot drive people into his way of cattle breeding merely because he wants them all to be dairymen and to have no other but dairy bred stock.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not a fair interpretation.

Mr. DEACON: These people are producing for the State. Why should they be hampered with further restrictions under this Bill?

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—"*Appeal in case of refusal of license*"—

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [3.49 p.m.]: This clause states that the Appeal Board can consist of the Supervisor of Dairying and two cattle breeders. I think there should be two dairy cattle breeders. I do not know whether the Minister intends to appoint representatives from the industry, but I would like some information on the matter. At any rate, the board should comprise men who are breeding dairy cattle and have an intimate knowledge of matters associated with dairying extending over a period of years. I do not know whether the Minister

has considered the appointment of representatives from the owners of the Jersey or Illawarra milking shorthorn type of cattle. We know quite well that at different shows in Queensland we are getting a milking Shorthorn man judging Jersey cattle and he will look for the characteristics of the milking Shorthorn in the Jersey cow. Then we find a Jersey man judging the Illawarras, and he will look for a different type altogether. We have had instances where a judge condemned a cow at one show for certain characteristics and at the next show another judge gave her the blue ribbon for the same characteristics. This board should consist of men who have a knowledge of the different breeds. I do not know whether they are to come from the breeders of dairy stock, but the Bill says "two cattle breeders." I say definitely that they should be "dairy cattle breeders."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [3.52 p.m.]: The title of the Bill is "The Dairy Cattle Improvement Bill," so I think the implication is fairly strong that it is desired and intended to have two dairy cattle breeders on the board.

Mr. KENNY: Will they be breeders of the milking Shorthorn or Jersey cows?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I shall endeavour to have them as equitably chosen as possible. The industry itself, I take it, will be asked to appoint these two judges, and I think we can leave it at that.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—"*Unlicensed bulls*"—agreed to.

Clause 17—"*Provisions as to keeping of bulls*"—

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*) [3.53 p.m.]: This is rather a significant clause, and contains very great powers. When the Bill is passed, the owners will know that they will have to restrict their bulls to their own property, but I do not know that the bulls will know that. What seems particularly serious is that a bull can be emasculated at the discretion of the inspector if he happens to get out. Later in the clause it is provided that—

> "the amount of any costs, charges, and expenses incurred by the inspector in connection with the destruction or emasculation of any bull shall be recoverable from the owner."

The bull may horn or kick him, and you will certainly have a dissatisfied inspector then. We do not know what the limit may be; and it might be wise to insert some restricted amount, otherwise it may mean that the dairy farmer might be mulcted in a very large amount. I am afraid that, before we are finished, he will have to get a permit to take the bull to water.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [3.54 p.m.]: If a bull gets out and does damage, the owner of the bull can be prosecuted. That is provided for at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It may not be possible to estimate the amount of damage a wandering bull may do.

Mr. DEACON: It is always possible to estimate the damage. The individual suffering has a legal remedy now.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You may not be able to assess the amount of the damage.

Mr. DEACON: The court can.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There are instances where the court could not. If a wandering bull committed damage, how can you assess the value of the damage? It is a most difficult thing to assess the value in that case.

Mr. DEACON: It is possible for any magistrate to give a reasonable judgment on the evidence submitted. A dairyman knows the expense he is put to, and can state a reasonable amount. Even bulls which are not straying bulls will wander about and commit damage—that is the difficulty. The inspector, in his discretion, can emasculate any bull. Any bull may break out under temptation. The clause goes too far. I am quite willing to admit the nuisance and damage done by worthless straying bulls. As a general rule, the worthless kind of bull is one that roams about most and breaks down fences. We are leaving too drastic a power in the hands of the inspector by allowing him to emasculate a bull which may have accidentally broken out, but may not have done any particular damage. The inspector cannot show where the bull has done the damage. The clause should be modified, as it gives such extreme power to the inspector, not only with regard to worthless bulls but with respect to well-bred bulls.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—"*General penalty*"—agreed to.

Clause 19—"*Proceedings under Justices Acts*"—agreed to.

Clause 20—"*Exemption from liability*"—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4 p.m.]: I do not like this clause at all. It provides that nothing done by any inspector for the purpose of executing this Act shall subject him or the Crown to any liability provided it is done in good faith. That relieves the Crown or the inspector of responsibility, but treats the dairyman very roughly. The inspector might be guilty of gross carelessness, but, provided his action is done with good intention, he and the Crown are protected. In a previous clause an inspector has power to emasculate a bull, amongst other things; yet he is deliberately exempted from the results of any action for which anybody else but an inspector would have to take the responsibility, simply because he happens to be an officer of the Crown, whether competent or not. Not so many of them are incompetent now, because they have had to pass examinations, but previously many of them had to learn by experience.

If the Crown is satisfied that the inspector is competent and reliable, it has an excellent defence to any action. If, on the other hand, the injured person can prove that the inspector was careless or did not make sufficient inquiry before acting, the owner should be left with the common law right to a judicial decision; and the Minister should not try to legislate the Crown and inspectors out of all the consequences of their acts merely by stating that, if they are done in good faith, no action shall lie. That is going too far.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [4.2 p.m.]: I have been very interested in listening to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and I am constrained to ask him to give me some explanation of a provision which

appears in an Act passed by his late Secretary for Agriculture, "The Diseases in Stock Act Amendment Act of 1930," which goes much further than the clause to which he has been taking exception. It says—

> "And it is hereby declared that the owner of any such horse so destroyed, or otherwise dealt with under the aforesaid provisions, shall have no claim for compensation or otherwise against the owner of the holding who made the muster, or against any of his servants or any other person who so destroyed or otherwise dealt with any such horse or horses, or against the inspector of stock or officer of police or against the Crown, or against the Minister, or against any officer of the Crown in respect of any such horse so destroyed or otherwise dealt with, anything in any Act or law or process of law to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. MOORE: That referred to "brumbies."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not necessarily to "brumbies." In that Act he covenanted himself out of his responsibilities to an infinitely greater degree than I propose to do in this Bill. The clause provides for acting in good faith. Is it reasonable to assume that an officer entrusted with the administration of the Act will act in bad faith?

Mr. MOORE: I know of officers of the department who did not know what they were doing when they went out, and they made the most hideous mistakes.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That was a most unfortunate thing. The officers who will be entrusted with the administration of the Act will get a very specific training along certain lines before they are entrusted with that duty.

Mr. DEACON: That might make them worse.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think so. If it does, then there is no hope for agriculture in our State. These things must be done in good faith. The Crown can covenant itself out of its responsibility, if it is a responsibility, only if things are done in good faith.

Mr. R. M. KING: A man might be very careless and negligent yet act in good faith.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Would there not be some remedy?

Mr. R. M. KING: Not under this clause.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We must have regard to the corporate body and not to the individual. We cannot assume that the officers will act in a careless manner or without good faith.

Mr. R. M. KING: An officer might become intoxicated and do something silly.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then he would not be worthy of his position in the public service, be it in the Department of Agriculture or any other department. If an officer entrusted with definite responsibilities becomes intoxicated and is guilty of a dereliction of duty, he will be suspended and dismissed immediately by me.

Mr. MOORE: That will be all right so far as he is concerned, but the person who has suffered will get nothing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The things that the hon. gentleman contemplates will happen did not happen under the Act which I have just quoted, and there is no more reason to believe they will happen under this measure.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [4.8 p.m.]: There is no comparison at all. Under the Act quoted by the Minister the persons concerned had power to deal with worthless animals; but under this Bill they will have power to deal with admittedly very valuable animals. Under the Act quoted by the Minister those officers could destroy worthless animals.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They could destroy valuable animals, too.

Mr. DEACON: No.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then, why did the Government covenant themselves out of their responsibilities if they could destroy only worthless animals?

Mr. DEACON: Because it would be possible in some cases for people to swear that the animals were not worthless, but they were worth a good deal of money. That is quite a different matter. Under this Bill a bull that may have escaped into a neighbour's paddock is liable to be emasculated by order of an inspector. A good beef bull may have gained access to a dairy herds. We should next look to the that emasculation was not only necessary but was a good thing. What about the damage the owner suffers? It is quite a different thing. This clause had better come out. Inspectors must take some responsibility for their action. If they had to assume personal liability, it would be a check on their desire to do more than they are sent out to accomplish. There are officers in Government departments who do exceed their duty, notwithstanding that they may have a clear idea of what their duties are. You get officers like that in any Government department; but, if they had a personal liability, that would act as a deterrent to their ardour.

Mr. R. M. KING (*Logan*) [4.11 p.m.]: This clause is worthy of the serious reconsideration of the Minister. The object of the Bill is to improve the efficiency of our dairy herds. We should next look to the efficiency of those who have to carry out certain duties imposed on them. Some inspectors are over-zealous in the discharge of their duties. Some might exceed the powers conferred on them under the Act which they are administering. Others might be negligent and careless. At the same time they are all acting in good faith, and because of that fact no action at law will lie against them. That is a position which should not be tolerated. The Minister should preserve the common law rights of those who suffer by the acts of officials, and not exempt the inspector or the Crown from any liability from damage arising out of the execution of any inspector's duties.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [4.13 p.m.]: This clause is altogether too drastic. I have no desire to say anything condemnatory to inspectors, who, generally speaking, are very efficient; but a number of them are young men, and, through lack of experience, they might make a mistake which would be very detrimental to the interests of dairymen. That mistake might be made in good faith, yet, under this clause, the dairymen would have no redress. That is lopsided justice.

The section quoted by the Minister in reference to getting rid of "brumbies" does not apply at all. The inspector may go out and give orders for certain action to be taken in regard to a dairyman's cattle; and the dairyman is to have no remedy in respect of anything that may have been done wrongly by the inspector. I see no reason why the clause should not be eliminated.

Question—"That clause 20, as read, stand part of the Bill"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Mr.	Barber	Mr.	Llewelyn
,,	Bruce	,,	Mullan
,,	Bulcock	,,	Pease
,,	Conroy	,,	Smith
,,	Cooper	,,	Taylor, G. C.
,,	Foley	,,	Waters
,,	Funnell	,,	Wellington
,,	Gair	,,	Williams
,,	Gledson	,,	Wilson
,,	Hanlon		
,,	Hayes		*Tellers:*
,,	Hynes	,,	Copley, W. J.
,,	Keogh	,,	O'Keefe
,,	Larcombe		

NOES, 22.

Mr.	Barnes, G. P.	Mr.	Moore
,,	Barnes, W. H.	,,	Nicklin
,,	Brand	,,	Nimmo
,,	Costello	,,	Plunkett
,,	Daniel	,,	Roberts
,,	Deacon	,,	Swayne
,,	Edwards	,,	Tozer
,,	Fadden	,,	Wienholt
,,	Kenny		
,,	King, R. M.		*Tellers:*
,,	Maher	,,	Clayton
,,	Maxwell	,,	Russell

PAIRS.

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr.	Dash	Mr.	Sizer
,,	Collins	,,	Grimstone
,,	Bedford	,,	Walker
,,	Copley, P. K.	,,	Peterson
,,	King, W. T.	,,	Sparkes
,,	Stopford	,,	Taylor, C.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 21—"*Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund*"—

Mr. TOZER (*Gympie*) [4.20 p.m.]: I move the following amendment:—

"On page 5, line 51, at the end of the clause, after the word—

'Fund'

add the following proviso:—

'Provided that the fund shall not be charged with expenditure incurred in carrying out the activities specified in paragraphs (*a*) and (*c*) of subsection (2) hereof.'"

This clause provides for the constitution of a fund called "The Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund," which is to be under the control of and operated by the Minister. The clause states that the fund shall be administered and applied by him to improving the standard of dairy cattle in the direction of—

"(*a*) Production recording;

(*b*) Extending the use of approved sires; and

(*c*) Control of health of dairy stock."

I understand that the department receives something like £4,000 from the Butter Board for the purpose of extending the use of approved sires; and I understand that both production recording and the control of the health of dairy stock are provided for from other funds. So it seems that the Government are relieving some other funds by the creation of this fund. Whether this is to be an addition to or a substitution for the existing funds I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: It is obvious that the hon. member has not considered the clause. The effect of the exclusion of paragraphs (*a*) and (*c*) from the operations covered by the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund to be constituted under this Bill would result in the funds for those purposes having to be provided out of the consolidated revenue. I, therefore, think that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [4.24 p.m.]: With all due respect to your ruling, Mr. Hanson, I would point out that——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not going to allow the hon. member to debate my ruling. He can discuss the clause.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [4.25 p.m.]: Clause 21 provides that a fund shall be constituted to be called the "Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund," to the credit of which shall be placed all moneys received—

"(*a*) For or on account of fees for licenses;

"(*b*) For or on account of penalties imposed for offences against this Act;

"(*c*) From precepts under this Act; and

"(*d*) From other sources otherwise provided in this Act."

If the Minister can tell us what that covers, we can discuss the matter much better. What money would we get from (*d*) as a source of revenue?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Paragraph (*d*) refers to money paid in for appeals.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The Bill sets out to improve the dairying industry generally, and production is one of the most important factors, as well as extending the use of approved sires and controlling the health of dairy stock. This clause will relieve the Department of Agriculture to the extent of that expenditure by making it a charge on the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This fund will be used in addition to and not in substitution of the activities we are engaged in at the present time.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I understand from the Minister that all money received from the registration of bulls will go back into the industry. I do not want the money used by the Government in various activities to be a charge against this fund, which would mean increasing the financial responsibilities of the dairying industry. If the Minister could give us an assurance in that regard, the clause would be all right, but, from the way it reads, it indicates that what I have suggested may be done, and that would not be fair.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [4.27 p.m.]: The definite intention of the clause is to utilise this fund to do more work than we are doing at the present time. I unreservedly assure the hon. member that the passage of this Bill will not relieve my department of one single item of expenditure incurred at the present time. All the revenue we get will be spent in the dairying industry in addition to what we are spending at the present time along these lines.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [4.28 p.m.]: Do I understand that the £4,000 referred to by the hon. member for Gympie will be paid into the Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund? If it is not the intention of the Minister to relieve the Government of any responsibility, that £4,000 should be paid into this Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund, together with the fees collected under this Bill. I take it that is not the intention of the Minister, because he said that the Government were going to subsidise the scheme to the extent of £10,000. In his second reading speech he indicated that this fund is not going to be subsidised by £10,000; therefore, the whole charge in connection with the registration of their bulls is going to fall on the dairy farmers. In giving your ruling on the amendment, Mr. Hanson, you said that it would increase the charge on the revenue. That shows that the Government are going to be relieved of this charge. You are a member of the Labour Party, Mr. Hanson, and may have heard the matter discussed in caucus. That being the case, we must take it that the Government are being relieved of the charge. Subclause (3) reads—

> "The Dairy Cattle Improvement Fund shall be charged with all the expenses of and incidental to the administration of this Act and of the Fund."

What is the meaning of the words, "and incidental to the administration of this Act"? Are the Government officials who administer the measure to be paid from this fund after the Minister pays to the credit of the fund the £4,000 he already receives from the industry? From his silence we must come to the conclusion that he has no intention of paying over that £4,000; therefore, this fund, which is to be created by the farmers themselves, must pay the "expense of and incidental to the administration of this Act and of the fund." It shows that the Government are shifting their responsibility upon the shoulders of the farmers who are contributing this fund.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. F. Bulcock, *Barcoo*) [4.30 p.m.]: The hon. member for Cook has either not given the question very serious consideration or is merely making statements to prolong the stonewall to delay the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. However, the position is that we certainly receive £4,000 in the way that has been mentioned, but that does not in any way represent the total expenditure by the Government. That is paid for the general administration of the dairying industry, but it is supplemented by many thousands of pounds in addition which come from consolidated revenue. It is proposed to utilise all that we get from this fund in addition to what we are expending at the present time for the purpose of doing the things prescribed under the Bill.

Clause 21 agreed to.

Clause 22—"*Regulations*"—

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [4.32 p.m.]: In my opinion, clause 22 is the Bill itself. In his second reading speech the Minister told us nothing about the scheme, but this clause gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations to any effect they like. Under this clause the farmer loses his liberty, the Minister can impose any restrictions, spey cattle, and do anything he chooses. That being so, we should not give him the power set out in the clause. The farmer does not know what to expect from this scheme. We know that the Government's majority will carry the clause and also enable Parliament to approve of any regulation made under it when it is tabled, but I hold that the people who contribute the money should know exactly what the scheme is. The Minister does not know.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't be silly!

Mr. KENNY: If he does know, why did he not tell the Committee? Why did he not tell us how he proposes to keep the records of production, what he will do with the cows that do not come up to the standard required, what production per cow will satisfy the Government, and so on? He should have told us exactly what he proposes instead of merely taking power under this clause to do what he likes and impose any restrictions and penalties on the farmer.

Clause 22, as read, agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. W. Bulcock, *Barcoo*): I move—

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

Question put and passed.

FISH AND OYSTER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1, 2, and 3, agreed to.

Clause 4—"*Amendment of section* 18—*Exclusive licenses*"—

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4.36 p.m.]: This very wide clause extends a priority right in connection with the renewal of licenses. It provides that licenses may be renewed "upon such terms, provisions, conditions, and stipulations as the Governor in Council shall approve." The principal Act provides that a licensee may be granted 75 miles of foreshore, from which he may take marine products over a period of fourteen years. This clause appears to be rather dangerous in that it does not set out the terms and conditions upon which a license may be renewed. One or two individuals may be given a complete monopoly. Not very much plant is required. The only place where I have seen any essential plant was at Caloundra, and that comprised only a screen upon which the shell grit was shovelled, and it was then bagged, placed on a dray, and carted to a boat. The clause also provides that any person upon being charged before a court for having in his possession "coral, shell grit, or other marine products which may reasonably be suspected of being stolen or unlawfully obtained," if he does not give a satisfactory explanation of how he came into possession of it, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £20. The principal Act says—

> "Provided that nothing herein shall prevent any person from taking therein any fish or marine products for his personal use and consumption, but not for sale."

This clause appears to contradict that provision in the principal Act. The clause provides that any person who disposes of shell grit in bags that are not branded shall be subject to a penalty.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: He is liable to a penalty if he takes it for his own use.

Mr. MOORE: The clause does not say that; but it does appear that the clause will not be applied only to the person who has the right to sell marine products. It is a very wide and dangerous clause. Apparently it means that a person will not be able to take any marine products for his own use. I do not suppose that it is intended that the clause should operate in that way.

I do not know whether a number of people already hold licenses. The number might be very large; but it might only be two or three. The clause does not provide that applications shall be required from persons who desire to take out licenses; nor does it set out the terms and conditions upon which the marine products shall be removed. If the trade is placed in the hands of a few people, an exorbitant price may be charged. It will lessen the competition. The price will not be fair, perhaps, unless it is specifically stated that not more than a certain price shall be charged for shell grit of a certain quality. I should like some information from the Minister on the points that I have raised.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) [4.40 p.m.]: Dealing with the last thing first, the Leader of the Opposition can readily understand that this Bill provides that it shall be read as one with "The Fish and Oyster Acts, 1914 to 1918," which provide that any person can take any fish or marine product for his own personal use or consumption, but not for sale.

Mr. MOORE: This clause is contradictory.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not at all. The clause provides that any person who may reasonably be suspected of stealing or having unlawfully obtained coral, shell grit, or other marine products shall be liable to a penalty. If this clause is read in conjunction with section 18 of the principal Act, which permits an individual to take any fish or marine product for his own personal use or consumption, it clearly shows that he cannot be prosecuted.

Mr. MOORE: He may be charged.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: If an individual can satisfy an inspector that he is taking a little shell grit or coral for his own use, he will not be prosecuted, and no such individual would have any difficulty in satisfying the inspector.

Mr. MOORE: Can he take it from an area that is leased?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. gentleman cannot raise his sheep on another man's selection simply because the sheep might be his own property.

Mr. MOORE: This Bill gives an individual the right to a lease of 75 miles of foreshore, which might embrace an area from Redcliffe to Pialba.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The shell grit leases embrace very small areas indeed. The hon. member for Wynnum could throw some light on the question. The only reason I know why the priority clause is included is because there is a big industry which is doing a big work in this State which has the right to certain portions of the foreshores for fourteen years. There does seem to be some justification in protecting this industry and not permitting anyone to come in and take from them an industry which they have established. There is no secrecy in the matter. The name of the company to which I allude is the Darra Cement Company, which has a lease for fourteen years of certain foreshores in the vicinity of Mud Island.

Mr. MOORE: That is in order to obtain lime for making cement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It would be an injustice to allow this company to be open to every blast at the end of fourteen years. This priority clause affords it some protection for its present rights.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It would be a terrible crime if a man were caught taking away a bucketful of grit for his own use.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There is not the slightest doubt that he might take it, and there is no objection to an individual doing so, provided it is for his own use. The law allows him to take it.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—"*Amendment of section* 44—*General powers of inspectors*"—

Mr. R. M. KING (*Logan*) [4.45 p.m.]: The word "fisherman" appears five times in this clause, and it is the only clause in which it appears.

In other parts of the Bill the word "person" appears; but in this clause the word "fisherman" appears, and there is no interpretation of what a fisherman is. Of course, we know that the man who catches the biggest fish is regarded by some people as a fisherman, but I think that, so far as this Bill is concerned, the word "person" might be substituted for the word "fisherman." If that were done and a slight transposition were made, the clause would read—

> "(5) The Inspector of Fisheries at any port may, by notice in writing served on any person with fish in his possession, require the said person to notify when he lands in such port. When any such inspector has been notified, he may require such person to submit such fish for inspection by himself . . ."

With all due respect to the parliamentary draftsman, that would read much better.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) [4.47 p.m.]: It has been thought better to rely on the generally accepted meaning of the term "fisherman" than to attempt to define it. Of course, we might define a fisherman as "any person who attempts, intends, or desires to take fish"; but the inspectors are certain that the clause as it stands will cover their requirements.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*): I move—

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

Question put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. M. P. Hynes, *Townsville*) [4.49 p.m.]: I move—

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

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [4.50 p.m.]: I certainly thought that the Minister would have given us some further information, and would have given the reasons for introducing this Bill. He evidently feels ashamed of the child he has brought into this Chamber. He has every reason to be ashamed of it, and I was giving him credit for recognising that. The less he says about it the better.

It is to be regretted that advantage is being taken of the resolution passed by this House giving opportunities for a Bill to be introduced and passed through all its stages in one day to bring in the two most important Bills that we have had this session, and endeavour to rush them through without giving hon. members an opportunity of considering them, of understanding them, or of being able to discuss them in the way they ought to be understood and discussed.

Last Friday we had a very important and very far-reaching Income Tax Act Amendment Bill brought in and passed before hon. members had an opportunity of reading it.

To-day, owing to dissensions in the Government caucus and their inability to agree as to what form this Bill should take, we have been placed in the position of having this Bill introduced this morning, and now we are asked to pass the second reading. I have no idea as to how far it is intended to go; but certainly it is wrong to adopt such a policy in regard to Bills of such an important nature. No one can say that an important Bill like this should be brought in and pushed through like this, when it has the characteristics that this Bill has, with its wide ramifications and the restrictions that may be placed upon industry, the powers that it takes for preventing an individual from securing a livelihood, the opportunity it has for practically closing up industries in this State, the arbitrary methods by which all those engaged in industry may be controlled, and the opportunity of placing restrictions upon industry, many of which it will be quite impossible to carry out. It has been stated that it is a very excellent principle to allow sufficient time between the introduction and the first and second readings of Bills to enable them to be discussed. That principle has been approved by Parliament for a number of years, as it was recognised that it was essential that hon. members should have the time to go through Bills carefully and realise what the different clauses mean.

Here we have a Bill of eighty-three clauses and a schedule introduced this morning, and only agreed to by the Government caucus last night after a most strenuous debate as to whether the 44-hour week should be introduced at once or whether it should be postponed; and as to what other provisions should be included in the Bill or left out; consequently Parliament has to suffer by having the Bill thrust at it and put through like this without a proper understanding of the contents of the measure. It is a very far-reaching measure indeed. Yet the Minister never said a word on the second reading, but contented himself with moving—"That the Bill be now read a Second time." That is a most extraordinary method to adopt. Everybody realises the far-reaching importance of this measure. We have at the present time on the statute-book an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act which provides for the constitution of an Industrial Court and conciliation commissioners, who, so far as we are able to see, are quite competent to deal with any situation that might arise. This Bill goes considerably further than any arbitration measure we have had introduced in this Parliament at any time. I regret that, owing to the exigencies of the position and having to go on with the Bill, I have not been able to read it through. I have only been able to skim through it and read the headings in different places.

It is a great pity that one has such scant information about it. It goes ever so much further than the old Act. We know that the Act of 1916 is very different. That Act practically embraced all sections of the community, but it left out and definitely exempted from the operations of the Act certain callings and industries, where it was recognised that it was impossible for them to carry on effectively under the stiff regulations and conditions set out in that measure.

This Bill goes so far as to make some exemption, although I did not understand it to be so when the Minister was speaking, and the mere fact that some exemption is made affords justification for the action that was taken by the late Government. Clause 5 of the Bill states—

> "Save as next hereinafter provided, this Act applies to all callings whatsoever and to all persons whomsoever:
>
> "Provided that—
>
> (i.) Nothing in this Act applies to any State child within the meaning of 'The State Children Acts, 1911 to 1928';
>
> (ii.) The Governor in Council may from time to time, by Order in Council, declare that any person or class of persons shall be excepted from the operation of this Act, and thereupon while such Order remains unrevoked this Act shall not apply to any such persons:"

It only shows that there is a realisation on the part of the Government, exactly the same as on the part of the previous Administration, that conditions may arise in which it is absolutely essential that the Government shall have power to exempt certain classes of business and certain callings from the operations of the Act. It only shows how sensible were the late Government in taking advantage of the opportunity offered to exempt certain classes of businesses that were operating under the Act, and which it would have been impossible to carry on had the conditions laid down in the Act been

followed. Recognising that, a good deal of the criticism by the present Government of what the late Government did falls to the ground. The Minister justified the necessity for putting in a clause like that, which enables the Governor, by Order in Council, to exempt any classes of persons or callings from the operations of the Act, which shows that the Government realise that under certain conditions it is essential that people who are operating those industries should be allowed as free a hand as possible to carry on their work. The unfortunate thing is that in the majority of our industries this Bill is going too far.

The reason I object to the regulations and restrictions that are provided by the Industrial Court awards in many of our industries is that it takes the control and management out of the hands of the people who are trying to conduct those industries. These people are the ones best fitted by experience and knowledge to conduct them. They are men who have placed their capital, or the capital of other people if it happens to be a company, and have been chosen by the shareholders to conduct those enterprises because of their knowledge and experience. Yet we find that a man who happens to be an industrial organiser or a member of an organisation may be placed in the position of a judge of the court. He may happen to be a police magistrate with no knowledge at all of industry—a man who has never had to fight his own battles in the world, who has had conditions made easy for him in the Government service. Or he may be a union official, who has been maintained by the contributions of the members of the union. These men are placed in positions where they can dictate to people with knowledge and experience as to how they shall conduct their businesses; and a most miserable and hopeless failure they have made of their opportunity of doing that in very many cases. In very many cases they have placed industry and business in such a position that they are unable to compete with other industries and other businesses in other parts of Australia which are operating under different conditions. In many cases they have placed burdens on industry that have thrown men out of employment and brought about rationing instead of giving men full-time work.

When anybody adopts the role of arbiter so far as business is concerned, the one thing that is necessary is that he shall have some knowledge of the industries with which he is dealing, and will not have to decide entirely upon the evidence put before him what is necessary in such an industry. Industries nearly all differ in their capacity to pay. Men and women differ in their capacity to earn.

General rulings are made by the court, which are applied to all industries and all employees. We all know that provision is made by which the court can prescribe certain rates of pay and conditions of labour under piecework conditions, according to the earning capacity of individuals; but they are objected to in every possible way by the combined unions, except in a few cases. We are supposed to believe that, irrespective of the different classes of industry, irrespective of the varying capacities and fitness of employees to engage in them, the Industrial Court has the requisite knowledge and is able to make general rulings affecting all industries. I say that it is absolutely essential, if the court is to function in a satisfactory way, that on that court there should be an employers' representative as well as an employees' representative, and that it should be compulsory on the court to call in assessors who are expert in any industry upon which it is adjudicating, so that those who are familiar with it may be able to give information which will enable the court to make an award which will enable the industry to stand up to competition.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Will you explain why you did not make such provision?

Mr. MOORE: Among other provisions, we laid it down that conciliation boards might be established, under which employers and employees could come together and discuss round a table the exact position of their industry; and we endeavoured, as far as we could, to prevent the court from interfering until a reasonable time had elapsed to give those employers and employees an opportunity to come to a conclusion themselves.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: It was impracticable.

Mr. MOORE: It was impracticable only for one reason—because the unions object to conciliation with the employers. They endeavoured as far as they possibly could to put obstacles in the way so that the employers would be forced to the court in the end.

If a round table conference is to be utilised only for the purpose of securing concessions, afterwards to serve as a stepping stone to demanding further concessions in court, then there is no possible chance of arriving at an industrial agreement. In these circumstances it is no use the employers endeavouring to offer a quid pro quo with the desire of securing an equitable working arrangement; and it is difficult to secure the co-operation that is so necessary for the development and extension of industry.

The industries in this State can be divided into three classes. There are those highly sheltered industries that can stand practically any award that is imposed. The high protective tariff enables them to withstand these impositions, whether they be efficient or inefficient. The cost is merely passed on to the consuming public. Then there are those industries that are sheltered to a moderate extent, and, lastly, there are those industries that have no shelter or protection at all.

It is a rather remarkable fact that it is to those industries without any shelter or protection that we look for the financial salvation of this country. We do not look to those industries that are sheltered by high tariff walls or to those industries that are subject to adjudication from time to time and are able to enjoy certain artificial restrictions. We look to the industries that have no shelter and protection—industries that cannot demand any shelter or protection because they are engaged in our export trade. For years past these industries, and these industries alone, have made possible the beneficial conditions that existed for a very long period. It was the proceeds from these industries, and these industries alone, plus the amount of money we were able to borrow on the credit and security of the assets of this country, that enabled the country to enjoy the conditions of the past.

Our assets have now been mortgaged to the hilt, and we are experiencing the greatest difficulty in meeting the interest commitments on the capital sums involved.

Mr. WATERS: The adverse exchange rate materially assists the exporting industries.

Mr. MOORE: Of course it does; but I would remind the hon. member that in the Union of South Africa, where the gold standard still prevails, and where exporting industries are not benefited by the exchange position, it was found necessary to subsidise the exporting industries otherwise they would have passed out of existence.

Mr. WATERS: The subsidies amount to indirect tariffs.

Mr. MOORE: They do. Some of the highly sheltered industries of Australia enjoy these indirect tariffs by way of embargoes, etc., up to 60 per cent., 70 per cent. and 80 per cent., in addition to the premium of 25 per cent. on exchange. They get it both ways.

Mr. WATERS: The city workers are paying for it.

Mr. CLAYTON: Don't you walk into this!

Mr. MOORE: It is only fair and reasonable that industry should be expected to pay a reasonable rate of wage to its employees, commensurate with the profit derived; but it must also be recognised that industry should not only be permitted to pay its employees a fair and reasonable rate and pay a reasonable dividend to its shareholders who provided the capital to initiate the industry, but it should also be able to set aside a reasonable annual sum to provide for replacements in machinery and working plant.

The trouble in Australia in the past has been that far too little has been set aside out of profits for replacements and modern machinery to enable industry to increase the volume of production at a reduced labour cost. It might be said that in many cases industry in Australia is endeavouring to face outside competitors with both hands free, while one hand of Australian industry is tied behind its back.

Many grave difficulties have to be overcome.

Outsiders are permitted to lay down the conditions under which industry is to function, while industry in Australia is restricted and regulated in every possible way. Queensland has taken the lead in this programme of restriction; and at the very worst possible time in its history it is proposed to go further in that direction by the introduction of this piece of industrial legislation. It should be recognised that our main purpose should be to reabsorb in industry that large body of unemployed who to-day are eagerly looking for work. It might be very gratifying to lay down certain attractive industrial conditions; but nobody can say that a Bill of this kind will make it possible for an increased number to be employed in industry.

The Bill is only going to make it more difficult to secure the necessary capital for starting new industries and expanding our present industries. Nobody in his senses—and most people who have saved a certain amount of capital have got a certain amount of common sense—would be likely to come here and invest money to commence an industry, or expand one under the conditions set out in this Bill, when he has an opportunity to go to other places where the conditions are very much easier, where taxation is very much less, and where there is an opportunity to carry on business and place the management of that business in the hands of people fit and proper to manage it rather than in the hands of an outside organisation, the constitution of which is entirely in the air, and of which we know nothing, but can only visualise its constitution by a realisation of what it has been in the past.

No one can say that the operations of the Act at present in force have in any way assisted industry. Industry has carried on in spite of it, but not with its assistance. In no instance has any industry been assisted, either to compete against other States or in the open markets of the world, by the operation of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

The Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Act of 1925 provided for the establishment of a Board of Trade, which was given tremendous powers of investigation. It was given powers of inquiry, the collecting of statistics, and to go into the business activities of certain organisations to find out if the possibilities existed for employing more men. It had power practically to inquire into the financial position of the various industries; but in no single industry did it take the opportunity to see if it could be afforded assistance in any way. The only thing that the Board of Trade ever did when an application was made by an organisation of employers or employees was to listen to the evidence placed before it by both sides and then endeavour to arrive at a compromise between the two sections. In almost every instance added responsibilities were placed on industry, which, while enabling it to struggle along, did not allow it in any way to be successful. In all conferences which have taken place the employers, and those particularly interested in the welfare of industry, have definitely pointed out that the one thing necessary was that those in control of industry should be given the requisite authority to carry on, that they should be disturbed as little as possible in their operations, and that the Government should confine themselves to the art of governing instead of interfering with business of which they have no knowledge.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Are you making out a case against arbitration?

Mr. MOORE: No. The court should have recognition of the fact that those engaged in industry are the most competent to discuss the conditions which should obtain in it, rather than an outsider, who might happen to be a judge or a union organiser who is not concerned directly in the industry. The people who are definitely engaged in industry have an infinitely better idea of how it should be carried on. It is very easy to impose conditions and restrictions upon an industry, but it is not so easy to enable that industry to carry on.

The imposition of restrictions will have a very deleterious effect. Hon. members on the Government side must recognise that in many industries it is a most intricate proposition to carry on in face of the numerous industrial awards that are operating. As an illustration of an establishment operating a

great number of departments, I might instance the Brisbane abattoir, where 600 or 700 men are employed in different sections and operate under different awards and regulations. As a matter of fact, there are many union regulations in existence that have been practically raised up to the status of an award of the Industrial Court or an Act of Parliament. Many of these things are having a very deleterious effect upon industry, making it almost impossible to carry on, and imposing much greater charges than should be imposed upon the people who are supplying the raw product to go through the abattoir. Generally speaking, it makes the position of industry far more difficult.

It is a commentary on the whole position to find that in many industries one or two men are wholly engaged in interpreting the various awards which cover the particular industry. In some industries seventeen or eighteen different awards are operating, all imposing varying rates and conditions for those engaged in the industry. Surely that makes it infinitely more difficult for business to be conducted on proper lines! Moreover, it militates against the employment of additional labour. I happen to know one employer who was behind the counter of his shop when an organiser came in with an inspector, and the organiser, not recognising the employer, said, "Now it is our turn; we have a chance to make the bosses squeal." That might be a very admirable sentiment from the point of view of the organiser; but it is a very rotten one from the point of view of the successful conduct of business, and is most unfortunate from the aspect of the extension of industry and the employment of additional labour. It is not a question that any section of the community should be made to squeal; the question to-day is the necessity to work in co-operation in order to provide as much work as possible with the money that is available after Governments have taken their share of it.

Mr. WATERS: You only raise the question of co-operation when you are in opposition.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member may say that; but I happen to be in the position of employing six or seven persons all the year round. I have done so for years past; and I know what it means when difficulties have to be contended with. When each year a boy gets older—a boy in whom you have taken a keen interest—and it becomes impossible for you to pay him the man's wage that is prescribed by an award, what alternative have you but to dismiss him? It is a sad thing that a boy who has been with you for five or six years should be turned out into the street with no opportunity of getting other work—turned out merely because you cannot afford to pay him a man's wage to do a boy's work.

The difficulty can be overcome in a time of depression by making the job worth so much. That is what hon. members opposite must realise. If the job is valued at so much, and in the case I mention the boy wants to continue in that job, he can be paid what the job is worth and can be retained in employment; but to say that he must be thrown on the unemployment market because it is impossible to carry on under the conditions imposed is to draw attention to a set of circumstances which are hard and cruel in their incidence.

Difficulties have to be faced, but I do not think this Bill will improve the position. In fact, the conditions of the Bill and the powers and instructions given to the court, seem to me to make it difficult for industry to survive if the Act is administered in the way that the Government think it will be. There are some things in the Bill which I cannot understand. It gives enormous powers. It provides that—

> "The same wage shall be paid to persons of either sex performing the same work or producing the same return of profit to their employer."

I cannot understand that provision. I know it was in the 1916 Act. Then the Bill says that the rate of pay of an adult male shall be such as will enable a man, his wife, and three children to live in a comparative state of comfort; that the wages of an adult female shall be such as to enable her to keep herself. It does not follow out the principle of equal pay for equal work. It does not say that the single man shall receive as much as is necessary to keep him in a reasonable state of comfort, as is done in the case of a single woman. That does seem to be conflicting. The Bill gets us nowhere.

It has been recognised by the court, after inquiry, that some of our primary industries are quite incapable of carrying on if they are to have restrictions and regulations placed on them by awards. I can remember when the fruitgrowers of Stanthorpe were under an award and found it impossible to carry on, and the Government of the day sent up the Judge of the Arbitration Court to conduct an investigation as to why the award should be broken, and the investigation by the judge showed that the people in the industry were not earning sufficient to enable them to pay the rates fixed by the award. The consequence was that advantage was taken of a section of the Act and an Order in Council was issued exempting those people from the operations of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Are you objecting to that?

Mr. MOORE: No; I am pleased to see that provision in the Bill; but I am wondering why hon. members on the Government side made such a tremendous row because the late Government used their power under that section to exempt that same industry from the award. That is what the provision was there for; yet Government members pretended before the elections that so soon as they got into power they were going to remedy the position that had arisen as a result of the action of the Moore Government. We were accused of filching away the rights of 50 per cent. of the people. We were accused time after time of placing them in the position of industrial outlaws. Hon. members on the Government side said that so soon as they got into power and had the opportunity, they would remedy the position. They did not do it, and they are not doing it to-day, except in some instances, and in other cases action is postponed until next July. The Government recognise that it is quite impossible for industry under existing conditions to carry on with a restricted number of hours, and they want to get out of the difficulty of having made the very definite promise that they would immediately bring in a 44-hour week by being able to say during the recess, "We have provided for it in the Act, but it will not come into

operation till next July. By that time all sorts of things may have happened; and we may not be in a position to say whether it shall be carried out or not; but we are hoping for a miracle and that the finances will have so improved that we shall be able to do it."

That seems a most remarkable method of carrying out their promises. If a 44-hour week is right it must be right now. If it was right in 1924, when hon. members on that side of the House supported it, it must be right now. I can remember the present Attorney-General getting up that time and proving to his own satisfaction, if to nobody else's, that the 44-hour week was going to be of enormous advantage to Queensland; industries were going to expand, and, owing to the fact that machinery had been introduced, people working 44 hours a week were going to produce ever so much more than they did under a 48-hour week. He put forward all sorts of contentions that were quite pleasing to himself, but which certainly left the Opposition cold. We found after the Bill had been passed exactly the same position as had been forecast and which had been glossed over by Mr. Theodore, by Mr. McCormack, and by the present Premier—that all that had been done was that the productive capacity of the people had been reduced by one-twelfth and a large number of people had lost their jobs. A large number of industries which were fairly successful up to that time commenced to decline, and goods which had been made in Queensland commenced to be made in Victoria and New South Wales and were sent up here and were purchased by the people of Queensland, with the consequence that a lot of people here lost their jobs, while the people in the other States profited, and the expenses of the Government increased by £300,000.

The Government evidently recognise that what happened then will happen again; and, rather than have that state of things brought about, they are postponing the operation of the Bill until next July, so that they can go out and say "We have kept our promise. We have brought in a Bill providing for a 44-hour week irrespective of what the cost is going to be, and it will come into operation next July unless something happens in the meantime."

I take the strongest objection to legislating for a 44-hour week. If a 44-hour week is possible in the industrial and financial position of the State, the court has ample power to grant it to-day. As a matter of fact, in reply to a question asked in the House yesterday, it was shown that about 80 per cent. of the awards in Queensland cover a 44-hour week. The reason for providing a 48-hour week under the other awards is that a 44-hour week would place a hardship on the shoulders of some people who are in no way connected with the dispute and who would be unable to carry on with a 44-hour week.

I have always taken the view that it is absolutely wrong to give any section of the community a concession at the expense of another section. We find the primary producers to-day, who do not come under this Act, have to work unlimited hours in order to provide food to keep up the conditions in the various districts of the State, who have to work harder and longer hours in order that another section of Government employees may work 4 hours a week less, I cannot justify the position. I am absolutely opposed to that. If any of these sections are to be given a concession, it should be the people who are producing articles of export, and who require concessions in railway freights, for instance, to enable them to get their products to the markets of the world to compete with other countries. A 44-hour week will mean that railway freights and fares will have to be raised to meet the increased cost, or taxation will have to be put on the people who are supplying products from the land. The extra cost will have to come back to them. The principle is not only entirely wrong, but it is sheer lunacy on the part of any Government to legislate in this way when we are going through such a period of financial difficulty as we are at the present time.

We have only to take note of the replies given to questions yesterday by the Treasurer as to the amount of money that has not been sent overseas as compared with what was sent overseas this time last year, the lower amount which was received under the Commonwealth Savings Bank Agreement as compared with the corresponding period last financial year, to realise the financial position of Queensland, to see how difficult it is and how close we are getting to disaster. Yet the Government, by placing restrictions on industry by a Bill of this sort, are doing everything possible to increase the expenditure from the national income, of which they are already taking too great a share.

Hon. members must realise that industry cannot carry on if we are going to restrict it in every possible way by awards and conditions—and not court conditions, but legislative conditions. The Industrial Court has definitely set out what rate of wages is to be given, and has provided that, except under exceptional circumstances, the hours are to be 44 per week. That gives the court the opportunity to take into consideration the financial position of the country, one of the things which it was supposed to be given the fullest power and opportunity to do under the Premiers' Plan. One of the conditions of the Premiers' Plan was that under no circumstances should legislative action be taken to hamper the court in its recognition of the financial position of the State, and to enable it to provide those conditions that were necessary to enable industry to carry on.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY interjected.

Mr. MOORE: Hon. members on the other side always try to put up the defence that someone else did something the same or but little different from what they are endeavouring to do to-day. I am trying to point out to the Minister that Queensland is facing one of the most difficult financial positions she has ever faced, that Australia is definitely facing a difficult position, and that the whole world is facing problems which are taxing the best brains of the world in an endeavour to arrive at some understanding or agreement which will offer some way out. I am endeavouring to make hon. members opposite realise that, in the middle of all this, and when we are confronted with the lowest prices we have received for the last forty or fifty years, the Government deem it advisable to bring in the most stringent Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill that has ever been introduced. The "conciliation" is there only for the purposes of

deception so far as I can see, because the provisions for conciliation are so remarkably poor that they were not worth putting in. On the other hand, the measure provides for definite restrictions on the powers of the court—so great that they mean that the Government propose something absolutely antagonistic to the welfare of the community. If ever there was a time when the greatest freedom should be given to all people to secure employment—if ever there was a time when the barest restrictions should be placed upon industry—the barest restrictions necessary to prevent unscrupulous employers from taking advantage of hard-up employees—if ever there was a time when the widest possible opportunity should be given to provide employment and also to permit that employment to be taken—if ever there was a time when the widest possible freedom should be given to those in charge of industry—men peculiarly fitted for the purpose—to carry on their undertakings in the way they think fit and not in the way that the court thinks fit, surely that time is now!

How the court is to be constituted I do not know. I do not want to find myself in the position of criticising the court, but one cannot help expressing wonder at what the court thinks it advisable to do. When one sees the wholesale way in which preference to unionists is being given out and the conditions that are being attached to employment, it makes one wonder whether the court is not in some instances anxious to please the Administration that is in power rather than carry out what is necessary in the interests of industry.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: It is regrettable that one should have to look at things from this point of view, but one cannot help recognising the position as it is. One cannot help remembering that, by an Order in Council, the Governor in Council nullified the specific provisions of an Act of Parliament in which preference was forbidden, in which the right was given to an individual to work, in which it was laid down that the one thing of which account was to be taken was the individual's capacity to work and his competency. He did not have to be a member of an organisation before he was allowed to work; yet this Bill unfortunately goes back to that extraordinarily undemocratic principle which gives the executive of an organisation the power to take away from an individual the right to earn a living. Not only that, but in this preference to unionists the individual is required to sign away his birthright and forgo his own opinions. He has to pledge himself to agree that a portion of the union funds shall be used for political purposes; he is forced to consent that money which he contributes for his own benefit shall be used to subsidise newspapers in whose policy he has no interest and with whose policy he does not agree. One has only to consider the amount of money which has been deflected from the benefit of the employees in industry to the aggrandisement of the positions of the officials of organisations, to the assistance of candidates to secure seats in this House, to realise that to a great extent these are the objects for which the funds of unions are used.

It is quite wrong to compel a competent worker to join an organisation after he has secured a job. Why should he be called upon to join an organisation with which he has no sympathy? Why should he be called upon to pay dues when it is so difficult for him to find the money? Why should he be subject to fines and indignity if he does not conform to the wishes and rules of the organisation when he has had no say in its constitution?

Mr. ROBERTS: He is also liable to expulsion.

Mr. MOORE: He is liable to expulsion if he does not do exactly what he is told, and he is deprived of the opportunity to earn a living. And then this is called a free country! To my mind, it is the most outrageous tyranny that could ever be inflicted upon a supposedly free people; and it is all done in the interests of industrial organisation and industrial unionism.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You would like to see it an exploiter's paradise.

Mr. MOORE: I have seen infinitely more prosperity and happiness and less unemployment under what the hon. gentleman is pleased to term an exploiters' paradise than I have seen under the tyranny of union organisation and union domination.

Mr. MAHER: There is more happiness under slavery.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Where have you seen this greater happiness?

Mr. MOORE: In Australia, prior to the advent of arbitration, and in New Zealand.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Arbitration has been in operation in New Zealand for the past thirty-five years.

Mr. MOORE: To a modified extent.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You picked the wrong one.

Mr. MOORE: I did not. The hon. gentleman is so imbued with his own importance in introducing a Bill like this that he fails to recognise that there are other sections of the community who are entitled to their opinions, and are entitled to endeavour to secure their rights in industry. Industry is staggering under most difficult conditions at the present time, and this is not the time when further regulations should be imposed. Rather is it the time when they should be diminished.

No matter how the Minister may try to deny my assertion, the Bill confers extraordinary powers upon industrial organisations. They are given the right to sue for dues in arrears. At the present time some of the organisations insist that, before a man shall be permitted to join an organisation which he is compelled to join in order to secure employment, he shall pay arrears of subscriptions for three years. These subscriptions fell into arrears because he was unable to secure employment over that period. Now he must pay those dues before he can accept a job. He is compelled to sign away a portion of his wages for weeks ahead to enable this claim to be met. An organisation should have no right to do that. The late Government, whether justifiably or not, decreed that it was not necessary for a man to belong to a union before he could secure work; consequently, the workers were not compelled to join a union and to pay dues. They were entitled to work without that restriction, in accordance with the laws of the

State. No one now has a right to say that the people who obeyed the law as it then existed should be called upon to pay arrears of dues over a period of three years before they can accept the opportunity to work.

Mr. LLEWELYN: That is not true.

Mr. MOORE: It is true, and I can quote definite instances. Hon. members opposite would like me to mention the names of individuals so that victimisation might be practised. They would like to be able to enter the names upon a black list to be broadcast throughout Queensland and Australia with the object of depriving the individuals of the right to work. The power of the union organisations is used in that way and in that way alone. The power of the organisation is not used for the good of the individual members, but to tyrannise over them and prevent them from doing certain things. No union employs its power for the good or the benefit of its people. They employ the power given to them by Act of Parliament to say that a man shall not be allowed to earn a living unless he conforms to the wishes of the organisation.

Mr. LLEWELYN: You have a poor conception of their manhood.

Mr. MOORE: I have not a poor conception of their manhood. Many men have come to me with tears in their eyes strongly objecting to the position into which they have been forced. Let the hon. member place himself in the position of such an individual. Consider the case of a man with a wife and family. He must knuckle down and accept the domination of an organisation before he is allowed to accept a job.

Mr. LLEWELYN: The Toowomba Foundry Company did that.

Mr. MOORE: I have faithfully outlined the position that exists to-day. It is all very fine to say that it does not say much for a man's manhood; but what can a man do in such circumstances? The Government have, by legislative enactment, given the organisation the power to say to that man, "You must join or you cannot get work." It is quite wrong for a Government to do that, but they have done it. The last thing that any hon. member on the Government side should do is to sneer at a man who does not want to join a union but does so rather than sacrifice his wife and family. It is for that reason that he submits to a domination that he objects to with every fibre in his body in order to earn a living.

Mr. LLEWELYN: He robs the other man and his wife by not joining the union.

Mr. MOORE: Every individual in a free country should have the right to seek and obtain work without the intervention of any union. No one says to the man who grows corn, wheat, or potatoes that he must not do so unless he joins an organisation. The utmost freedom is given to those people; and the reason why that freedom is given is that organised unionism would have to pay too dearly for its food if such restrictions were placed on those engaged in primary production as are placed by legislative enactment on workers in sheltered industries. It is pure selfishness on their part to take unto themselves advantages which they will not confer on others. They know too well that, if such restrictions were placed on those engaged in primary production, they would not be able to manipulate the huge blocks of votes which they now do in the cities. They know full well that the people on the land have got to work to keep up the standard of living of the people in the sheltered industries, and that the greater the freedom given to them to work the longest possible hours for the poorest possible return, and the less the return, the cheaper the living conditions for the people in the cities. They are given freedom to do so in order that certain organisations in the State can be handled dexterously by certain candidates for Parliament.

This Bill gives organised unionism power to exercise the greatest tyranny ever introduced in any country in the world. Many of its clauses are copied word for word from the 1916 Act. Odd clauses are put in that were in the 1929 Act. One amendment which we moved on the 44-hour week measure in 1924 gave the court power to prescribe a greater number of hours up to forty-eight, if it was going to mean that greater employment would be brought about and hardship would be inflicted on the community by the introduction of the 44-hour week. Hon. members opposite declaimed against it then, said it was absurd, and rejected it. They have now taken it word for word and placed it in this Bill. The Government recognise—tardily I admit—that an occasion might arise when it would be absolutely essential for different conditions to be applied if an industry is not to be closed up. The ridiculous idea put forward many years ago—that, if an industry cannot carry on under conditions as laid down by the court, it should be shut up—is now not to prevail. We do not want any further experience of that. We saw what happened at Mount Morgan, and there are other experiences.

Mr. TOZER: Gympie.

Mr. MOORE: These industries closed down because they were not able to carry on under the awards of the court. Later on under a modified system one or two of these industries have been enabled to start again. They could have been operating continuously but for the absurd conditions imposed on them by a court which had no knowledge of the working conditions of the industry and no conception of what to award to enable the industry to continue. It merely fixed a hard and fast rule, and unfortunately the industry stopped.

Unfortunately in this Bill legislative restrictions are placed upon industry to an enormous degree. When the day of reckoning comes, as it inevitably must, it will be said that the capitalistic system is at fault. It will not be the system but rather the legislative interference with the system that will make it at fault. It will be the legislative interference with the control of industry that will increase unemployment and accentuate the difficulties of the situation. Hon. members on the Government side will not go out to the people and say that it is owing to the legislation they passed that the unfortunate position has been created. Rather will they rail against the capitalistic system, and say that the people cannot get out of their difficulties except by the nationalisation of banking and finance. They will not recognise that it is through their own folly in passing legislation of this kind that the difficulties have been accentuated.

Unfortunately the whole position to-day is being made infinitely worse; and there seems

to be no recognition of that fact by those in responsible positions. I do not believe that the Premier and one or two other members of his Cabinet are satisfied with the conditions that are imposed by the Bill, knowing as they must do the financial position of the country and realising the difficulties that have to be faced. I cannot imagine for one instant that they have reached their present position without recognising that a Bill of this sort will do infinitely more harm than good. I recognise, in common with other hon. members, that every member on the Government side has to sign a pledge that he will carry out what the majority of the caucus decide. Unfortunately this Bill is a product of what the majority of the caucus decides, and the whole community has to suffer because that majority, elected on the most absurdly restrictive franchise in the world—an Australian Labour Party plebiscite—consider this legislation must be placed on the statute-book in their own interests. We must face that position.

No doubt the Bill will go through; the Government have the majority to enable it to pass it. I have not had time to analyse each clause carefully. The opportunity has not been given to do that by reason of the rush with which legislation is being considered. Legislation is being rushed through in order that the House may go into recess. That is a mistake.

In a Bill of this kind the widest publicity should be given so that those engaged in industry may know exactly what is proposed and be enabled to place their views before the Government. For some unknown and inexplicable reason, this Bill and the Income Tax Bill with which we dealt recently have both been kept until the last days of a dying session, although it was known from the beginning of the session that such legislation was contemplated. Of course, the Government may consider it clever tactics and it may suit their ideas to indulge in those tactics; but to my mind it is absolute folly to act in that way. If a person had the interests of Queensland at heart, the last thing he would want to do would be to inflict injustice on those on whom we rely to extricate the country from its present unfortunate position and to create additional employment. They should be given the opportunity to know fully exactly what is contemplated with respect to the restriction of industry to enable them to put their case before the Government. When the Government had the opportunity of hearing first-hand from people who are fitted to conduct their business by experience—much of it possibly very sad, but the experience of a lifetime in conducting industry—who would be able to show the pitfalls in a Bill such as this, and who would be able to show what the results are likely to be, they would probably be inclined to go back to caucus and show it what the position is likely to be and modify some of the provisions. What opportunity is there for the most important section of the community—those conducting industry; those who have their money invested in industry; those whose desire it is to expand and create further employment—what opportunity is there for them, knowing what is in this Bill? What opportunity have they to make suggestions to enable them to carry on? None whatever! The Bill was introduced into this House this morning and the second reading moved this afternoon. The Minister evidently is ashamed of it, seeing that he did not make any comment or any explanation whatever.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I will make some comments.

Mr. MOORE: The time to make comments is surely at the introduction.

Mr. LARCOMBE: So he did.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, and he said that when he moved the second reading he would give a fuller explanation and reply to any criticisms made.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You have had the Bill for six hours.

Mr. MOORE: Yes, but the House has been sitting all the time, and hon. members are supposed to take an intelligent interest in the legislation before the House. We do not always have that opportunity. I am perfectly satisfied that, if we had brought in such an important measure as this, thrown it to hon. members opposite and expected them to discuss it intelligently, put it through in the time we are asked to put this Bill through, there would be a united protest, and very rightly so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You "gagged" your Bill through.

Mr. MOORE: Hon. members had it for weeks in which to digest what was in it, and then it was put through in a specified time. The guillotine was used—not the "gag."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Over sixty clauses were put through en bloc.

Mr. MOORE: That was the result of hon. members opposite taking up all their time on one or two clauses that did not matter, so that they did not have the opportunity to discuss clauses that did matter. We gave them ample time to discuss the Bill. It is no use going back to what was done. We have to face the position and see what is being done to-day.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Why did you not face it?

Mr. MOORE: Unfortunately the hon. member is not facing it. If he was engaged in industry and had fifty employees, and had to find the money to pay them and find a market for what he produced, he would probably be less light-hearted in placing restrictions on industry. That, unfortunately, is the difficulty with which industry is faced. We are not having legislation put on the statute-book by people who understand industry, by people who have had experience, or by people who have to conduct industry. We are having legislation put on the statute-book by people elected on a class-conscious basis; and they have to carry out the orders of the class they represent. If all these measures were brought in as non-party measures, and every hon. member was allowed to vote according to his conscience, how many Bills that have been passed this session would have been passed?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You were in power for three years.

Mr. MOORE: It is no use saying that we had three years of government. We have to consider the legislation that is being enacted to-day. This legislation is of the most restrictive character.

The Government have taken the worse parts of the 1916 Act and put in some new

clauses and made the position worse. They have not recognised that, under the 1916 Act certain callings were exempted in regard to the 48-hour week. They were left entirely to the court, recognising that industry could not carry on under certain conditions. That Act was bad enough, but all those conditions find a place in this Bill.

There is a good provision in the Bill which was not included in the previous Acts—that is, with regard to intermissions for rest and meals. Employees could not previously start work at, say, 6 o'clock in the morning and work for three or four hours, and then knock off for the middle of the day and go on in the afternoon; but that can be done under this Bill. The alteration is a sensible one; and, if men prefer to work in that way, I do not see why they should not be allowed to do so. Those intermissions for rest were not allowed under the Acts of 1916 and 1929. They are allowed under this Bill, and this is the only way in which conditions have been made a little freer in regard to employers and employees working in the manner they think best. After all, the main conditions should be, not what the Government or the Industrial Court think, but what suits the people engaged in the industry.

Then there is the very objectionable clause with regard to a 44-hour week in the sugar industry, which I hope will be removed by an amendment which will enable the court to grant a 48-hour week. It is a 48-hour week now, and I want the court to be placed in a position that it can grant forty-eight hours, otherwise the word of the Queensland Government will have been broken, because I understood the conditions in the industry would not be altered by legislation but only by the court. Unfortunately, that provision is being left out of the Bill. Other workers, such as gatekeepers on the railways and men employed on coastal vessels, are being included, but workers in the sugar industry are excluded. That will mean a greater impost on the sugar industry at a time when it is quite unable to carry any extra burden. I wrote a letter to Mr. Scullin at the time the sugar embargo was put on.

The PREMIER: What letter are you referring to?

Mr. MOORE: The letter that I wrote to Mr. Scullin at the time the sugar embargo was put on. There was a clause in the sugar agreement with regard to the conditions in the industry which was not agreed to, and it was taken out. Mr. Scullin then said that he would refuse the embargo unless a compromise was reached by a letter being written by me, as Premier of Queensland, stating that conditions in the industry would not be interfered with legislatively, and that any alteration made would be made by the court, which restricted the hours to forty-four.

The PREMIER: At the time you wrote that letter it was a 44-hour week, and it was clear at that time that you would do to the sugar industry what you did to others. You denied to the others the protection of the court.

Mr. MOORE: Irrespective of what the conditions were at that time, I definitely stated that the Government would not interfere legislatively with the conditions which operated in the industry, and we did not do so. The court was to have the right to make any alteration; it was agreed that it should not be done legislatively.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Clause 16 of the sugar agreement only operates when the court does not function.

Mr. MOORE: Clause 16 has nothing to do with it. The matter is governed by the letter which was written by me to Mr. Scullin, stating that the Queensland Government would not legislatively alter the conditions operating in the industry.

I have not had an opportunity of going into the Bill as carefully as I would like, so that I can only make more or less general remarks.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Rockhampton*) [7 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition accused the Minister of shock tactics—of bowling to leg—of bowling to the body—because he did not make a second reading speech. I am satisfied that, before the discussion ceases, the Minister will make a speech which will be exhaustive if not exhausting—sufficiently exhaustive to satisfy the Leader of the Opposition—but we must recollect that at the introductory stage of the Bill the Minister gave a full and comprehensive outline of its main features, and one could not expect him to repeat it on the second reading. There is, in fact, no satisfying the Opposition. They complain that speeches are long; they complain if they are short; they complain if they are not delivered at all.

The Leader of the Opposition took for the text of his speech the principles and ideals of liberty and freedom. He reminded one of Satan quoting Scripture. He reminded one, to, of the despairing cry of Madame Roland during the French Revolution when she was being led to the guillotine—

> "O liberty! liberty! How many crimes are committed in thy name!"

That observation is just as true to-day as it was then. What crimes are committed in the name of liberty! The Opposition talk about liberty! They were the most despotic autocratic, and tyrannical party that ever occupied the Treasury benches in this Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition's speech reminds one of the remark of Dr. Johnson—that patriotism was often the last refuge of a scoundrel. So liberty is often the last refuge, the last cry of the tyrant.

I shall deal now with the old despairing cry of ruin voiced by the Leader of the Opposition. We know that when slavery was abolished, according to the critics of that Act, the world would be ruined. We know that, when the Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867 were passed through the British Parliament the same old cry of ruination was raised. We know that out here in Australia, when the kanakas were deported, or when legislation was passed to deport the kanakas, the same despairing cry was raised that the sugar industry would be ruined. We know that, when the Chapman sugar industry regulation was framed the same cry was raised. We know that, when Labour was returned to power in Queensland, we again heard the despairing and capitalistic cry repeated that the State would be ruined. We remember that later in 1925, when the 44-hour week was placed on the statute-book the same cry was raised. It is remarkable the number of times that the State and society have been ruined, according to critics, and how we seem to survive. We

have progressed in spite of that cry; therefore, we can derive a little crumb of consolation from the fact that despite the cry of ruination that has been uttered, repeated, and reiterated time and again throughout history, we have prospered and progressed.

The Leader of the Opposition talked like a statesman, but what a change between his speech to-day and his utterances in 1929! When challenged on the public platform in 1929 that his reactionary policy meant low wages and longer hours, he said that it was all moonshine, and that it was platitudinous piffle to gull the electors. However, wages were reduced, and the hours increased under his Administration. At that time the Leader of the Opposition said that a high-wage country was a prosperous country. He asked why he should wish to reduce wages and the purchasing power of the country when a high-wage country meant a prosperous country. That was the observation of the Leader of the Opposition in 1929; but his observations to-day are quite the contrary.

We all know that there is a limitation to the wage standard; but the Leader of the Opposition placed too much importance upon one or two factors in production. He spoke of the handicap upon industry, of an increase in wages and a reduction in hours; but he ignored other important factors in production. He ignored the factors of profit, interest, rent, efficiency or inefficiency in business, efficiency or inefficiency in plant, promoters' shares, and watered stock. All these factors of production were carefully ignored. I want to remind hon. members that the Leader of the Federal Country Party, speaking in Sydney last year, remarked that the woodworking plants in New South Wales were fifteen years behind their competitors in the United States of America. That factor must be taken into consideration. We cannot capitalise all the weaknesses of industry into low wages and longer hours. The "Sydney Morning Herald" last year reported the arrival in Australia of Captain Clayton, a leader of trade and industry in South Africa. He referred to the many thousands of workers who had been thrown out of employment in the Union of South Africa; but he further pointed out that, by intensive organisation and chemical experimentation and the adoption of modern methods, thousands of men were reabsorbed in industry, which was able to proceed fairly successfully. He used these remarkable words:—

> "High wages would not make it impossible for a number of mining shows now idle in Australia to be made profitable if proper methods were employed similar to those adopted in South Africa."

The Leader of the Opposition should have given a more comprehensive review of the factors of production, but he failed to mention those factors to which I have referred.

He further stated that the immediate problem of the Government should be to see that the unemployed were reabsorbed into industry. I agree with him; but surely every reasonable observer and critic will allow that the Government attended to that very important problem at the very beginning. Thousands of men have been placed in employment, and relief has been extended to those who were unfortunately thrown out of work in Queensland through economic depression and other factors. The Government have fully borne in mind the very important consideration of absorbing the unemployed, which, as the Leader of the Opposition stated, is vital.

The Leader of the Opposition also emphasised the claims of business and the rights of industry. The Government recognise these important considerations too; and there is nothing in this Bill which will penalise industry or embarrass business. These considerations have been well recognised by the Government in their policy. The "Telegraph" of 5th instant, in dealing with the business index of Queensland, stated—

> "HIGHEST SINCE 1930.
>
> "BUSINESS INDEX FOR QUEENSLAND
>
> "A sharp upward movement in business conditions as tabulated in the indexes of the Bureau of Economics for October marks a general recovery to the level at the end of 1930, nearly two year ago. Larger quantities of exports and some revival of confidence have offset the consequences of the continued fall in world prices."

These observations show that the policy of the Government pays due regard to the important factors of trade, industry, and commerce.

The Leader of the Opposition further referred to undue legislative interference, and to what he termed the excessive restrictions placed on trade and industry by the Labour Government and Labour legislation. For three years prior to June last, when the present Government came into power, the Moore Government had control of the reins of office. This "legislative interference and excessive restrictions on trade and industry" were not present then. Do we find that there was any improvement in trade or industry in that period? We find that the facts are to the contrary, and that this alleged legislative interference and restrictions on trade and industry were only myths. They did not exist at all.

Fortunately, we have the experience of the policy and record of the Labour Government between 1915 and 1929 to which I hope to refer in order to refute the arguments of hon. members opposite particularly the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman ridiculed the conciliation provisions of this Bill; but they are real, practical, and valuable. We know that under the previous Labour Government a settlement of most of the industrial disputes was brought about by conciliation. That is an important feature of Labour's policy—to avoid industrial trouble and turmoil. Statistics and records show that under the Labour Government very many disputes were settled by that valuable preliminary method, which is being re-established under this Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition was concerned about the flow of capital and investment of money in this State. He was of the opinion that the flow might be lessened as a result of this Bill and other Labour legislation. There is no foundation for those fears. Under Labour Government capital flowed into this State, and money was invested in a splendid manner. For instance, millions of pounds were invested in the Mount Isa proposition. That is a great industrial proposition which has meant, and will mean, so much to the State in the way of railway traffic and employment, and in various other ways. The investment

of that money was made after due deliberation and consideration by the best industrial and financial brains of the world. I had the pleasure of being associated with the representatives of the Government who met Mr. Urquhart, the chairman of the company, and other representatives of the company which visited Brisbane to ascertain whether it was safe to invest capital in Queensland under a Labour Government. After returning from his trip to North Queensland, Mr. Urquhart made the following statement which was published in the "Daily Mail" and the "Telegraph":—

> "I can frankly say that any vestige of doubt which may have been in my mind as to the attitude of Labour has been fully and finally removed. I feel certain that labour can be obtained as cheaply as any in the world. I feel sure as long as they (workers) are given a fair deal, the employers will get a fair deal. I am satisfied there are no exceptional labour problems which cannot be overcome. Given modern machinery and appliances, great developments could and would be made in Australian mining."

That is a very weighty and important observation by one of the great leaders of industrial and financial affairs in the world after he had conferred with the political and industrial leaders of Queensland. As the result of his recommendations, millions of pounds were invested in the State and a very fine industry established, therefore, following the past as a guide—and Thomas Carlyle once soundly observed that the best guide to the future is the past—there is no reasonable ground for the fears expressed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS: Your statement proves nothing.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Interjections of that nature do not solve problems. It is easy to make an assertion, but it is more difficult to prove it. The information I have given is based upon fact, and cannot be controverted; therefore, I submit that it is of some value in this discussion.

The principles of the Bill can be effectively tested by reviewing the industrial record of the Labour Government and their policy in regard to compulsory arbitration, the 44-hour week, the recognition of unionism, and the effect of that policy upon production, secondary industry, export trade, unemployment, and the general welfare of the State.

The value of this Bill from the aspect of its probable danger or otherwise can be tested by a short review of the nature I have outlined. In 1914 the average wage for males was £2 13s. 5d. per week; in 1928 it was £5 1s. 2d., or an increase of £2 7s. 9d. The wage for females had increased from £1 7s. 1d. per week in 1914, to £2 14s. 10d. in 1928, or an increase of £1 7s. 9d. Those were substantial increases; as a matter of fact, they were the best in the Commonwealth.

In regard to hours, the weekly working hours for males were reduced from 48.64 in 1914 to 43.96 in 1928, or a reduction of 4.68. The weekly working hours for females were reduced from 49.82 to 44.01, or a reduction in that period of 5.81.

If we take the figures for production, we can ascertain whether that high wage and shorter hours' policy had an injurious and pernicious effect upon production or otherwise. According to the figures supplied me by the Registrar-General on the 24th October last, the aggregate value of production for the period 1915 to 1929, inclusive, was £733,000,000. I suppose hon. members opposite will say that is only the value—that there were changes in the monetary value of money, and that those figures are not necessarily conclusive; but, if we take the aggregate volume of production, we shall find that the period 1916 to 1929 showed the following increase over the period 1902 to 1915:—

Butter	384,600,000 lb.
Cheese	105,900,000 lb.
Wheat	11,100,000 bushels
Cotton	89,069,000 lb.
Sugar	2,419,000 cwt.
Wool	125,000,000 lb.

Any sensible logical observer can find in these figures evidence of progress and no evidence of injury. If we proceed to the Savings Bank returns, we find the increase between 1914-15 and 1928-29 was—

	Depositors.
1914-15	229,023
1928-29	480,160
The deposits amounted to—	£
1914-15	11,972,000
1928-29	24,075,504

Now let me take the trade balance. I am going back to the period when compulsory arbitration was introduced, when the 44-hour week was introduced, and when the general industrial policy of the Labour Party was in operation. Hon. members opposite make the general statement that that policy injured the State, and that a continuance of that policy will operate similarly. All the facts and experience prove otherwise; and these figures absolutely controvert the generalities of the arguments of hon. members opposite. The figures in regard to the trade balance were—

	£
Export overseas, 1915-16 and 1928-29, inclusive	224,455,000

Mr. MOORE: What was the increase in taxation?

Mr. LARCOMBE: Let the hon. member ascertain how much taxation it would take every year to pay the interest on his deficits. It is no use the hon. gentleman taking that line of argument as an argument; capacity to pay taxation was greater. We find that there was a record trade balance in the period referred to. Under the 44-hour week in 1925-26 the trade of the State was £40,157,763, or a record for any one year in the history of the State.

The aggregate favourable trade balance from 1915-16 to 1928-29, both inclusive, was £87,000,000. Yet hon. members opposite say the industrial policy of the Labour Party was injurious to the State!

Mr. RUSSELL: There was no increase.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The hon. member can prove that two and two make five if he can prove that the Registrar-General and the statisticians of the State are wrong. There was an excess of exports over imports of £87,000,000

In regard to the very important question of unemployment, if hon. members take the Commonwealth statistics for 1914, they will

find that in that year 17.7 per cent. of the trade unionists of this State were registered as unemployed, and in 1929, when Labour went out of power, only 7.6 per cent. of the unionists were registered as unemployed. Yet hon. members opposite who criticise the policy of this party say that it will lead to further unemployment!

If we take the purchasing power, we find that in 1929, after fourteen years of Labour rule, the purchasing power in Queensland was the greatest of all the States of the Commonwealth. The amount necessary to purchase a similar amount of goods in each State in that year was—

	£	s.	d.
Queensland	4	5	0
New South Wales	5	1	7
Victoria	4	13	8
South Australia	4	14	6
Western Australia	4	18	7
Tasmania	4	9	5

I will just read one or two press excerpts in conclusion to prove the value of Labour policy, and to show that there was no injury thereby, but that, conversely, there was splendid progress, notwithstanding our industrial policy of high wages and shorter hours. The "Telegraph," in August, 1928, when dealing with the Brisbane Show, said—

> "It enables Queensland to proclaim from the housetops the extent of its opportunities to the enterprising, and the high degree of attainment already reached."

The "Daily Mail" of 3rd August, 1928, stated—

> "Heavy increases in production of primary products, in direct exports, and in investments through the Brisbane Stock Exchange were recorded by Queensland in the year ended 30th June. In addition, large sums of money from outside the State were put into Queensland enterprises."

That was the comment of the "Daily Mail" after thirteen years of Labour Government—thirteen years of short hours and good wages! In August, 1927, the "Telegraph" stated in its Exhibition review—

> "Queensland is a huge State, full of varied resources . . . boasting records of production and trade astonishing for so small and scattered a population."

Those figures and that information prove conclusively that the Bill we are now discussing is based upon sound principles, and that there is no possible handicap to trade or industry in it. The experience of the past teaches us that the arguments of hon. members opposite are not based upon sound logical reasoning, and should not be entertained by members of this House.

I wish to deal briefly with the vexed question of the 44-hour week. The question of the reduction of hours is one that is receiving world-wide recognition. As a matter of fact, five hundred years ago, in England, as pointed out by Professor Thorold Rogers in his "Work and Wages," the 8-hour day was a part of the law of the country; it prevailed in various industries. We know that the late Sir Samuel Griffith, an ex-Premier of Queensland—a statesman, scholar, jurist, and a great leader politically and legally, who reached the heights of statesmanship—introduced an 8-hour Bill into this Chamber in 1889. He recognised the right of Parliament to fix hours, so that over forty years ago the principle of an 8-hour day was recognised by him. In the legislation passed by the Moore Government that principle was destroyed—not only the 44-hour week but the 8-hour day principle that had been so long recognised in this State and other parts of the world, showing how reactionary and retrogressive the Moore Government were.

We know that, as a result of the application of science to industry, the shortening of hours must come. That has been recognised by various countries of the world, and it has existed in Queensland for many years without injury to industry, notwithstanding what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition.

The reply given by the Secretary for Labour and Industry yesterday concerning the number of awards covering a 44-hour week which operated even under the Moore Government showed the general recognition of the 44-hour week principle. There will not, therefore, be a great extension of the 44-hour week principle, as it has been established in the State and has been no handicap at all.

Mr. C. TAYLOR: Then why not introduce it straight away?

Mr. LARCOMBE: The hon. member knows that a similar extension of time was allowed when the Bill was introduced in 1925, and that, if we do not allow a reasonable time for industry to accommodate itself to the change, hon. members opposite would be critical. We know that there is enough machinery in the world to produce and supply double the commodities its inhabitants require; therefore a limitation of hours is a measure that should receive the attention of every legislative hall in the world. I know that of itself is not going to solve the greatest problem, but it will contribute to a solution, and I submit that our experience shows that in this State we can do with a reduced number of hours.

Mr. BRAND: Do you think the sugar industry can stand it?

Mr. LARCOMBE: The hon. member is well acquainted with the sugar industry, and he may not value an opinion of mine; but our experience shows that there has been no great difficulty in the sugar industry as a result of the application of the principle.

Hon. members opposite frequently assert that the man on the land works fifty or sixty hours a week or even more. That is so, and it is unfortunate. We sympathise with the man on the land. We have shown our practical sympathy in a number of ways, and have extended him protection and assistance in our primary producers' organisation legislation and similar measures. We sympathise with those who have to work long hours; but there is no exact parallel between that case and the case of the worker in the factory. The latter toils for an employer and he works for a number of hours that are reasonably necessary to enable him to produce the money necessary to pay his wages and provide reasonable profits. Anything he does over what is necessary to produce a reasonable profit goes to the employer; but, in the case of a man on the land, if he works long hours, he is not benefiting a boss. The average producer is working for himself.

We all know that many men on the land work long hours; but in working long hours they are adding to their assets. They are not working for a boss; so that there is no exact parallel between the two cases to support the argument of hon. members opposite.

I want to quote some figures in regard to the factories of Queensland in 1925 and 1929.

Mr. MOORE: Quote the figures for 1900 to 1903.

Mr. LARCOMBE: As a matter of fact, between 1900 and 1903 there was a substantial decrease in the number of factories in this State. In 1901 the number was 2,078, whereas in 1903 it was 1,919. During the same period the number of employees decreased by 5,895 and the value of the output of the factories by £623,000, so that under low wages and long hours there was a decrease in the number of factories, the number of employees, and output.

Mr. BRAND: Take the average.

Mr. LARCOMBE: No doubt it was a difficult period, but there were difficult times under Labour Government. We experienced the troubles of drought and post-war difficulties; but let me make the comparison between 1925 and 1929 of which I have spoken. In 1925 the number of factories was 1,890, and in 1929 it was 2,156. Is it not a reasonable inference that, if the 44-hour week was as injurious to trade and industry as hon. members opposite would make out, there would have been a decrease in the number of factories immediately following its enactment? It seems that the Leader of the Opposition was wrong when he contended that trade and industry were injured, and that the 44-hour week was unsatisfactory, because we find the increases I have mentioned after it was put into operation. When there was a reversion to the 48-hour week between 1929 and 1931, the number of factories was reduced from 2,156 in 1929 to 2,104 in 1931. The value of plant and machinery and the value of premises increased between 1925 and 1929. There was a slight decrease in the output; but, if we consider the statistics of the other States where lower wages and longer hours prevailed, the decrease in output was greater than in Queensland. Production decreased throughout the Commonwealth between 1924 and 1929. The estimated value of production in Australia in 1924-1925 was £454,631,000, whereas in 1928-1929 it was only £447,863,000; so that in the States where longer hours and lower wages prevailed the decrease was greater than in Queensland.

These figures show the increase in unemployment:—

	1925	1930
New South Wales ...	11.25	31.7
Victoria	8.6	18.3
Queensland	6.6	10.7
South Australia ...	4.3	23.3
West Australia ...	6.1	19.2

It will be found that in Queensland under a 44-hour week and a Labour industrial policy the percentage increase in unemployment was less than in the other States where the 48-hour week and low wages prevailed. How can hon. members opposite now say—in view of those figures—that the Bill before the House will in any way prejudicially affect the industries of this State? We know quite well that the industries of Queensland bore up remarkably well under a 44-hour week and a Labour industrial policy.

The Leader of the Opposition has stated that there are not more than 20 cwt. of potatoes to the ton, and that it is impossible to squeeze 21 cwt. into a ton. That is quite true; but what we as a Government can do is to double the production of potatoes and other commodities by a sound policy of reasonable wages which will stimulate the purchasing power and increase demand. We can thereby increase production, trade, business, and industry. Authorities like Professor Marshall and others point out that by increasing demand we can increase production and increase the national dividend. Queensland is a State with an extensive area where wealth production has only just been touched. There are great possibilities in this State for increasing production and thereby the national dividend.

We know that the policy the Moore Government pursued for three years had just the reverse effect. It destroyed the purchasing power—by the reduction in wages—which was the magical mainspring of demand. By maintaining wages at a reasonable level—not too high for industry to bear—we can increase production and make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, and produce 2 tons of potatoes where 1 ton was formerly produced. That is a sound axiom of political economy, and it has received the endorsement of an authority like Professor Marshall. We know that by increasing demand we can greatly increase production of trade and industry, and we also know that we cannot hope for improvement in the absence of demand. We know that by a policy such as the present Administration is pursuing we can stimulate production from the land and bring about results such as those published under the heading of "Business Statistics" by the "Telegraph" on the 5th inst. We can increase wealth production, and, having done so, we can proceed, as we are proceeding in this Bill, to an equitable distribution of that wealth.

The Bill deals with one branch particularly, and that is the distribution of wealth. It is a simple truism that wealth cannot be distributed until it is produced. Realising that, the Government are pursuing a policy that is increasing trade, industry, and production, and thereby helping Queensland to that upward standard to which both parties of the State should aspire.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*) [7.41 p.m.]: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat has been very busy collecting information, but some of it has no bearing upon the subject-matter under discussion. Some of the references he made go right back to 1902. They were relative to production, but had no bearing whatever in connection with the increases which he said had been brought about. It is all very well to come into this House with a number of figures; but, if the hon. member uses them on the one side, then they must be used on the other. The facts are that, whatever might have been the position of affairs when the Labour Government came into office in 1914-15, Queensland—and this is the other side of the picture—from that time onward

became a target for fresh taxation at every turn by the Government.

The PREMIER: You only increased taxation by £1,050,000.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman and the Government he was associated with increased loan expenditure by £56,000,000.

The PREMIER: No.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is an absolute fact. When Labour took charge of affairs in Queensland in 1915 the interest payment amounted to £954,000; when they left office, it was over £5,000,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. W. H. BARNES: Mr. Speaker, I was just using those figures by way of illustration to show that at the present time the position is such that we are not able to deal with this Bill as we should by reason of the fact that the depression at present existing in this State was brought about mainly by the present Government and their extreme loan expenditure during their previous tenure of office.

The hon. member for Rockhampton implied that practically no help was given by the Moore Government for the relief of unemployment. The Moore Government started unemployment relief work, and, so far as I know, the proposals introduced by them are being very largely followed to-day. There is very little alteration in the scheme.

Mr. LLEWELYN: You certainly made it necessary to do so.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If, Mr. Speaker, I return to financial affairs, you would call me to order. We had to deal with the results of the extravagances of hon. members opposite and try to put their affairs right. It is almost impossible to ask any hon. member to master and deal with a Bill which has been handed to him at 11.15 a.m. How could any member on the Government side do that?

The PREMIER: Quite easily.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have frequently heard the hon. gentleman protest against such things being done, and they were not done by us.

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, you did not even have the courtesy to give me a copy of your Bill before its introduction. (Opposition dissent.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is not so, because I heard the hon. gentleman say that the Treasurer in the Moore Government did furnish him with copies of Bills.

The PREMIER: You did individually, but your colleagues did not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You got a copy of the Bill after 9 a.m.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman had to go through certain preliminaries before we could get a copy of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Your party had a copy.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Leader of the Opposition had a copy, but I did not see that copy. How can hon. members on this side properly discuss one of the most important Bills ever introduced in this Parliament under those circumstances? Whilst I am prepared to admit that the hon. gentleman spoke at some length at the introductory stage of the Bill, he did not do what he said he would do at the second reading stage, but merely formally moved "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I gave a comprehensive review earlier.

HON. W. H. BARNES: But the hon. gentleman said that he would have something to say at the second-reading stage. I can only think that the criticism offered by the Leader of the Opposition so upset the Minister that he felt ashamed of his own child and did not wish to be heard. Perhaps his party said to him, "You are not to speak on the second reading." Is that a courteous way to treat the Opposition? The hon. gentleman failed to do what any ordinary Minister would do.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I can exercise my own judgment.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman's judgment was absolutely wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has been speaking for almost ten minutes, and has not yet dealt with the principles contained in the Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am seeking to answer some of the interjections made during the debate. I contend we have a right to know what principles are contained in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question as to whether the second reading of this Bill should be moved to-day was decided at an earlier stage of the sitting. It was then decided that the second reading be made an Order for a later hour of the sitting. That was the stage at which any protest should have been made. At the present stage the hon. member must confine himself to a discussion of the principles contained in the Bill.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I shall be pleased to do that, and shall straight away deal with that provision in the Bill which suggests that the only people who may be employed are unionists. What does this mean? Does it mean that men and women are to be compelled to join a union before they can get any help? Does it mean "No union, no bread?" I have reason to ask that because I can well remember in connection with the big strike that took place in 1912, that men could only get bread in the city of Brisbane if they got an order from the unions.

Mr. W. T. KING: That is not correct.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is correct. It practically means that, unless you join a union, you will be subjected to victimisation of the worst kind. Surely this should be a free country! Hon. members opposite talk of democracy! Where are we drifting? This Bill bears out what Mr. Collings, a Queensland Labour member of the Senate, said: "He was there to represent the people who sent him to the Senate." It appears to me that this Bill, dealing as it does with unionists, says that the only people who shall have bread and butter are unionists. Unless they are unionists, they shall get nothing. When you take up your paper, what do you find? Somehow or other there is a stigma put on people unless they are unionists. When children are born, it seems to me that they must be branded. They are

followed to school, where they must be taught unionism. I want to ask, Has arbitration failed?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You endeavoured to kill it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am going to make some statements to-night for which I am personally responsible. I am not going to ask hon. members on this side to accept responsibility for these statements. The Minister said the reason for this Bill was that in a time of necessity we should protect the workers. What is the best way to protect the workers?

Mr. W. T. KING: Give them work.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Give them work by all means! There is nothing that helps to destroy a man so much as not to give him work when he asks for it. It is my firm conviction that one of the causes of the troubles to-day is—not that we have had no arbitration, but that we have had too much of it. I want to say further that the economic position does not justify a measure of this kind. It is going further to harass the people who are trying to do something to find work at this juncture. My own conviction is that these Bills, which are brought in presumably to protect the worker, are helping to kill the worker. The time has come when men should feel that it is very much better for them to take work when it is offered without being tied down as to conditions. What can be the effect on a man who has nothing to do? In my judgment there is nothing so awful for a man than to be looking for work and not able to get it. Let me give an illustration of what I am driving at. This has really reference to Sydney, but a writer in "The Australian Christian World" of 2nd December, said—

> "OBSTACLES TO EMPLOYMENT.
>
> "A correspondent writing in the 'S.M. Herald' complains bitterly of the hampering conditions surrounding the employment of youths displaced by the financial stringency of the times. 'I advertised,' he says, 'for a strong youth about nineteen years of age for a store. I received 800 replies, and interviewed several. I proposed to pay from £1 10s. to £1 15s. per week.' He goes on to say that he found the award rates such as to make his proposal impossible. There were thirty-seven jobs that such a youth must not perform unless paid full adult wages. One was wheeling a barrow, and another lifting a weight over 56 lb. He was, in consequence, compelled to give up the idea."

I want to make my position perfectly clear. It is better for youths to be employed than to be put into a position in which they drift about and come to no good in many cases. This is striking at the very foundation of a great deal that we have to do with to-day. It is very much better for young people to be employed than to be allowed to drift about. They want employment, but we are helping to kill them by the policy we are pursuing.

Does the present economic position justify a measure of this kind? The Premier has been saying that he wants financial assistance. Is this Bill justified under the present financial conditions? I say that it is not. Every additional restriction is making men reduce the number of their employees because of the expenditure associated with the carrying out of the provisions of measures of this kind. The Bill does not help to improve conditions. The Minister said that his object was to restore to the workers what they lost. Have they had restored to them what they lost? The Premier said that certain privileges were going to be restored to the public servants and others. Have they been restored? I admit that this Bill provides for their coming under the Industrial Court. Most public servants should be exceedingly glad that they are getting regular salaries, especially bearing in mind that there are many deserving men who to-day have only two or three days' work a week.

The election promises made by the Premier have not been carried out, and he cannot carry them out because the financial position will not allow him to do so. Acts of Parliament will not find work, and the biggest of our questions is that of unemployment. Acts of Parliament will not fill empty stomachs. Employment creates happiness, and every movement made in the direction of minimising employment—and this Bill is one of the things that will do that—will be disastrous to the people who are seeking work.

The Minister said that the object of the Bill was to bring a fair return to employers and employees. How can there be a fair return?

No business can succeed unless there are happy relations between employer and employee. You cannot run a business if the men employed by you are hostile. This Bill will not bring a fair return to employers. It will so harass them that there will be fewer employers and more employees looking round to see what they can do. How can a fair return be given to employers? There is only one way. I know there is an idea that they make tremendous profits, but that idea is not borne out by the majority of income tax returns. This is one of the causes of our present trouble; and we shall not have profits or better conditions as a result of measures of this sort. Queensland and Australia will not get out of her troubles until many of these pinpricks are wiped out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You were always a bad prophet. All your prophecies have gone west.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Whether they went west or not, at any rate there were reasons for making them. No one is more anxious than I to see better conditions brought about in Queensland. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill has expressed himself as desirous of seeing the Bill create work, but it will not help in that direction. (Government dissent.) The Minister said that the absence of work would bring about discontent and revolution.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: I said that the alternative to arbitration is direct action.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman has had the opportunity of making his speech, and I ask him and other hon. members on my right to allow the hon. member for Wynnum to make his speech.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Minister said this morning that the absence of work would bring about discontent and revolution.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: No.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is the note I made at the time, but I must accept the hon. member's statement. It is all very well to tell people to go straight and not to "jump the rattler" and all the rest of it; but when a man is foot weary, in need of employment, and unable to get it, then it is very hard to resist the temptation to "jump the rattler" and to do other such things.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: That was the position under your Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to respect my request regarding interruption.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If men are not allowed to work, it will bring about the condition of affairs which I allege the Minister described this morning. He denies having used the expression that I have in mind. I would remind him that the adoption of the principle that no man shall work unless he carries a particular brand is more likely to bring about revolution than anything else. That is how the hon. gentleman has described it. He said that the Bill repealed the most objectionable industrial legislation ever introduced into Parliament. Was it objectionable because it was unfair? Has not the Minister embodied a number of sections contained in that measure in his present Bill? Did he describe the measure referred to because it gave equal rights to citizens and because it allowed non-unionists to work? Was it a crime to provide that non-unionists should be allowed to work?

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: Is it a crime that public servants should have access to the Industrial Court?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am dealing with another phase of the Bill, and one that throws an extraordinary sidelight on the subject. This Bill has many clauses which mean that the political bludgeon is being used in the direction of compelling people to do certain things. What is the most important duty to-day? I repeat, it is to find work for the unemployed. The Minister said that the Bill would not add to the unemployed, but he knows full well that it will swell their ranks considerably.

The Bill also provides for a 44-hour week, but the difficulty is being overcome in an extraordinary way. It is to become operative as from 1st July, 1933. The Government claim that they were given a mandate in June last to provide for a 44-hour week, but they have decided to postpone it until 1933. If the Government are in office next year, I shall not be surprised if they decide to postpone the 44-hour week for another year. It is merely one way of trying to placate their supporters so that they will be able to get upon the platform outside and say, "See what we have done! What generous people we are. We are carrying out our promise. Of course it is to be twelve months ahead, but that will give you an opportunity to look around." They are afraid of its consequences. Micawberlike, they are waiting for something to turn up in the interval, hoping that the deficiencies at the Treasury will have disappeared by 1933. No one on this side hopes that any harm will befall the Treasury.

The Bill also authorises strikes. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, how, when the Labour Government were previously in office, it was impossible for a member of the community to enter the offices of the Commissioner for Railways? Do you remember how we were told, "You are not allowed to go into the railway offices; there is a strike on?" Do you remember how railway servants stood in front of those offices and said, "You shall not go in there?"

We find that that conduct is being legalised under this Bill. I am sure that the Premier does not believe such legislation to be right, although the Minister in charge of the Bill may do so. Men associated with a big public utility such as the railways should not be allowed to conduct themselves in that manner by legalising their action in going out on strike. I unhesitatingly believe that such legislation will increase the tendency of workers in that direction, because this Bill practically says to them, "Go on, it is all right!" We know the attitude of the Government of the day when the railwaymen struck work. They did not attempt to uphold law and order. They did everything possible to say to the men who broke the law, "You shall go back, boys; we will put you right." Is this Bill to be another victimisation of workers because they will not do certain things? Will it help to increase confidence in this State? The Minister, when introducing the Bill, said that the law of common sense should prevail; but is it the law of common sense to say to people that they can be employed under certain conditions only? The workers will not be allowed now to do what they wish. All the time that we are seeking to re-establish ourselves the Government set themselves out to pursue a policy which will hurt Queensland to the fullest extent. No Queenslander, no matter which side of the House he may be on, can be other than anxious to see that relief is given to people who are unemployed. That is our biggest problem to-day. If the people are unemployed——

Mr. G. C. TAYLOR: They cannot be working.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Enoggera forgets something else. He forgets that the brains of these men cannot be quietened, that the people cannot be kept on the safe road of democracy if they continue unemployed, and that they become a positive danger to society. This Bill will cultivate a spirit in that particular direction, and the day will not be far distant when the Premier and the saner members of his party will object to the course which is being taken by the introduction of a Bill such as this.

One of the very first things done by the Government was to introduce this contentious Bill without giving us a fair chance of analysing it with a view to suggesting amendments. I find on looking up the records that the Moore Government on a similar measure gave the Opposition eight days to debate it, and one day to consider it in Committee.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY: You put sixty clauses through under the guillotine.

HON. W. H. BARNES: We introduced our measure on 22nd November, and it was not passed until 2nd December. This Bill, metaphorically speaking, has been thrown by the Government on the table because they did

not want us to look at it. They want us to swallow it, because it is the result of the dictates of the extreme section of the Government Party and the more extreme section of the party outside who are their bosses.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) [8.15 p.m.]: The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat and the Leader of the Opposition, who has also spoken on this Bill, have attacked the measure from the standpoint that members of their party always adopt in industrial legislation. Their attitude towards this measure is due to the fundamental basis of their party being opposed to the regulation of industry and to industrial control in a manner that seeks to bring about equitable conditions in industry. Their policy can be summed up in the phrase, "Let a man control his business in his own way!"

Mr. DANIEL: What is wrong with that?

The PREMIER: That is the attitude that has always been taken up by the opponents of humane conditions in industry. The people who opposed the factories and shops legislation in the days of Lord Shaftesbury and other reformers claimed the right to control industry in their own way. They claimed that child labour was essential for the successful conduct of the cotton industry, and that, without child labour, the Lancashire cotton mills would close down. They were the people who, owning the coalmines, demanded the right to control them in their own way, which involved the employment of child and female labour in the mines. As a matter of fact, in some cases children were born in the mines.

The history of industrial control in a manner befitting the public interest is a history of efforts made by reformers, on the one hand, steadily and bitterly opposed by conservative reactionaries on the other hand. While hon. members opposite may belong to a political party that renders lip service to the principle of arbitration in industry, they have endeavoured to the utmost of their power to destroy the system of industrial arbitration. At no time is that more apparent than during a period of industrial depression. They believe in what they call the law of supply and demand, which they regard as an economic principle that cannot be combated. They regard as blasphemous in the extreme any argument against that principle in all its implications. They desire the law of supply and demand to govern the conditions of labour and the reward of labour, so that, if there are more men than jobs, the price of the job shall be determined by what an unemployed person will do the work for.

That is the basis of individualism and the method of control of industry that hon. members opposite stand for. But the people of Australia do not stand for that policy; and on many occasions when the matter has been referred to the arbitrament of the people they have declared very definitely in favour of the control of industry by means of industrial tribunals. We recall how the Bruce Government were destroyed by the people of this country because they attempted to destroy the machinery of arbitration and the industrial control of industry. For their efforts to destroy the principle of arbitration, the Bruce Government suffered the most crushing defeat of recent times.

The Leader of the Opposition further condemns the Bill on the ground that it imposes additional restrictions on industry. That is in keeping with the individualist conception of how industry should be controlled. Hon. members opposite and their supporters never appear to realise that more than the individual is concerned in industry. There are three factors that at all times have to be considered. No one would argue that a Bill of this kind is going to bring about a new heaven and a new earth in Australia. No one could argue that any system of industrial arbitration means the economic salvation of the people; but we do argue and we do definitely affirm that a system of arbitration holds the balance in industry, preserves public interest, and eliminates the evils of sweating and the worst forms of exploitation.

There are three factors, I repeat, that have to be considered in regard to industry. There are capital and labour immediately concerned; there are those who own the instruments of industry and govern their control; and there are those people who sell their labour and agree to perform certain duties or tasks for a certain definite return.

The individual who controls the instruments of industry—particularly any industry subject to competition—desires to obtain his labour at as low a cost as possible to him. The man who sells his labour desires as high a return as possible. It is his means of livelihood; and on the contract he is able to make for the disposal of his labour his standard of living and that of his dependants entirely depends. So at all times in modern industry there has been a periodic clash of interests between those who own the instruments of industry on the one hand and those who operate them on the other hand. Where that takes place, strikes and lockouts frequently occur; and you have the spectacle within an alleged form of civilisation of two contending economic forces engaged in economic war, each seeking to determine which can hold out the longer. The old policy of direct action was entirely based on that. It was a contest between the worker on the one hand and the employer on the other hand as to which could hold out the longer. The employer considered that, if he held out long enough, he would starve his employees into subjection. The employees, on the other hand, felt that, if they were strong enough, the loss occasioned through the stoppage of industry would be such as to inflict injury on the employer, with the result that he would be willing to make terms. That is the basis of direct action. It is carried on in every country where there is no system of regulated control of industry.

Hon. members opposite talk about industrial stoppages in Australia. It is due to the fact that they obtain prominence in the public press. They are advertised extensively, and are part of the stock in trade of men who are otherwise mentally derelict of ideas. But in countries such as the United States of America, which has reached the pinnacle of individualism and lack of control of industry—that country of which hon. members opposite prate so much—the industrial disturbances that take place are far more bitter, far more severe, and far more numerous than have ever occurred in Australia. The records indicate that; and

they have gangs like the Pinkerton gang and others who resort to the use of machine guns and other lethal weapons with which to assist whoever may employ them. No one who has any regard for the public interest could seriously put forward such a policy; but that is the alternative to the regulation and control of industry. The logic of events demands a choice. You must accept direct action with all the evils and economic disturbance that brings about, or you may have a system of regulated control of industry, whereby the possibility and likelihood of stoppages of work are reduced to a minimum. The Australian system has achieved that. While disturbances may, and do, occur occasionally, they are not of the long drawn-out bitterness, nor do they inflict the sufferings which were the case in the period before this system was called into being.

When hon. members opposite oppose a Bill of this kind, they ignore the third factor of industry, and that is the general public. I have described the conflict between the owner of the instruments of industry and his employees. While economic warfare is allowed to go on, are the public to stand idly by and not to be protected, and be denied the services or the commodities which it is necessary that they should continue to have? Therefore, in the system of arbitration the State affirms that, in the public interests when industrial difficulties take place, the contending parties shall be brought before a competent tribunal, and the differences be settled in the best possible manner. That is the basis of arbitration that we as a Labour Party stand for. It is the basis of this Bill, and it is the considered opinion of the majority of people in Australia who have any regard for decent conditions in industry.

The Leader of the Opposition complained of not having had an opportunity to study the Bill. He is late in the day in making that complaint. The resolution whereby a Bill can be passed through all its stages in one day—and we are not proposing that in connection with this Bill—was moved by me last week. The Leader of the Opposition did not call "Not formal" to that motion. No objection was made by any member of the Opposition to that resolution. That was the time to raise objection to the quick passage of Bills, if such objection really existed. But it should be known by hon. members that, while the Leader of the Opposition who makes that complaint makes it as if he was not consulted in the matter, by arrangement with his own "whip" this morning I agreed that after the Bill was brought to its first reading stage, the second reading debate would not be brought on until after two other Bills had been proceeded with. I was perfectly agreeable to that arrangement, which was made at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and to meet the convenience of the Opposition; and if the members of the Opposition complain that they have not had an opportunity of studying this Bill during the period it has been in the possession of hon. members, then I claim that they have made no real attempt to make themselves conversant with it.

The Government have a clear and definite mandate for this Bill. It was part of the election policy of the Labour Party. Let me quote from the Policy Speech delivered on behalf of this party by me at Mackay under the heading of "Industrial"—

> "In its industrial policy the Moore Government has pursued a relentless vendetta against organised Labour, and endeavoured, in every possible manner, to destroy the industrial conditions which had been built up in this State by years of effort on the part of trade unions and the Labour movement generally. This State now has the unenviable notoriety of being the only part of Australasia which fails to provide a statutory eight-hour day. Wages have been reduced, awards cancelled, and thousands of workers denied the protection of the industrial code. In average times when work was plentiful and labour was scarce, the protection afforded by Arbitration Courts was not so necessary as to-day. Industrial laws are being broken with impunity; the public service, railway employees, metalliferous miners, pastoral workers, and those engaged in rural pursuits have been industrially outlawed. The industrial policy carried out under the regime of the Moore Government is the negation of every sound principle of orderly control of industry.
>
> "The principle of arbitration is one that has been endorsed for many years by the Australian people. It has given more satisfactory results than any other method for the control of industrial relations, and is calculated to promote industrial peace and provide a measure of justice to all sections engaged in industry. If Labour is again entrusted with the control of government, not only will we use the full resources of the State in the rehabilitation of industry with a view to providing useful employment to those at present workless, but we will also restore access to the Arbitration Court and grant the full protection of the industrial code to all sections of wage-earners, including those who have been so callously betrayed and brutally outlawed by the Moore Government. Full rights of citizenship will also be restored to State employees. The 44-hour week will be restored. The use of labour-saving machinery and improved methods of production justify a reduction in the hours and in the intensity of labour, and the 44-hour week is a natural corollary. An Arbitration and Conciliation Act will be introduced to give effect to the above principle, and an Arbitration Court will be established vested with authority to mete out a measure of justice to all engaged in useful industry. Wages are the natural payment for services rendered, and should be based on as high a scale as possible, having regard to the productivity and the general financial position of the State."

That was an integral part of the policy on which this party went to the country. It was part of a definite pledge we made to the people, and is included in the mandate we received from the people. This Bill gives effect to that mandate.

Generally speaking, the measure is one that is sound in every detail. The opposition that has been raised to it has been based, first of all, on a wrong conception of the principles of arbitration, and, secondly—and more important—on the real objection of hon. members opposite to any form of controlled

industrial activity. They desire, during a period of economic depression, that the law of supply and demand shall operate, and that advantage may be taken of the economic circumstances of the people. That was indicated very clearly in a speech made by the Leader of the Opposition not so very long ago when he was Premier. At Clayfield he referred to these restrictions on industry as being harassing in the extreme, and complained that the employers had not taken advantage of the law he had passed by applying for the relief which it afforded them. That was a direct invitation to the employers to join with the Moore Government in their attack on industrial conditions in Queensland.

The fact that the majority of employers did not follow the lead given by the ex-Premier is an indication that the majority of good employers believe in the orderly control of industry and good conditions. You cannot have a line of policy without accepting the whole of that policy. You cannot pick the plums out of your pudding and expect to get away with it for any length of time. If you adopt the policy of arbitration, you adopt it with all its implications. If you oppose it and adopt a policy of direct action, you adopt it with all its implications also, and there can be no doubt in my mind about the evil results of such a line of activity.

Hon. members opposite, especially the hon. member for Wynnum, are evidently obsessed by what I have frequently described as a poverty complex. They imagine that, if you make things worse, in some strange fashion they will ultimately become better. They appear to suggest that, if wages were sufficiently low, all the evils in existence in Australia to-day would speedily disappear, and we would be able to live in a perfect industrial heaven. What is the position? Is it not obvious that, if the people are reduced to the kanaka level, it will have a serious effect upon the volume of business transacted? Is it to be argued that the low-wage policy of the Malay States, Java, and Japan —a policy so dear to the heart of hon. members like the hon. member for Wynnum— enables those countries to be free from the evils of unemployment, dull trade, etc.?

The whole position taken up by hon. members opposite is ridiculous. What is required in industry to-day is not improved production, because the question of production has been definitely solved. What is required is an increase in the standard of solvent demand by the supply of a sufficient purchasing power. The evils of unemployment and trade depression will continue until such time as a system of control, financial and otherwise, is adopted to permit of the more equitable distribution of the purchasing power. The problem at the present time is not one of scarcity; it is one of plenty, with a faulty system of distribution. One must be brought into relation with the other; otherwise evil will result.

The Leader of the Opposition is usually inaccurate in his reference to past events, and the margin of error I allow to him is very great indeed. But when that margin of error reaches a point at which it may be dangerous to allow the error to go forth uncontradicted, it calls for a reply. In the course of his speech the Leader of the Opposition referred to the sugar industry and the Sugar Agreement, and complained that the Bill was a violation of a letter which formed the basis of the Sugar Agreement as between the Premier of Queensland and the Prime Minister of Australia. If that were true, or even partially true, it would be serious, because, apart from the question of ethics—ethics cannot and should not be ignored—no Government can afford to break a contract with another Government and expect to retain the goodwill of the people of the country. But what are the facts? When the Sugar Agreement was being negotiated by the various parties in the industry, including the Government, a proposition was put forward by the Commonwealth Government that some system of industrial control would be required. No Government in the Commonwealth could agree to a guaranteed price for sugar without seeing that the producers received an adequate return for their share in that protection; nor could they agree upon a fixed price unless they ensured that the workers in the industry would also be subject to control by an industrial tribunal. The Commonwealth Government of the day had had some experience of the methods of the Moore Government.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: What nonsense!

The PREMIER: I repeat, they had had some experience of the methods of the Moore Government, and naturally they took the necessary measures to protect all the interests concerned. The Commonwealth Government had granted a bounty to the cotton industry, but the Moore Government excluded the workers engaged in that industry from the arbitration tribunal. The Commonwealth Government proposed to give the cotton growers a bounty, but the Moore Government withdrew all the workers engaged in the cotton industry from the ambit of the court—they industrially outlawed them. When it came to the Sugar Agreement, the Federal Government naturally were not going to agree to the same thing happening there. A Federal tribunal was set up to fix the wages in the cotton industry and the same principle was embodied in the Sugar Agreement. I propose to quote from section 16 of the existing Sugar Agreement, which is the same in essence as the agreement which the Leader of the Opposition signed, as Premier, but which no longer exists—

> "That the employees engaged in the Australian cane sugar industry and in such sections of the Australian fruit industry as receive benefits under clause 7 of this agreement shall be entitled to have their wages and conditions of employment determined by conciliation, or arbitration if not settled by agreement and in the case of any employees or section of employees who are now, or who may subsequently be excluded from the jurisdiction, or control of any conciliation or arbitration authority the Commonwealth Government shall, on the application of any industrial organisation bona fide representative of such employees establish for the purpose of determining what wages and conditions of employment for such employees are fair and reasonable a tribunal or tribunals consisting of—a representative of employers a representative of employees —a person who shall act as chairman and who shall be appointed by the Minister of State for Trade and Customs."

Hon. members will see that clause was framed by men who understood the methods of the Moore Government, and who were cognisant of the fact that thousands of employees in this State had been industrially outlawed. They considered it to be their duty to make provision for arbitration in a case where they were guaranteeing the price of a commodity. They provided that, in the event of the Moore Government extending their nefarious practices to the sugar industry, the employees in that industry will have an opportunity of applying to the Commonwealth Government and a competent tribunal would be set up to deal with it. That only operates, however, when the exclusion of the employees from the State tribunal takes place. That is the governing factor in the clause which I have quoted.

Mr. FADDEN: That clause is also inserted in the present Sugar Agreement.

The PREMIER: I am quoting from the present agreement, which is similar to the old one. The letter which the Leader of the Opposition stated he wrote to Mr. Scullin, the then Prime Minister, was to the effect that during the currency of the agreement he would not take certain action which would make it necessary for section 16 to be operated.

The question is one which is not new in the sugar industry. The Scullin Labour Government desired to impose certain things in the Sugar Agreement—these are the facts, and hon. members should know them—which were contrary to the policy of the Moore Government. The Moore Government objected to them going into the agreement, but the then Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition handed Mr. Scullin a letter to the effect that during the currency of that agreement his Government would refrain from certain actions. That is the sum and substance of it. A similar situation arose when we were previously the Government, and when Mr. Bruce was the Prime Minister. I handled the matter for the then Government, and Mr. Bruce put up certain propositions that were in conflict with Government policy. They were not included in the agreement, but a letter was sent to the Commonwealth which was satisfactory for the purpose. In any case, the letter of the Leader of the Opposition no longer has any validity, because the agreement which has just passed the Commonwealth Parliament states—

> "Upon this agreement coming into operation the agreement in subclause (*b*) shall cease to have any force or effect."

Subclause (*b*) reads as follows:—

> "The agreement referred to in subclause (*a*) of this clause is the agreement made on 1st June, 1931, between the Right Hon. James Henry Scullin, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, acting for and on behalf of the Government of Australia of the one part, and the Hon. Arthur Edward Moore, Premier of the State of Queensland, acting for and on behalf of the Government of the State of Queensland of the other part, with respect to the acquisition and purchase of raw sugar manufactured from sugar cane in Queensland and New South Wales during the seasons 1931-32, 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-35, and 1935-36, and the sale of refined sugar and other sugar products and other matters incidental thereto."

That refers to the agreement made between Mr. Scullin and the hon. gentleman who is now Leader of the Opposition. That agreement is no longer in existence. The position is one that should not be allowed to go unchallenged. Naturally an hon. member who occupies the position of an ex-Premier is regarded seriously by some people; and, if a statement of that nature were allowed to go forth unchallenged to the sugar districts of this State or to the Southern portions of the Commonwealth, it might have embarrassing results in many quarters, and would certainly cause difficulties where no such difficulties exist at present. The evidence that I have quoted from the existing Sugar Agreement shows that there is no violation either in the principle or in the spirit of the agreement between the two Governments. My explanation indicates clearly the plight of the Leader of the Opposition, who finds it most difficult to make a case against this Bill.

This measure is one that is in accord with Government policy and one for which the Government have obtained a mandate from the people. It will bring about more equitable conditions in industry than have existed during the last three years. When it becomes operative, the Bill will be of benefit to all concerned.

Mr. KENNY (*Cook*) [8.49 p.m.]: It is all very interesting to hear the Leader of the Government slang-whanging members of the Opposition, and endeavouring to show that certain things occurred during the term of office of the Moore Government. The Premier told the House that the Opposition have had plenty of time to understand this Bill; but I would remind the hon. gentleman that a copy of the Bill was only received to-day, and that since it was received members on this side have been busily engaged in intelligently considering and discussing other legislation which was being passed through Committee. While doing that, hon. members on this side had no time to study the Bill now before the House. The Premier, in arguing that he has a mandate from the people of Queensland to bring this Bill into operation, is right up to a point. Ever since the Labour Party have been on the Treasury benches, they have had a mandate to bring in this measure; but they left it to almost the last day of the session. They say they have a mandate to introduce this measure; but are they giving the people the legislation they promised? No! They are introducing a Bill, and saying, "We will delay the operation of the measure until 1st July, 1933." If they had a mandate from the people, they had a mandate to do it at the first available opportunity. They had a mandate to give the people a 44-hour week immediately they got into power. They had a mandate to introduce this Bill; but they did not carry out that mandate, recognising that, if they did introduce a 44-hour week, it would affect their finances, and they would not do that. They, therefore, bring it in on almost the last day of the session and delay the operations of the Bill until July next. The same applies to the mandate to put Government employees back on the wages they had before.

At 8.51 p.m.

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

Mr. KENNY: The Government said that the Government employees were industrially outlawed by the late Government, and they promised that, if they were returned to power, these employees would be given access to the Industrial Court. They have not done that, as this Bill does not give them the opportunity to go to the court until after the end of the financial year. We do not know whether the Government will carry out their promise then. We know that they have failed in their promise in this respect. This was a contract with the Government employees. They have broken that contract; and now they have made another promise that they will make the Act operative on 1st July next.

The Leader of the Government complains that the opposition to this measure is based on wrong principles and on the inability of this party to understand the principles of the Bill. He said that we were opposed to the principle of arbitration. Nothing is further from the truth. We believe in arbitration, but we believe in arbitration for both sections of the community. In 1912 arbitration was first introduced into Queensland, and not by a Labour Government but by an anti-Labour Government. They recognised that arbitration was one of the best means of settling industrial disputes. We recognise that to-day; but we recognise that when you have arbitration you must have arbitration untrammelled. You must have arbitration that gives cognisance to both sides of the question. The Bill before us to-day makes provision for the appointment of a judge and two laymen to the Industrial Court bench. We know quite well that, when the last Arbitration Court was constituted by the Labour Government, they appointed supporters of the Government. That will happen again to-day. When this Bill is passed, we shall find Mr. W. J. Riordan, Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, appointed to the Industrial Court bench. They expect to see—not the employees represented but the unions. When we get such a bench as that, is industry going to get the square deal it should get? Although two laymen are to be appointed to the Industrial Court bench, these two laymen are to be given the powers of a Supreme Court judge. There is to be no appeal from them even on a legal point. These laymen will have the last say even on a point of law. Arbitration of that kind can get us nowhere.

The Leader of the Government said that, if we did not have arbitration, we would have direct action. We on this side believe in arbitration. We have endeavoured to give the people every opportunity to settle their disputes by arbitration. When we passed the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act in 1929 we gave the people an opportunity to go before a conciliation commissioner and settle their disputes. Notwithstanding what the Premier said to-day, during the period the Moore Government legislation was in operation we had no industrial disputes at all, and no direct action, because the measure passed by the Moore Government met with the wishes of the people and there was no need for direct action.

While this measure is being introduced, the Government of the day are taking advantage of the legislation which is now on the statute book. That legislation gives them all the power they desire, and they are going to carry on under that legislation until 1st July next. The Leader of the Government alleged that this party is attacking the Bill on the basis of a man controlling his business in his own way. We believe in a man controlling his own business, and do not believe in union control. We make no apology for that.

The Leader of the Government had to get on the soap box, as it were, and go back fifty or sixty years ago in referring to child labour. He mentioned women working in coalmines and poor little children being born in the mines. We have got a stage beyond that—that soap box stuff does not carry any weight to-day. It is all right to try to pull at the heartstrings of the people, to try to make mothers weep about the treatment of children many years ago.

Then in the next breath the Premier talked about this party only giving lip service to the workers of Queensland. Where does the lip service come from to-night? We had lip service from the Leader of the Government, when he stated that the Bill cannot come into operation for another six months. Hon. members opposite are going to give that lip service for six months.

The Premier promised a 44-hour week when on the hustings. He said "To-day there is nothing but darkness and despair; but, if we are returned to power we will bring light and happiness into the homes of the people." This Bill, which is to bring that light and happiness and cast out darkness and despair, is not to come into operation for another six months! Is this Bill going to leave the people in darkness and despair in the meantime? Where is the justification for the Premier to talk of lip service to the people we represent?

We know that there is another party inside the Labour Party to-day which is forcing the Premier to introduce this legislation. We know that in the Labour caucus held last night a discussion took place as to whether the Act should come into operation on 1st July next year or immediately on its passage through the House and the "Reds" lost. The Premier had his way and the Act will come into operation on 1st July next. I fancy that the members who promised all these things—these representatives of Government employees who said "We will give you access to the Industrial Court"—have found thus early in their career that it is not quite so easy to get their way as they thought.

This party has always believed in arbitration; but it believes in it in the interests of every section of the community. This Bill, whilst giving arbitration, legalises the strike weapon. It says in effect to one section of the community, "We give you arbitration, but, if you do not get from the Industrial Court what you want, you can strike until you do." That is arbitration for one section of the community, which suits hon. members opposite.

The Leader of the Government said that the Bruce Government were thrown out because they were desirous of overthrowing arbitration. That is a deliberate misleading statement—a deliberate untruth—because the

Bruce Government went to the people and said that they did not believe in the overlapping of awards. They said that it should be left to either the Federal Government or the State Government to control wages. They asked the people to decide, and the people were misled. They were gulled then, as they were gulled at the last State elections by hon. members opposite, and they threw out the Bruce Government; but no truer word was spoken than that of Mr. Bruce when he told the people of Australia where they were heading. Had they taken notice of what he said, Australia would be a different country to-day, and Queensland a different State.

The Leader of the Government condemned our leader because he referred to the restrictions placed on industry. We have only to look at our unemployed throughout the State to note that the restrictions on industry are such that they cannot be re-employed. The Leader of the Government spoke about the employing classes sweating the workers of Queensland and Australia. If they are sweating the workers of Queensland, they are sweating them for profits; and, if they can make profits from them, they must be fools indeed if they do not employ another 50,000. I do not think that hon. members opposite would say they were altogether fools; but, if a man can employ another and make a profit out of him, he is a fool if he does not do so. That is what we are all aiming for.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is Sandy Gallop logic.

Mr. KENNY: The Home Secretary has no logic at all. My argument is sound. The Leader of the Government said that two factors had to be taken into consideration—capital and labour. Here I find myself in agreement with the hon. gentleman. Capital and labour are important factors, and capital cannot be got to employ labour if that labour is unprofitable. If capital cannot make a profit from the wages paid to the workers, unemployment will increase. Unemployment is increasing because capital cannot make a profit under present conditions. The workers are looking for work, and they are quite prepared to give a fair return to their employer to whom they do not deny the right to make a profit; but the industrial "Hymn of Hate" is sung by the union organisers. They conceive it to be their duty to prevent people from being employed. The restrictions that are imposed upon the employer must inevitably operate against the opportunities of the workers to secure employment. A number of restrictions that were previously removed from industry are to be restored; so that there can be no hope of industry absorbing the unemployed in the future.

The Leader of the Government charged the public press with unfair criticism and with giving undue prominence to industrial disturbances. Ever since the session commenced the Premier has complained of undue criticism. If his actions are criticised by hon. members on this side, we are told that we are jeopardising the credit of the State. If the press find it necessary to criticise the Premier, proceedings are taken for sedition. Where are we heading? If the people cannot be told the truth, there must be something wrong with our system. The people were gulled at the last elections, but they will not be gulled for all time. They are now waking up, and they are pushing the hon. members who sit behind the Premier. That is one reason why the Bill has been introduced.

The Premier has stated that we on this side are prepared to ignore the opinions of the general public. We are not prepared to ignore those opinions; but, as a party and as individuals, we have a duty to perform, and we are not concerned if, in the performance of that duty, our opinions conflict with those held by certain people. It is our duty to go ahead with our job even if it means that we shall never again be returned to Parliament. That is something that is not understood by the Premier and his supporters. Apparently the Secretary for Labour and Industry has not learnt the story that is told in the poem, "Not Understood."

The Premier has also referred to economic warfare, and charged us with failing to recognise its evil consequences. Does he not recognise that we are dependent upon the markets of the world for the sale of our primary products? The late Government were condemned by the hon. member for Rockhampton for their policy of deflation. When we were returned to power, it was necessary to take steps to arrest the drift in our financial policy so that the State might be placed upon the high road to recovery and to increased production. I have here the November issue of "Economic News," dealing with the exports direct from Queensland during the years 1929-30 to 1931-32. These figures show the percentage increase in the weight of the primary products exported from Queensland—

	Percentage increase.
Wool	23
Butter	54.6
Sugar	58.9
Mutton	310.4
Sundry meats ...	15.6
Cheese	54.1
Tallow	12.3

Those figures show an appreciable increase in the weight of exportable products from Queensland under the Moore Government—a Government which, according to hon. members opposite, was not in the best interests of the State.

Now let us consider the percentage increase in the value of the primary products exported over that period. Wool showed a decreased in value by 10.9 per cent., whereas the weight had increased by 23 per cent. Although the volume of butter exported increased by 54 per cent., its value increased by 18 per cent. only. The export of sugar was up by 58 per cent.; yet the increased value was only 13.9 per cent. The quantity of mutton exported showed an increase of 310 per cent., but the increased value was 202 per cent. only. Sundry meats exported increased by 15.6 per cent., but the values fell 14.7 per cent. These figures show that the Moore Government encouraged primary production; and, although some primary products exported increased by 310 per cent., the values, on the whole, show a diminution. Where is the justification for the argument that production did not progress under the Moore Government?

Mr. FUNNELL: Now give the unemployment figures.

Mr. KENNY: I will do so. The unemployment figures, according to the "Economic News" for November, page 3, were as follow:—

October, 1929	10,170
October, 1930	21,460
October, 1931	24,279

That was during the regime of the Moore Government—

October, 1932	38,147

That shows the increase in the unemployment figures under the policy of the Labour Government, who prated so much about what they would do for them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will connect up his remarks with the question before the House.

Mr. KENNY: I am connecting up my remarks with this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Premier told us how these people would be employed, and that, where darkness and despair once prevailed in the homes of the workers, brightness and happiness would appear with the advent of Labour. Instead of finding the position as he told us we would find it, what do we find? Thousands of workers have not been absorbed in the rotational relief scheme. The basic wage of the unemployed workers to-day is £1 13s. 9d. per week for a man, his wife, and three children. There are only 520 men out of the 38,147 unemployed who are getting over £1 13s. 9d. per week. This is the party who were going to bring in a basic wage for relief workers! No such provision is contained in this measure.

At 9.13 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. KENNY: Notwithstanding that 38,147 workers are unemployed and that the basic wage of the unemployed worker is £1 13s. 9d. per week only, the Government are seeking to reduce the standard of living further by reintroducing a 44-hour week in industry. That will not give the relief workers a greater wage than £1 13s. 9d. per week. The Government know that to be true. They know what effect a 44-hour week will have on Government finance, because that is why they have refrained from making it operative until 1st July next. It is very doubtful whether it will become operative then. The majority of people to-day are worse off than they were fifteen years ago. At that time we did not have the unemployment which exists to-day, or the restrictions and interference with industry. This Bill will not free industry from those restrictions. It will not give employers of labour an opportunity to employ more men. When the 44-hour week becomes operative, it will prevent manufacturers competing with the manufacturers of other States and the profitable sale of our products on the world's markets. If that is so, how will a 44-hour week help us? Hon. members opposite can offer no argument in that direction. They admit by their willingness to postpone its operation till 1st July next that it will be to the detriment of industry and further increase unemployment.

While hon. members opposite condemn the late Government for taking certain employees from the Industrial Court, we must look at the legislation which contains that power. We find that this legislation was introduced by the Ryan Labour Government in 1916. Section 5 of "The Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916" contains the following provision:—

> "The Governor in Council may from time to time by Order in Council declare that any person or class of persons shall be exempted from the operations of this Act."

That power was utilised by the Moore Government in an endeavour to rectify the position of the State. While we were condemned for that, hon. members on the Government side forget that the Labour Government took advantage of the same provision between 1917 and 1920 and again between 1921 and 1924, when persons were removed from the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Court and the salaries of Government employees were reduced. The Labour Government did that because they found it necessary to do so in the interests of the State; and that was done on occasions when conditions were not half as bad as they are to-day.

Again, in August, 1922, the Labour Government were in power; and every Minister petitioned the Arbitration Court for a reduction in the basic wage of Government employees from £4 5s. to £4 per week. Later, when a Labour convention wished the Government to restore the basic wage, Labour members voted against that restoration. Yet we hear all this talk about fixing a basic wage and hours of labour by legislation! As a matter of fact, the basic wage was brought in after a railway strike. It has been stated during this debate by the Minister that, if we do not have arbitration, we will have strikes. The fact remains that even with arbitration we had strikes under the Labour Government. It was a strike which made the Labour Government restore the principle of arbitration.

While Government members condemn the Moore Government for adopting a deflation policy, it is as well to draw their attention to the fact that in 1922 returns tabled in Parliament disclose the following information:—

	Saving effected. £
1,120 employees were dismissed	240,872
4,247 employees were pooling work	66,000
Total	£306,872

That was done at a time when the prices of primary products were 50 per cent. higher than they are to-day. It all goes to show that the arguments of Government members have no foundation. This Bill has been introduced to enable the Government to say to certain sections of the community, "We promised to do this, and we have done it"; but they will not tell the people that this measure will not become operative for some considerable time.

I object to that provision in the Bill which refuses a person the right to work. We can find no evidence where there has been a general demand for preference to be restored. Many cases were heard before the court; but it was useless for an employer to go to the court in view of the fact that the question was decided beforehand. No definite reasons were given that preference to unionists was desirable for the good of industry, and I object to the principle for the simple reason that under this system the

unions are compelling employers to become their agents. Employers must see that their employees are members of a union or become members of a union, otherwise the employees will be cast upon the scrap heap. Men will be cast out if they do not subscribe to the political funds of hon. members opposite. You can understand that action being taken by a Minister who is a vice-president of the Australian Workers' Union. Has the Queensland Parliament come down to the stage where we must be dictated to by the Australian Workers' Union? Are we down to the stage when the Australian Workers' Union can tell Parliament what to do and instruct its Ministers to introduce a Bill to collect funds to fight a political election? If we have got down to that basis, we have got down to a very low level indeed; and it is time that the people of Queensland sat up and took notice.

If members of the unions were getting any benefit from their subscriptions, we would not mind so much. The hon. member for West Moreton a few weeks ago read out the balance-sheet of the Australian Workers' Union, showing that out of the enormous amount collected in subscriptions only £24 went towards relief of the unemployed. And what was that granted for? The £24 was paid for boot repairs! Repair their boots to keep them walking!

The workers to-day are being conscripted and compelled to pay funds into the unions so that they can fight a political election. No consideration is given to the efficiency of the employee. No consideration is given to the length of service of any employee in industry. That being the case, where can an employer get efficiency? Where can he look for assistance from his employees? We find that girls in the shops on very small wages are compelled to pay their subscriptions to the unions? What for? For funds to fight the next election campaign. We know that the next election will be bitterly fought. We know that the Labour Party need funds and the girls that were going to get the light of happiness brought into their homes are being compelled to subscribe to the expenses of the political bosses —the Australian Workers' Union and the Trades Hall. That is the position we have come to as a State; and then the Premier says, "We will not bring the Bill into operation until the 1st July!"

Another objection to preference to unionists is that it is an unfair discrimination between individuals who should have equal opportunities in obtaining employment. Every person should have the right to work on the one basis; but the Government say, "No, whether you believe in our politics or not, you must pay us a contribution before you get the right to work." If we on this side of the House, when in power, had made a definite rule that, before a man could get a job, he had to subscribe to our political funds, there would have been a howl throughout Queensland. We would have been condemned from every platform. But the Leader of the Government says, "We will make them pay, and, if hon. members opposite criticise us, we will say they are ruining the credit of Queensland; and, if the press criticise us, we will issue a summons for sedition, and then we shall go on untrammelled and get our money."

Although the Government are introducing this Bill, we find that the financial position is getting worse day by day. Although industry is being asked to find additional employment, to-day Bill after Bill is being introduced in this Chamber increasing the taxation of industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must deal with the principles of the Bill.

Mr. KENNY: I just mentioned that in passing, Mr. Speaker. Industry to-day is being asked to find work for the unemployed; yet we find a clause in this Bill granting preference to unionists, which practically means industrial conscription on every section of the community. On the other hand, we have no guarantee from the unions under that industrial conscription the employers are going to get efficient labour. The employees have to pay tribute to Caesar, and a number of them are refused the right to work. It is those people with a spirit of individualism and who are anxious to preserve their citizenship who are deprived of the right to work; and whose services are denied to the employer. The rights of the employees are protected under an award of the Industrial Court, and the Bill is unnecessary in that regard.

There is another principle to which I object, so far as preference to unionists is concerned; that is, that the power to tax is taken out of the hands of Parliament and given to the unions. When we give power of taxation to the unions we are putting a power into their hands that they should never possess. When we give the right to unions to tax a man who does not believe in the political policy of the Labour Party, we are breaking every principle of justice. Justice is being denied to the citizen.

If the Premier claims that he has a mandate to bring in this Bill, I will agree with him; but he has that mandate from the time Parliament commenced to sit. Why, then, leave the Bill till the last week of the session, to be rushed through in a few hours? Why refuse the right of the people who are interested in the Bill to have the position discussed when we have not had time to read the Bill carefully?

Men who are controlling industry have had no opportunity to read the Bill or of getting into touch with the Premier or hon. members opposite to show them where they are making a mistake. Hon. members opposite practically say, "We will stifle discussion, so that people will not know what is in the Bill." If that is what hon. members opposite stand for, they are welcome to it. I do not stand for that. If it is not necessary to bring the Bill into operation until 1st July next, why not leave the Bill over till next session?

There was a point the Premier raised in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, when he made a misleading statement about the letter that the Leader of the Opposition had to write to Mr. Scullin in connection with the sugar industry. The Premier said in effect that that letter was of no effect at all. Up to a point the Premier may be right; but at the time the Leader of this party was Premier, Mr. Scullin, as Prime Minister of Australia, demanded that letter before he would sign the Sugar Agreement.

The Premier referred to the relevant clause in the Sugar Agreement. That clause is in

the present agreement, and was included in every previous agreement. Why does the Premier attempt to belittle the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition? Only to try to gull the people, as he did before the election campaign, when he put forth a statement that could be taken in two ways. What is the use of making an ambiguous statement upon which you can place two constructions? The Leader of the Opposition says one thing, and the Leader of the Government says, "I will use your own words in the letter to bear out my own argument and to try to belittle you and bring discredit on your party." We have arrived at a stage in Queensland and Australia when the people demand more than that members of Parliament should try to score off their political opponents. They demand more than members trying to get a little political kudos at the expense of their political opponents. The people of Queensland are depending upon the Premier, and, though this Bill is to be one of the measures that were going to bring light and happiness into the homes of the people and cast out darkness and despair, I think that that darkness and despair will still be here.

Mr. WATERS (*Kelvin Grove*): I move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.