

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 12 AUGUST 1936

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 12 AUGUST, 1936.

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

QUESTIONS.

LOSS OF RAILWAY SEASON TICKET.

Mr. MULLER (*Fassifern*) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. On what date was the theft of J. Thorpe's season ticket reported to the Railway Department?”

“2. As the evidence at the criminal trial of the murderer Kopit revealed that he travelled freely on this stolen ticket, what action was taken by the railway authorities to locate the ticket after its loss had been reported?”

“3. How many season tickets and passes of all kinds reported as lost or stolen remain unaccounted for?”

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

“1. 25th February, 1936.

“2. In the next issue of the Weekly Notice to the staff, the following instruction was issued:—

First-class All Lines Season Ticket No. 30833, account Mr. J. Thorpe, lost.

First-class All Lines Season Ticket No. 30833, issued in favour of Mr. J. Thorpe, and available from 14th January, 1936, to 13th January, 1937, has been lost.

All concerned must keep a sharp lookout for this ticket, and report at once should it come under notice.

“3. Inquiry will be made.”

Mr. Riordan.]

RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES PURCHASED OUTSIDE QUEENSLAND.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. How many railway locomotives have been purchased outside Queensland during the past four (4) years?”

“2. What was the cost involved and were tenders called?”

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

“1. Nil.

“2. See No. 1.”

WINDMILLS FOR STOCK ROUTES.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. What firm or company had its tender accepted for the supply of twenty-two (22) windmills for use on stock routes?”

“2. What firm or company submitted the lowest tender?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. P. Pease, *Herbert*) replied—

“1. Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited.

“2. Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited, was the lowest tenderer working under State awards. The Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited, were prepared to submit an alternative tender based on the Federal award, which would have been lower than any other tender received.”

QUESTION DISALLOWED.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to report to the House that a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Oxley does not conform with the requirements of the Standing Orders. I informed the hon. member yesterday that it would not appear on the business sheet in its then existing form.

PAPERS.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Director, State Children Department, for the year 1935.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulations, dated 23rd July, 1936, under “The Bureau of Industry Acts, 1932 to 1934.”

Regulations, dated 6th February, 1936, under “The Land Tax Acts, 1915 to 1935.”

Regulations, dated 12th December, 1935, under “The Navigation Act of 1876.”

Regulation dated 18th June, 1936, under “The Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1935.”

Orders in Council under “The Bureau of Industry Acts, 1932 to 1934.”

Order in Council under “The Succession and Probate Duties Act of 1904.”

Regulations, dated 9th January, 1936, under “The Adoption of Children Act of 1935.”

Regulations, dated 12th December, 1935, under “The Cremation Acts, 1913 to 1935.”

Regulations under “The Health Acts, 1900 to 1934”—

The Sanitary Conveniences and Night-soil Disposal Regulations, 1936;

The Thursday Island Diphtheria Regulations, 1936;

The Rat Prevention and Destruction Regulations Amendment Regulations of 1936;

Amendment of No. 32 of The Poisons Regulations of 1924 and new Regulation No. 32A;

The Rat Prevention and Destruction Regulations of 1936, dated 23rd July, 1936;

Amendment of The Poisons Regulations of 1924 relating to Pastels and Crayons, dated 6th August, 1936.

Regulations, dated 15th May, 1936, under “The Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1935.”

Orders in Council under “The Local Authority (Grazing Districts Improvement) Acts, 1930 to 1934.”

Ordinances under “The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1934”—

Permit for Tramway, dated 12th December, 1935;

Tramways, dated 12th and 19th December, 1935;

Distribution of Hand Bills, dated 19th March, 1936;

Deputy Town Clerk, dated 6th April, 1936;

Keeping and Registration of Dogs and Goats, dated 18th June, 1936.

Regulations under the following Acts:—

“The Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1935.”

“The Dairy Products Stabilisation Act of 1933.”

“The Diseases in Plants Acts, 1929 to 1935.”

“The Fertilisers Act of 1935.”

“The Fruit and Vegetables Act of 1927.”

“The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1934.”

“The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1935.”

“The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts, 1915 to 1935.”

“The Slaughtering Act of 1898.”

“The Sugar Experiment Stations Acts, 1900 to 1934.”

“The Tobacco Industry Protection Act of 1933.”

Orders in Council under—

“The Banana Industry Protection Act of 1929.”

“The Dairy Products Stabilisation Act of 1933.”

“The Diseases in Plants Acts, 1929 to 1935.”

“The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1934.”

“The Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1935.”

“The Native Plants Protection Act of 1930.”

“The Tobacco Industry Protection Act of 1933.”

Proclamations under—

- “The Farmers’ Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Act of 1935.”
- “The Diseases in Plants Acts, 1929 to 1935.”
- “The Fertilisers Act of 1935.”
- “The Stallions Registration Acts, 1923 to 1932.”

Fifty-first Annual Report of the Union Trustee Company of Australia, Limited.

Orders in Council under—

- “The Supreme Court Act of 1921.”
- “The Magistrates Courts Act of 1921.”
- “The Elections Acts, 1915 to 1932.”
- “The Coroners Act of 1930.”
- “The Financial Emergency Act of 1931” and “The Contracts of Sale of Land Act of 1933.”
- “The Mortgagees Relief Acts, 1931 to 1932.”
- “The Lessees Relief Acts, 1931 to 1932.”
- “The Purchasers of Homes Relief Acts, 1930 to 1932.”
- “The Financial Emergency Act of 1931,” “The Financial Emergency Relief Extension Act of 1932,” and “The Law of Distress and Other Acts Amendment Act of 1934.”

Proclamations under—

- “The Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Acts, 1914 to 1932.”
- “The Justices Act of 1886.”

Statements of various insurance companies under “The Life Assurance Companies Act of 1901.”

By-laws Nos. 323 to 329 under section 134 of “The Railways Acts, 1914 to 1934.”

Regulations, dated 27th November, 12th December, 1935, and 30th April, 1936, under “The State Transport Act of 1932.”

SITTING DAYS.

HOURS OF SITTING.

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

“1. That, during the present session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 10 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and after 2 o'clock p.m. on Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.

“2. The House shall not sit later than 5.30 o'clock p.m. on each sitting day, and the proceedings on any business under consideration shall be interrupted as hereinafter provided—

(a) If the interruption be in the House, the debate shall stand adjourned at 5.30 o'clock p.m., and the Speaker shall call upon the member in charge of the business to name the date for the resumption of the debate;

(b) If the interruption be in Committee, the Chairman at 5.25 o'clock

p.m. shall leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on a day fixed by the member in charge of the business under consideration, no debate or amendment being allowed:

Provided that if, at the moment of any interruption, a division be in progress, or if proceedings under Standing Order No. 142 be then in progress, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall not leave the chair until the question consequent thereon has been decided and the result announced.

“3. At 5.30 o'clock p.m. the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put.

“4. Nothing in this Sessional Order shall operate to prevent the House adjourning at an earlier hour.

“5. If the hour for automatic adjournment has arrived, and it is desired to adjourn over the next sitting day, the necessary question may be put before Mr. Speaker declares the House adjourned.

“6. That during the remainder of this session, Standing Order No. 17—‘Debate on Address in Reply’—shall be construed as if 5.30 o'clock p.m. were substituted for 10.30 o'clock p.m. wherever it occurs in the Standing Order, and 11.30 o'clock a.m. for 4.30 o'clock p.m.

“7. That during the remainder of this session, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Standing or Sessional Order, Standing Order No. 307—‘Days Allotted for Supply’—shall be construed as if twenty-five minutes after 5 o'clock p.m. were substituted for 10.30 o'clock p.m., in paragraph 5, and ‘5 o'clock p.m.’ were substituted for ‘10 o'clock p.m.’ in paragraphs 6 and 7.

“If on the last day but one of the days allotted for Supply the whole of the Votes remaining to be dealt with, including Votes on Account for the ensuing year, have not been disposed of before twenty-five minutes after 5 o'clock p.m., the Chairman shall not leave the chair until decisions have been arrived at upon each of the remaining Votes, and the sitting of the Committee and of the House shall be continued until the whole of the Votes have been decided and reported to the House, and an order made for reception of the Resolutions from Committee of Supply.

“On the day appointed for the reception of any Resolution or Resolutions reported from Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, whether on an allotted day or otherwise, it shall be within the discretion of the Leader of the House to proceed forthwith with the Appropriation Bill founded on such Resolutions, notwithstanding that the hour of 5.30 o'clock p.m. has arrived, but upon the passage of the Bill no further business shall be proceeded with at that sitting. The period for the discussion of the Bill at all stages shall be limited to 8 o'clock p.m., at which hour every question necessary for the disposal of the remaining stages of the Bill shall be put by Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, without amendment or debate.

"8. On the days allotted for Supply, Government business other than Supply, may be proceeded with until 11.30 o'clock a.m., at which hour the proceedings on such business shall be interrupted, and the business of Supply proceeded with.

"Business interrupted under this paragraph shall stand as an Order of the Day for the next sitting day.

"9. That during the remainder of this session, if occasion arises to put into operation Standing Order No. 249, the Standing Order shall be construed as if '11 o'clock a.m.' were substituted for '4 o'clock p.m.' and '5 o'clock p.m.' were substituted for '10 o'clock p.m.' in paragraph 2. If the business then under discussion is not completed by 5.30 o'clock p.m. the Committee may continue to sit until all the clauses of the Bill or other matter have been disposed of, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Standing or Sessional Order. Thereupon the Chairman shall make his report to the House, and all action necessary to complete the business of the Committee may be taken notwithstanding that the hour for adjournment of the House has arrived."

Question put and passed.

LIBRARY, REFRESHMENT ROOMS, AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS COMMITTEES.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

"That the Library, Refreshment-rooms, and Parliamentary Buildings Committees for the present session be constituted as follows:—

Library.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Larcombe, Mr. Bedford, Mr. Waters, Mr. Russell, Mr. Clayton, and Mr. Maher.

Refreshment Rooms.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. King, Mr. Dunstan, Mr. Power, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Nimmo, and Mr. Edwards.

Parliamentary Buildings.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Bell, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Conroy, and the mover."

Question put and passed.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

"That the Standing Orders Committee for the present session consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Larcombe, Mr. Maher, Mr. Brand, and the mover, and that the said Committee have leave to sit during any adjournment of the House."

Question put and passed.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

"That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all

matters which relate to the printing to be executed by Order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members. That such Committee consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson, Mr. Taylor, Mr. T. L. Williams, Mr. Nicklin, Mr. Plunkett, and Mr. Walker."

Question put and passed.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

TEMPORARY CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY AND WAYS AND MEANS.

APPROPRIATION BILL, NO. 1.

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

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day."

Question put and passed.

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT BILL.

APPLICATION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 276.

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

"That, under the provisions of Standing Order No. 276, the proceedings on the Bill intituled 'A Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Law relating to the Imposition, Assessment, and Collection of a Tax upon Incomes,' which were interrupted by Prorogation of Parliament on 12th December, 1935, be resumed at the point they had reached in the previous Session, viz., the Second Reading; and that the Bill be entered upon the Business Paper as follows: 'Income Tax Assessment Bill'—Second Reading."

Question put and passed.

EXPENSES OF PREMIER'S TRIP ABROAD.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I move—

"That there be laid upon the Table of the House a statement of the expenses of the recent trip abroad of the Premier showing also date of departure and return."

Question put and passed.

MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING EXPENSES, 1935-1936.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. NICKLIN (*Murrumba*): I move—

"That there be laid upon the Table of the House a return in the usual form of the expenses of Ministers for 1935-1936."

Question put and passed.

VOTING AT BY-ELECTIONS.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I move—

“That there be laid upon the Table of the House a detailed statement of the results of the polling at by-elections in 1935-1936.”

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST ALLOTTED DAY.

Question stated—

“That the following Address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this, the second session of the twenty-seventh Parliament of Queensland:—

‘May it please Your Excellency,—

‘We, His Majesty’s loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

‘The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.’”

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [10.47 a.m.], who, on rising, was received with Opposition cheers, said: I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on the temperate tone of their speeches.

I am pleased to note the entry of two young men into this House. In a large State like Queensland it is important that the younger generation be catered for. Owing to the vastness of the State large problems confront us and the presence of young men in this House, which enables them to make a proper survey of the State, will afford them an opportunity to put the case as they see it for the younger generation of which they are members. I hope that the two young men who have entered this Assembly for the first time will endeavour in its environment to study without prejudice the merits of the cases submitted to Parliament. No party has a monopoly of the true view, none can always be in the right; and the two young members should give careful consideration to the contention of those to whom they are opposed. By crystalising the opinions expressed on both sides of the House they will be able to form a proper and true judgment—which would be in the best interests of the people of the State.

One of the most pleasing features of the news of last week was the Press report to the effect that there is a strong likelihood of His Excellency the Governor being appointed for a further term of five years. This, if it proves to be the case, will be

a source of great gratification to the people of Queensland. There is not the slightest doubt that during his term here His Excellency the Governor has identified himself so fully with the people of this State that we have come to look upon him as one of us. He is popular amongst all classes and his reappointment will be welcomed by everyone in the State.

Quite recently I had occasion to touch upon one of the most important problems affecting Queensland to-day—the stagnation in our secondary industries. I am certain that everyone of us is concerned at the tremendous drift that has occurred in them during the past twenty years—a period which coincides with the term of Labour Administrations in Queensland. In seeking to ensure the advancement of our State, we have to look at two things. In the first place we need to increase the true wealth production of our State, and manufacturing enterprises can help very materially in this respect. Secondly, the development of secondary industries offers the most important and permanent avenue for employment that the State could have. The system that is adopted to-day of creating prosperity by means of increasing doses of loan funds is only an artificial stimulant, when all is said and done. It must have an ending. We are biting more deeply into the credit resources of the State all the time. When the Labour Government came into power in 1915 they took control of a State whose credit resources had been carefully husbanded by Liberal Administrations for fifty-six years, and recognising the big margin of credit that remained, lost no time in putting into effect their policy of borrowing. The result has been that for twenty years our public debt has been continually increasing, our loan service burden is very great, and our taxation is rising. We are the highest taxed State in Australia—despite all the denials that have been made from time to time and despite the inspired propaganda to the contrary that has been circulated in the Press. The tax on per head this year is in the vicinity of £7. You can see, Mr. Speaker, a precisely similar phenomenon occurring in New Zealand, where a Labour Party is now in power. No country in the world has had its resources more carefully managed and its credit so wisely conserved as has New Zealand. However, the Labour Government now in power there are adopting the same methods as were applied here twenty years ago, and there is no doubt that that Government will win popularity for the next ten years or so by using up those credit resources.

The difficulty is that we are now getting near the end of our tether in Queensland, and the high taxation consequent upon our using up the State’s credit resources has resulted in a lack of inclination on the part of investors and business interests generally to invest money in our State. This is reflected in the figures, which I quoted at the Real Estate Institute luncheon the other day, showing the rates of income taxation on companies generally in the three main States:—

New South Wales—From 1s. 9d. to 2s. 6d. per £1.

Victoria—1s. 10½d. per £1.

Queensland—2s. 1d. to 6s. 3d. per £1 (including super tax).

Mr. Maher.]

In the case of a company with a capital of £50,000, making a profit of £10,000 and

having land of unimproved value of £5,000, the taxes payable are:—

	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
State Income Tax	1,250 0 0	937 10 0	3,125 0 0
State Land Tax	Nil	10 19 0	104 3 4
Totals prior to 1936 Budgets	1,250 0 0	948 9 0	3,229 3 4

The local authority rates are much greater here than in Sydney or Melbourne, but I have not been able to obtain comparative figures. It is difficult to get them.

The totals of State taxation on a company such as I have instanced, are, however, striking enough. They warrant repeating—

	£
New South Wales	1,250
Victoria	948
Queensland	3,229

It must be obvious to the meanest intelligence that where such a big disparity exists in taxation investors are not likely to come to our State. They have not come here, as is very evident from the figures that I used in replying to the Premier the other day. I quoted figures from the Commonwealth Year Book showing that in 1915, when Queensland had a population of 677,000, there were 42,079 factory employees and that in 1935, when the population had increased to 970,000, the number had increased to only 44,778. It will thus be seen that during a period of twenty years, when the population of Queensland had increased by approximately 50 per cent., the increase in factory employees was only a little over 2,000. Do not those figures constitute a damning indictment of Government policy in Queensland with its high taxation? It has had a tremendous detrimental effect in restricting development in this State. On the other hand, the reverse obtains in Victoria, a State that has enjoyed stable government practically throughout its history. Only one Labour Government have been in power in that State, and that was during the period of the depression. In 1915 Victoria had 113,834 factory employees, but in 1935 the number had increased to 169,691, or an increase of 55,857 in twenty years, which clearly shows that a policy of sound government and low taxation has attracted capital to that State. Although it is the smallest State on the mainland and is a poor State in comparison with Queensland, it has maintained a very large population and is extending its commercial enterprise to a greater extent than any other State in Australia.

At different times the Premier has endeavoured to mask the true position in this State by setting out, both in the House and outside, that Queensland, after all, is an agricultural State and that we should concentrate our attention on that factor, that it is not our job to endeavour to develop secondary industries here, that Victoria and New South Wales should be allowed to have all those plums. That is the gist of what he has said on more than one occasion, but it is a wrong attitude to adopt. We have got to clear the decks in this State as soon as possible by altering the position, particularly in the direction of gradually reducing taxation. I recognise that the desirable end of reduc-

tion of taxation must be achieved gradually. We must lay down a right foundation if we are to overcome our difficulties and attract capital to the State. I have before me an extract from the Press which sets out that Mr. Butler, Premier of South Australia, said most emphatically the other day that if an aeroplane factory was to be built in Australia South Australia was going to have it. He is determined to stand up for the rights of his State, and he must have a much better and more attractive proposal to offer to investors than Queensland can hope to hold out to them.

The PREMIER: South Australia has the lowest wage system and the worst industrial conditions in Australia.

Mr. MAHER: I listened very interestedly to the statement by the hon. member for Bowen yesterday when he said he took pride in the fact that Queensland had the highest wage system and the best industrial conditions of any State in Australia, but what is the use of having a high wage system if jobs are not available? It is not so much the amount of money that a man has in his pocket that really counts as its effective purchasing power. To-day members of Parliament are getting £10 a week, but if the cost of living was reduced, say, by 50 per cent., then hon. members would be just as well off with £5 a week. We should remember that a high wage system and a shorter working week tend to drive capital out of this State to more profitable fields of investment. That is the difference. Do hon. members mean to say that the industrial worker in Victoria is worse off than the industrial worker in Queensland?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. MAHER: That is sheer nonsense. The £1 goes further in Victoria than in Queensland, that is to say, the worker there can buy more for his £1. It is reflected in the results—nothing speaks so convincingly as actual results. Despite all that has been said to the effect that the workers of Queensland receive the highest wages and work the shortest hours of all the workers of the Commonwealth the fact remains that they have not the same number of jobs. I remember that during the by-election for the Federal Maranoa seat the late Mr. W. Dunstan, then a prominent official of the Queensland branch of the Australian Workers' Union, who contested the seat as the endorsed Labour candidate, took credit for the fact that just prior to the vacancy he, on behalf of the Australian Workers' Union, had conducted the case of the pastoral workers before the Federal Court of Conciliation and Arbitration and had been successful in obtaining for them an increase in wages and improved industrial conditions. As Mr. Dunstan had piloted that claim through the court one would naturally have expected that the pastoral workers in that electorate would have

[Mr. Maher.

returned him as their representative in the Federal Parliament. Mr. Dunstan looked upon the seat as—to use the vernacular—a “cinch.” When he spoke at Charleville, Cunnamulla, Roma, and elsewhere throughout the electorate he took credit to himself for having helped in obtaining these improved wages and conditions in the pastoral industry, but the men who subsequently lost their jobs because of the increased expenditure involved to the stations as a result said, “Yes, Mr. Dunstan, that is all very good, but where are our jobs?” Mr. Dunstan lost the Maranoa seat, comprising a great pastoral area that one would naturally suppose would return a Labour man to Parliament on that very issue.

It is not the amount of wages a worker gets but what he can buy with them that counts. It is an inescapable fact that even during the period of the Moore Government £1 purchased more goods than it does to-day under a Labour Government. (Government dissent.) The difference is 5s. 8d. on the basic wage of to-day. The July figures of the Director of the Bureau of Industry, Mr. J. B. Brigden, will indicate to hon. members that there has been an increase of 7.7 per cent. in the cost of living. That works out in the index figures at 5s. 8d. on the basic wage.

The PREMIER: I shall have to consider where you get your figures from.

Mr. MAHER: The basic wage worker is 5s. 8d. a week worse off to-day than he was in the 1931-32 period, which shows clearly that he can buy less to-day with his money than in that period.

Reverting to the question of secondary enterprises, let me say that Mr. Butler is making no mistake about his claim to have an aeroplane factory established in South Australia. I have also an extract from the Melbourne Press dated 25th June, 1936, stating:—

“MOTOR CAR BODIES.

“£200,000 FACTORY FOR MELBOURNE.

“Melbourne, 25th June.

“Plans for the erection of a £200,000 motor body building factory in Melbourne by General Motors and Holden’s have been completed. The Premier, Mr. A. A. Dunstan, announced to-day that Cabinet had decided to sell fifty acres of land at Fishermen’s Bend, Port Melbourne, to the firm for £40,000. The factory will cover twenty-one acres and work will be put in hand as soon as possible. About 2,000 persons will be employed in the factory.”

Victoria is the State to which capital is gravitating—gravitating for the very reason I have indicated—that there are sound government and better industrial conditions for the workers and investors in the southern States. There must be an understanding of this problem if Queensland is to get out of her difficulties. The primary industries are doing their best. As a matter of fact, during the last twenty years there has been an ever-increasing expansion of primary production. We have greater production in most of them. There are one or two exceptions, and one of these exceptions is the wool industry. It is a regrettable fact that fewer sheep are being shorn in Queensland to-day than twenty years ago. New Zealand has 30,000,000 sheep whereas, according to the latest statistics, we have only 22,000,000 in Queensland. Generally

speaking, however, there has been an increase in development of primary production in recent years in Queensland, and the volume of wealth production has increased. One would expect that in a growing city like Brisbane big secondary industries also would arise to cater for the needs of Queensland, but such is not the case. One startling fact associated with this phase of the question is that in 1933-34 in Queensland there were 219 employees fewer per 10,000 of population than in 1914. This is one of the truest tests we can apply. My figures are taken from the “A.B.C. of Queensland and Australian Statistics.”

This argument has been largely met by the Premier on the basis that there has been an improvement in that respect during the last four years—implying that the improvement has taken place since his Government have taken office. Undoubtedly there has been a general recovery throughout the Commonwealth. It is only natural, after the sudden drop from a given point in 1930 in consequence of world-wide depression, that as confidence and recovery return we must gradually again approach the point from which we dropped in 1930. That recovery has been due to rising prices and greater confidence throughout Australia, which in turn are due to circumstances that have been debated in this Chamber on many occasions in the past. Although an improvement has taken place in Queensland since the advent of the hon. gentleman’s Government, Queensland during that period has made the least improvement of all the Australian States with the exception of Tasmania. The following table reveals the comparative position of the various States and Tasmania in regard to employment since 1931-32, as disclosed by the latest available figures:—

State.	Increase in Number of Employees.	Percentage Increase.
New South Wales	27,693	21.9
Victoria	28,089	21.9
South Australia	5,652	23.7
Western Australia	2,771	20.7
Queensland	4,284	11.9
Tasmania	782	8.0

Those figures are taken from the “Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics,” and indicate that Queensland shows the lowest percentage of any of the States except Tasmania. I am prepared to recognise the merit of the Premier’s argument that there has been an improvement since his Government came in; but when one takes into account the fact that the Government have had the extraordinary sum of £22,000,000 for the relief of unemployment during the past four years—made up of £16,000,000 from loan fund sources and £6,000,000 from the Unemployment Relief Fund—it is not surprising. Rather is it easy to understand, and seeing that the greater proportion of that amount has been spent in and about the city, it must make for improved conditions and stimulate industry to an extent. There has, it is true, been an improvement in Queensland, but compared with the other States on the mainland Queensland shows the lowest percentage of improvement. There is something radically wrong when such a condition exists. One cannot get away from the logic of cold hard figures. All the arts

Mr. Maher.]

of a public speaker cannot evade the fact that after four years—in spite of the enormous amount of money available—Queensland shows the second lowest percentage improvement in Australia.

I shall not refer to that point any further; there are other matters which I wish to touch upon. One arises from the answer the Secretary for Public Lands gave to the question I submitted about orders for windmills. I understand from it that the tenderer with the lowest figure for the supply of twenty-two windmills for use on stock routes was not accepted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not true.

Mr. MAHER: Did you not say that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No.

Mr. MAHER: Did you say the lowest tender was submitted by the Intercolonial Boring Company?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Yes, so it was—that particular tender was submitted working under the Federal award.

Mr. MAHER: That is evasion. This Government deliberately rejected the lowest tender of a Queensland foundry because it happened to be operating under a Federal award!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not true.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Toowoomba foundry offered to pay the State award.

Mr. MAHER: It is forced to by the policy of the Government. Why all this discrimination between two firms operating in this State? The Intercolonial Boring Company is not selling to the Government windmills manufactured in this State. It is importing them from the other States. The hon. member for Toowoomba represents the town in which the Toowoomba Foundry Company operates. It is my belief—although I am open to correction—that the Toowoomba foundry submitted the lowest tender, but lost the contract because it was not operating under the award of the State Industrial Court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Intercolonial Boring Company was prepared to submit the lowest price under the Federal award.

Mr. MAHER: There is a catch in it. There is something very wrong about the whole business. I want to pin the Minister down. Did the Toowoomba Foundry Company submit the lowest tender?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited, did.

Mr. MAHER: Irrespective of awards?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No.

Mr. MAHER: Irrespective of awards?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member would address his remarks to the Chair instead of engaging in an argument he would probably receive a much better hearing.

Mr. MAHER: I am sorry that in my pursuit of truth I have overstepped the bounds.

The Premier has been reported as having stated at Maryborough on the 22nd Febru-

[Mr. Maher.

ary, 1936, when speaking against the proposal for a 30-hour week—

“Queensland was not a highly mechanised State. It was chiefly a primary production State. It was no use carrying a resolution which would have the effect of militating against the industries of the State.”

There the Premier has a certain amount of sympathy with the view of the Opposition, but as in the instance I have given we find that in Queensland firms are operating under Federal awards—which is perfectly right and proper—and that as a matter of fact since certain of these engineering firms became subject to Federal awards have increased their employment where previously there was stagnation. But we find preference is accorded to firms who are working under the terms of a State award. Why is this discrimination made? Why not allow the lowest tenderer to succeed? From what the Secretary for Public Lands has said it appears that one firm operating in Queensland and manufacturing its windmills in the State actually submitted the lowest tender, irrespective of awards, but failed to secure the business. The order was given to a firm importing its windmills from another State—a firm that put in an alternative tender and was not the lowest tenderer. That is the way it appears to me, but I am open to correction by the Secretary for Public Lands. If that is the case, it is a scandal. It goes to show the discouragement meted out to the secondary industries in this State; it indicates that discrimination is used. Here is a firm of manufacturers giving employment to the taxpayers of the State, but the business is given to an importing firm that is merely a retailer in this State, and is not adding at all to the true wealth production of Queensland. I have no wish to disparage the Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited. It is, however, purely a retailer, importing its supplies and selling them at a profit. On the other hand the Toowoomba Foundry Company is an enterprise that employs Queensland artisans, uses Queensland raw materials, and manufactures them for sale. It is adding to our true wealth production and paying taxation to the State on the basis of its profits. It appears to me that there has not been a fair allotment of business, whereas that Queensland manufacturers should get preference. The secondary industries in the State are being discouraged in the way I have indicated and as defined more or less by the Secretary for Public Lands.

I propose to deal now with the difficulty that has arisen at the sewerage works at Breakfast Creek, in Brisbane. I find an extraordinary feeling amongst the workers to-day. Working men have stated to me that the present Labour Government have a “Tory” trend and in fact there were many points in favour of the Moore Administration. They point to the treatment being meted out to the workers by a “working man” Government. Let us analyse the combination which exists. We have the Australian Workers’ Union, one of the most powerful unions in Australia—which according to its balance-sheet has capital assets amounting to approximately £168,000—and we have the political Labour Party, of which it is one of the chief financial backers. We have these two powerful bodies working together to deprive these unfortunate men

at Breakfast Creek of the right to work. No other interpretation can be placed upon the attitude adopted. The Secretary for Labour and Industry, a member of a "workers' Government has refused to meet a deputation from the ranks of the unemployed workers at Breakfast Creek. A Labour-controlled Brisbane City Council has sacked them from the job.

What is the crime of these unfortunate men at Breakfast Creek? They merely ask for the right to work. They recognise the principle of unionism and they have asked for the right to work for a period of three months by paying the quarterly portion of an annual union ticket. Some of these men have been out of work for three or four years. They have been called up to work on a job for three months, but they are faced with the power of a Government, the power of a civic administration, and the power of the greatest industrial union in Queensland—all three banded together and working against them to deprive them of the right to earn their daily bread. It is the greatest scandal in this country to-day that these men are denied the right to work and that these powerful interests should combine to deprive them of their daily bread. This amount of 25s. they are compelled to pay is a first charge on their wages, and not only that, but the union is so well placed to-day that it does not even need to send its organisers down to collect the money. The City Hall is used as a collecting authority to get the union fees from these workers. They must sign an undertaking authorising the city council to deduct that money from their wages and to pay it to the union.

THE SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:
That statement is not true.

MR. MAHER: That rule has been in operation for some time. I know that in my own electorate, West Moreton, the shire clerk is called upon to deduct the money from the wages of the intermittent relief workers.

THE PREMIER: If an order is given, it must be honoured.

MR. MAHER: The fact is that a man must give the order, and these men did give the order. They were forced to do so. They have stood up for a principle and they are still standing for it.

This great Australian Workers' Union, which, according to its balance-sheet in 1934-35, received about £68,000 in revenue, and disperses no benefits whatever to its members and has not one scheme of benefit or assistance at all for those people who subscribe that large sum annually, has £42,000 invested in Commonwealth loans. It had £80,000 invested in the now defunct "Daily Standard." I suppose if the assets of the "Daily Standard" were realised they might not bring more than £7,000 or £8,000. The union is going to suffer a great loss. Those huge sums have been used for political propaganda, for financing political newspapers—the "Worker" and the "Daily Standard"—and for building up a nest-egg in Commonwealth loans. This big union, in association with the Government, is working the relief scheme in order to increase its revenue. As I stated in the Press we find 8,000 men qualifying for rotational relief work where there is only need for 2,000 if they worked for the whole twelve months. By giving three months' work to 2,000 men

each quarter the union derives a revenue of £10,000, whereas if only 2,000 men did the work the union would benefit to the extent of only £2,500. No doubt that is one of the main reasons why the Australian Workers' Union has refused to back down. It will not "let up" on these workers because the scheme provides an opportunity for the union to aggrandise itself at the expense of these unfortunate men. Such a position is intolerable, and to find that the Government stand for such a thing in a State like Queensland is one of the most extraordinary features of the present-day state of affairs. We find the workers' own Government is responsible for this extraordinary condition! A man demands the right to work and the right to live and the Labour Government say, "No, we will not give you the right to work or the right to live unless you give us our pound of flesh."

MR. MAXWELL: Shylock!

MR. MAHER: Political and industrial Shylocks who want their pound of flesh—their 25s.—from the unfortunate fellow who has been out of employment for three or four years. They deprive him of the chance to get a job at the basic rate even for a period to support his wife and family.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the basic rate is the same as ruled during the period of depression when the Moore Government were in power. Despite all the talk of improved conditions and the frequent assertions that prosperity has returned in Queensland, the basic wage remains the same as it was four years ago. What have the workers' Government to say to that? Their attack on the Moore Government was merciless and relentless when, during the period of depression, they sat on this side of the House. They contended that they stood for higher wages and better conditions; but although they say prosperity has returned they have done nothing.

I have much more to say, but time is going against me, and I should like, for the reason I have indicated and for many others that time does not permit me to mention, to submit an amendment to the Address in Reply. I move the following amendment:—

"Add to the motion the following words:—

'We desire, however, to inform Your Excellency that the Government does not possess the confidence of this House.'

(Government laughter.)

Dealing with the amendment which involves the subject of the right to work I should like to point out that according to an extract from the "Courier-Mail" the Plasterers' Union in this State demanded a fee of £5 from a tradesman for the right to join the union. Commenting upon the demand of this union, Mr. Justice Webb, President of the Industrial Court, described it as a fraud on the court to fix an entrance fee of £5. That demand gives some indication of how far certain union executives are prepared to go in dealing with applicants for membership. Fortunately the President of the Industrial Court took the correct view of the matter, but I want particularly to refer to the impertinence of this union executive that tries to extract sums of money like that from applicants for membership in the economic circumstances ruling to-day.

Mr. Maher.]

Quite recently two men, Mr. George Poole and Mr. Jas. Conn, came to see me. They had been working on the wharves in South Brisbane for John Burke Ltd. and were what are generally known as casual workers. Mr. Poole had been employed there for twelve months and Mr. Conn for eighteen months, but it appears that the union had refused their applications for tickets and that they had been thrown out of their jobs. The whole of the circumstances are well known to the Industrial Court and explanations have been made on the matter, but it should be remembered that because of the tyranny of trades unions men are refused the right to work. Why should this right be denied to these two men who have engaged in work on the wharf for twelve and eighteen months respectively and to that extent have become part of the industry? Why should they be denied the right to work? The law of the country says that a man must be a unionist in order to qualify for a job or to hold a job, but when two men engaged as casual workers on the wharves in South Brisbane applied for the tickets that would enable them to enjoy the right to work, the union—in its all-powerful position to-day—backed up by the strength of the Labour Government that makes its position secure, said, "No, we won't give you a ticket." No ticket! No job!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. BELL (*Stanley*) [11.27 a.m.]: I move—
"That the hon. member for West Moreton be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member for West Moreton be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAHER: I thank the House for its courtesy in giving me an extension of time. There is the position—that the right to work is denied to these men. No ticket, no job! Can any man justify that? Is any industrial union entitled to take up that attitude in a free country? We boast of our freedom, our British freedom. The laws of this country, passed by a Labour Government, say that a man must be a unionist in order to have a chance to qualify for a job, but the union executives on the other hand say to an applicant for a ticket, "We won't give you a ticket," thereby refusing that man his God-given right in a free country of a chance of qualifying for a job. There are hundreds and hundreds of men in that plight to-day. For instance, men who previously were engaged in the coal mining industry are unable to get tickets in the coal miners' union. Storemen and packers make a similar complaint. We have the paradoxical position at Breakfast Creek that 130 men are locked out of employment because they will not take tickets—cannot take tickets. On the other hand, we have these men from the wharves at South Brisbane who want tickets and cannot get them. The whole thing strikes a serious blow at man's individual rights, and his individual freedom. They cannot get jobs without union tickets.

How can members of the Government justify, how even can they condone such

[*Mr. Maher.*

an attitude by a union executive? It will probably be said in reply that the unions do not refuse to issue these tickets. This is what happens. A man makes application for a ticket with a job in sight but with the meeting of the union to be held a month hence. After the meeting is eventually held the union secretary writes to the applicant to say that pressure of urgent business prevented their giving consideration to his application and that the matter would come up at the next meeting of the union.

The whole position is intolerable. The workers themselves control these unions. Why do they stand for it? To me that is the extraordinary aspect of the matter. A correspondent in the "Courier-Mail" said the other morning—I think a member of the Australian Workers' Union—"We are the members of the Australian Workers' Union, yet we allow the officers of this tyrannical union to impose these conditions on us." The whole question is one of the utmost importance to the wage earners of Queensland. If any hon. member lost his seat in Parliament and found a job for himself in order to sustain his wife and family, he would find—if he was not in favour with the controlling authorities of the union—that he would have the greatest difficulty in securing a union ticket, and if he could not get the union ticket, he would not be able to proceed to his job. We have reached an extraordinary state of affairs in this State! There is certainly no freedom in a country where such conditions obtain. For that reason alone the Government do not merit our confidence. If every hon. member expressed his personal opinion, apart from party politics, on such incidents as occurred on the Breakfast Creek relief works, the position would not be tolerated for twenty-four hours. But hon. members opposite are bound by their obligations to their party, by the financial help which comes from the trades unions, and to that extent the Government are afraid to take a stand in defence of the rights of the minority—the poorest element in the community, who are seeking a job.

One of the greatest difficulties at the present time in the trend of the Government's policy is the spending of a great proportion of the revenue, loan fund, and relief funds in and about the metropolis and the large provincial cities. Of course, the object is to pander to larger numbers of people and votes in the more thickly populated areas: the effect is to attract our man power from the country centres. It is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain labour in our country districts. Mr. Briggs, of Politic Station, told me quite recently that he was moving large herds of fat cattle to the Adelaide market, but was finding it impossible to get enough men to help him to do so. I know from our own experience in the Dawson Valley, and from neighbours all round, and from settlers who are developing the reclaimed prickly-pear areas on the South-Western Railway, that it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain labour. We find an ever-increasing drift to the cities. In the first place, men are following up the dole to tide them over their difficulties in the hope of qualifying for a better job on the Kangaroo Point Bridge, or the sewerage works, or the Stanley River dam. I have an instance of the effect of the policy of the Government in providing large sums of money for the metropolitan districts and the

larger provincial cities, and I will quote it to the House to illustrate what is happening. In 1934-35 the Brisbane City Council obtained a loan of £97,159, and a subsidy of £361,661. These figures are taken from Government records. During the same period the shire councils in this State—they are the local authorities in the outside areas—applied for loans totalling £212,000, and the subsidy granted them was £176,000. Hon. members will observe the discrimination. They will note the preference that is being given to the capital city, from which the Government derive the greater part of their power. Can anyone justify the big difference?

I will show by another aspect of this matter how the Government are concentrating the expenditure of their funds in the provincial cities. Consider these figures showing the sums being spent in the larger centres of population—Toowoomba (city), water supply, £304,350; Rockhampton (city), water filtering plant, £16,000; sewerage scheme, £530,000; Maryborough (city), sewerage scheme, £150,000; water reticulation, £5,000; Townsville (city), sewerage scheme, £525,000; Warwick (city), new reservoir and enlarging mains, £18,000.

Large sums are being made available. I am not objecting to money being made available for country areas, but the expenditure is being centred in the metropolitan areas and larger provincial cities, to the detriment of the smaller towns and the great pastoral and farming areas from which our real wealth is obtained. I submit that a condition of things whereby the sources of our true wealth are neglected and the cities are favoured is wrong and must lead to ruination and decay if persisted in. In order to develop Queensland properly and increase our production money is needed. There is room for the expenditure of millions of pounds on rural development in this State. Farmers and producers are in need of long term loans at cheap rates of interest to enable them to develop their holdings, increase their flocks and herds and thus bring in new wealth, without which this State cannot succeed. The policy of concentrating Government expenditure in the cities and larger provincial towns may be likened to the action of a man erecting a handsome architectural superstructure on a building whose foundations are riddled with white ants. The foundations of the real wealth of this State are being neglected, and our secondary industries are in a state of complete stagnation. Our primary industries have been extended gradually, but there is room for a tremendous increase in production in that sphere.

Money is not being made available in the areas where it should. In the area that you represent, Mr. Speaker, men have lost their flocks of sheep and herds of cattle and there are not enough stock to use the fodder available. A great number of the people who live in that area have not got the necessary credit to restock their holdings. That state of affairs results in a tremendous economic loss to the State. Instead of fruitful areas, supporting extra millions of sheep and cattle, which would give employment to many people and thus stimulate the circulation of money over the State, we have great stretches of partially stocked country. One of the primary functions of government is to see that these parts of our State are used to the greatest possible advantage.

Our pastoral industry is suffering and has been suffering for many years from a lack of money for development. An amount of only £23,000 was allotted during the past financial year for the purpose of rural advancement although £4,000,000 was available from loan funds, and much money was spent in avenues that will not lead to wealth production. Once the £3,000,000 has been spent on the Stanley River dam the money will be irretrievably lost; it will have circulated through the State but will not show any further return. If that amount of money was lent to pastoralists and farmers in order to increase the true wealth of the State there would be some advance, because production would be stimulated, employment provided and the basis of an enduring prosperity laid down on economically sound principles. That is where the Government have failed. The result of their policy has been to denude the inland areas of the man power essential to work that country.

The following report appeared in the "Courier-Mail," 13th May, 1936, and contains a statement made by the Mayor of Toowoomba in regard to relief payments and the drift to the cities:—

"... The Mayor (Alderman J. D. Anand) said that relief payments in Toowoomba this week had reached the alarming total of £3,000 for one week, with the Government gift. A few months ago it was £590; then it rose to £1,200. The position was shocking."

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. MAHER: It is not a question of losing a seat. We are dealing with a major national problem and one seat does not count in the great scheme of things. The policy of the Government is encouraging and bringing about such a state of affairs at Toowoomba that the number of unemployed rose from 590 to 3,000 in May, and weekly disbursements amounted to £1,200. The policy of the Government is encouraging men to desert our rural areas for the cities, thus creating a very grave problem that will have to be faced by any Government that may be in power in the future.

Another aspect of the situation that appeals to me is that while on every side there is a demand for men to do ringbarking, dam-sinking, and station work of various kinds, there is a lack of applicants for such jobs. I know of a man who applied to the Toowoomba labour agency for men to do ringbarking, but was informed that those who were unemployed did not understand this work. It is ridiculous to say that out of the several hundred men registered at that agency there were not some who understood something about ringbarking. Those who did so could have obtained work and been employed in some useful occupation. This is an instance of one of our prime difficulties to-day. I remember that when I was at Brigalow during the last Federal election I found five or six men sitting round the dining table at the accommodation house. These young men were apparently all workers in search of a job. A station man came in and sat down at the table. Four or five of these young fellows asked him for a job. He said, "What can you do?" They replied, "We will take on anything." He asked them if they could fence and received a reply, "No, but we will have a go at it." The station man then said, "But I suppose you want to be paid the

Mr. Maher.]

same amount of wages as men used to this work?" Out of five or six men searching for work none understood the work offering! One young fellow asked, "Have you got a job for me, boss? I am a horse breaker." The answering query was, "Got your gear with you?" On being told that he had the man from the station told the young fellow he could have a job; he was asked to get into the station utility truck straightaway. The system of doles operating to-day is breaking the moral fibre of the young men of the country. They are drifting into "easy street" condition and refusing work. Evidence in this respect is accumulating on every hand. An instance is the happenings at Warwick, reported in the "Courier Mail" of 14th May last—

"The position which has arisen in Warwick in connection with the picking of men at the labour bureau for jobs on the State Highway was accentuated yesterday when four married and two single men were wanted. Though there are registered in Warwick 180 men there were present at the call twenty-five men, but only those who put in their cards, namely—two married and two single—were chosen. There was, therefore, a shortage of two married men.

"It has been apparent lately that men do not wish to take work outside the town. Rather would the great majority remain at home on intermittent work than go out and camp on jobs, even at award wages."

It will be seen that two full-time jobs at basic wage rates went begging. During the Bowen by-election I was told of a man named Coates, an orchardist in the Rockhampton district, who went to the labour exchange and asked for labour to help him to pull his citrus crop, which was rotten ripe, offering a wage he could afford to pay, 25s. a week and keep. (Government laughter.) It is all right to laugh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAHER: But where are we getting to? Here is a man prepared to pay a wage that his industry can afford. He made it clear to the labour agent that allowing for the price he would receive he could afford to pay no more than 25s. a week and keep, plus a bonus of 1s. a bushel, as far as I can remember at this moment. The agent was unable to get men to do the work. As his fruit was ripening rapidly he went again to Rockhampton and, standing on the steps of the labour agency, addressed the men present. He asked them to help him out of his difficulty. He appealed to these men to come and help him. The response was jeers. This is an instance of a man engaged in primary production in Queensland who, because of a glut in his commodity, cannot afford to pay more than a certain wage, but cannot get unemployed men to help him. While such a state of things exists I ask: Is it commonsense and is it right that such men in Queensland should be penalised by having to pay an unemployment relief tax at the present staggering scale and at the same time have the unemployed turn them down and refuse to engage in their primary industry?

The PREMIER: How many bushels of oranges could a man pull in an hour?

Mr. MAHER: I am not an authority on the citrus industry and would refer the hon. gentleman to the hon. member for

[Mr. Maher.

Murrumba, who is better informed in that respect.

The PREMIER: You made a blunder by putting in that 1s. a bushel.

Mr. MAHER: It is 1s. a something—I am not sure.

The PREMIER: You ask Mr. Nicklin. He will inform you.

Mr. MAHER: It is 1s. a something. The position is that Mr. Coates had to go down to the Greeks and sell his fruit at a great loss, and the Greeks, having their own system of labour, were able to pull the crop and take the profit that that primary producer should have had. That sort of thing is taking place all over Queensland and it is surely wrong that you and I and the rest of the State should be required to meet this relief tax—the heaviest tax placed upon us—to maintain this state of affairs. No one has greater sympathy than I for the married man with a family who is legitimately unemployed, and I will go a long way to help him. Here, however, we have young single men who could go out and take that work and thus obtain money from legitimate industry instead of living on their fellow citizens by accepting a relief tax dole. It is extraordinary that such a state of affairs should exist. I have here an extract from the Sydney "Bulletin," which may be right or may be wrong, but the "Bulletin" is a fairly reliable newspaper. It says:—

"HOW UNEMPLOYED-RELIEF MONEY GOES.

"Queensland's two unemployed-relief investigation officers are finding some interesting examples of how the taxpayers' money goes.

"For six months a well-dressed woman drove up in an expensive car to draw rations for herself and two children. Belated inquiry revealed that she was a widow living with her well-to-do father, and elicited her vigorous opinion that it was up to the Government to keep them, as father didn't want to.

"A well-tailored young man in a sports suit and a natty roadster explained—after several months of rations—that, although he lived with his prosperous farmer-uncle, it was the Government's job to feed him.

"A married couple, both on relief rations, were found to own a pub in New South Wales. In another case the wife's death revealed that she had £1,000 banked and was drawing the old-age pension.

"Single men draw rations for non-existent families, married ones add on another three or four kids. 'Workers,' after their quota of shovel-leaning, drive their families down to smart seaside cottages to picnic for the rest of the week. Others are paid for days when they are actually employed on other paid jobs.

"But all will have votes at the next elections."

(Government laughter.)

Mr. MAHER: I am not saying that is right or wrong, but it is in the Sydney "Bulletin" for what it is worth. (Government interruption.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will suffer less interruption. There has been far too much.

Mr. MAHER: The Government have been claiming for some years that they have restored prosperity in this State. The Deputy Premier, Mr. Pease, at the by-election in Bowen, had a whole heap of facts and figures to show how prosperity had been restored during the past four years, saying that we were back to the 1929 level of employment and all was well. If that is the case I should like to ask why it is that the unemployment relief funds have been called upon so heavily in the last year in comparison with previous years. The amounts taken from that fund are as follows:—

Year ending.	Amount.
	£
July, 1932	85,000
July, 1933	127,000
July, 1934	120,000
July, 1935	97,000
July, 1936	204,882

If all this prosperity that is being talked about by the Government ad lib. was really apparent, why is it necessary in July, 1936, after four years of Labour government, to make the heaviest inroads yet made on the relief tax funds? The Director of Labour in his report last year said on page 6 that rations were costing nearly £6,000 a week, which was 50 per cent. more than during the worst period of the depression. The basic wage earner is worse off to-day than when Labour went into office four years ago, because of the increased cost of living and increases in taxation, and because of the fact that his condition has not been appreciated by the Government, since he still receives only the amount of money that was given him during the depths of the depression.

According to the official report there are 20,000 men at present employed in loan fund activities and 20,000 on the dole. I suppose that there are approximately 16,000 registered as unemployed at the Labour Exchanges throughout the State. If you analyse those figures, the only thing the Government has achieved—and I see the Premier smiling—

The PREMIER: I am smiling at the malversation of fact.

Mr. MAHER: Here are the facts according to the official publication. The May issue of the "Economic News" shows the number of unemployed as 16,350, exclusive of the loan fund, and the full-time equivalent of relief workers is given as 10,080 men, so that the percentage of unemployed would be 14.5 per cent. The departmental report for last year revealed that the average working period for each man was 2.18 days a week, so that according to official figures there must be over 20,000 men on relief work. When the Government were engaged in a recent controversy between Mr. Brigden and Professor Gifford—

The PREMIER: The Government had nothing to do with that.

Mr. MAHER: I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he had nothing to do with it, but it is rather extraordinary that the method of setting out the figures in "Economic News" was suddenly changed, and it is also a rather extraordinary fact that after I had used the cost of living figures furnished by Mr. Brigden at the Toowoomba by-election the following issues failed to give

the cost of living figures in the way that they had been previously set out. I have no evidence to suggest that the Government instructed anybody, but apparently Mr. Brigden, acting on his own initiative, recognises what is favourable to the Government. The point is that there has been no misrepresentation—

The PREMIER: "Malversation" is the word. It means a wrong use of figures.

Mr. MAHER: There is no malversation in respect of the unemployment position. I have quoted figures that are set out in an official publication.

I should like to stress also the promises that have been made to the public by the Government that they have failed to fulfil. Is it right that the public should be deluded by responsible Ministers of the Crown? It is bad enough when irresponsible members of the party depart from the line of truth when they are on the hustings or in this House, but one does not expect that from a responsible Minister of the Crown. Replying to a deputation from the unemployed at Innisfail on 10th July, 1934, the Deputy Premier gave the undertaking to the unemployed workers of Queensland that all would be in jobs in twelve months from that date.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not true.

Mr. MAHER: That report appeared in the Press. The hon. gentleman was also reported in the Press the other day as having said, "If I were Premier there would be no relief work in Queensland." That seems to be rather an uncomplimentary reference to the man who is the Premier. However, these statements are made, and the public are deluded. I protest. It is utterly wrong and immoral for a Minister of the Crown to delude the public in any way. The Deputy Premier is not the only Minister who has offended in that respect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders. Before I call upon the next hon. member to resume the debate I should like to mention that there is more interruption and interjections than usually happens on an occasion such as this. If an hon. member feels that he does not agree with something that has been said by the speaker there is no occasion to contradict it then and there, unless it is of such a nature as to demand a personal explanation. An hon. member may then rise and make his personal explanation with the consent of the House, but he will not be in order in interrupting the speaker.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*) [11.59 a.m.]: It gives me great pleasure to second the amendment of want of confidence in the Government, not because I feel that anything that we may say may influence hon. members opposite or win their votes, but because it is our duty to place the true position of the State before the people. We have heard a great deal about the improvement that has taken place in the State during the past four years, but it is acknowledged by everybody that the improvement has been general throughout the Commonwealth, irrespective of whether Labour Governments, Nationalist Governments, or Country Party Governments have been in power. The general improvement that began after 1932 can be attributed to the improvement in the price of wool,

Mr. Morgan.]

which increased the wealth of the Commonwealth by many millions of pounds, and to the increased borrowing on the part of all Governments. Prior to 1929 the Governments of Australia, State and Federal, expended an aggregate of £40,000,000 of borrowed money per annum. All at once the flow of borrowed money completely ceased, with the result that the Governments representing all the States found it difficult to proceed with public works. We also know that during that period the value of our wool slumped to the extent of £40,000,000. That meant that much less money was coming into Australia during those years than in the years preceding them. It has been owing to an improvement in those two factors that there has been a general improvement financially throughout Australia. The Nationalist Government of New South Wales led by Mr. Stevens, the Labour Government in Western Australia, the Labour Government in Queensland, and the Nationalist Government in South Australia, have all been fortunately circumstanced owing to the economies effected by their predecessors, who not only adopted but also carried out the Premiers' Plan. They were able to take advantage of the economies their predecessors had effected and were saved an enormous amount of money. They were also favoured by the conversion of overseas loans, which meant a saving of many thousands of pounds to the Commonwealth as well as to the States. These factors enabled these States to better their financial position; yet notwithstanding this advantage the Government in Queensland have not restored to the public servants and others the reductions in their salaries and wages to the same extent as other States have done.

Let us take the position of Queensland—and the position obtaining here applies to all States. We are living from hand to mouth. We know that there has been an improvement in the economic position. Some go so far as to say that we have turned the corner of prosperity, but we know perfectly well that at the present moment we are living from hand to mouth, owing to the fact that since the Government has been in power they have spent approximately £10,000,000 of loan money. That money has been borrowed during the four years the Government have been in power. During the three years the Moore Government were in power they were not able to obtain borrowed money, but reduced the public debt by £539,739. Although the present Government is a Labour Government it is really the Smith Government, as it is a Government of one man—the Premier. He has controlled the State Government just as the dictator has controlled the destinies of Germany or Italy. (Government dissent.) Hon. members opposite know that is true, that the Premier is ruling Queensland at the present moment, assisted certainly, to a great extent, by the Australian Workers' Union. That is a very powerful union.

The Government have been enabled to carry on because of the amount of money that has been available from loan sources. Let anything happen that will prevent the Government from borrowing at the rate of £4,000,000 a year and difficulties will arise in this State just as severe as those we experienced in the 1929-32 period. Borrowed money has brought about the present alleged prosperity. I use the word

[*Mr. Morgan.*

“alleged” advisedly, because that is the fact. There will be a day of reckoning. We are mortgaging the future and evidently do not care what will happen to coming generations. The day of reckoning will come, just as it came in 1929, but perhaps some other Government will be in power to pay the bill. As a Country Party member I want to lodge my protest against the enormous amount of loan money that is being spent in Brisbane and large cities and towns of this State. There may be a certain amount of prosperity in Brisbane, owing to the huge public works proceeding at the moment, but the development of the country is being retarded. We know that when the Jubilee Bridge at Kangaroo Point is erected—at a cost of £2,000,000—it will not give any further work. We know perfectly well, too, that it will not increase the productivity of the State, nor help to market one more bale of wool or grow one more bushel of wheat. If, on the other hand, that £2,000,000 was being expended in water conservation, in locking suitable rivers, and in ringbarking, it would give work to thousands of men and after that work was finished would provide work for all time to both primary producers and employees. From £1,500,000 to £2,000,000 is being spent on work that is not necessary and could have been allowed to remain in abeyance for ten, fifteen, or twenty years without any loss to the State.

In connection with the Mackay harbour scheme it will be remembered that the Opposition protested against the way in which the contract was let. We protested against the tenderer being allowed to amend his tender. What do we find the position to be to-day? We find that up to date the work done has cost 100 per cent. more than the original estimate—and that is what generally happens in works necessitating a huge expenditure. I maintained that that work was not necessary and that it would be many years before the necessity for a harbour at Mackay would become apparent.

I wish to refer to a most important matter, which I take it comes within the ambit of the department controlled by the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, and that is, the assistance to farmers under the debt adjustment scheme provided by the Federal Government. The fact that the Labour Government have not passed the necessary legislation enabling Queensland farmers to benefit under that scheme indicates the extent of their concern for the farmers.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: The Bill we passed was approved by the Commonwealth Government.

MR. GODFREY MORGAN: The Bill passed during last session does not enable the farmers who are eligible for relief to obtain any money, whereas in other States the farmers have received assistance. Up to the present time not one solitary individual has obtained any assistance although applications have been made, and that is owing to the fact the Commonwealth Government are not satisfied with the Bill passed by the Queensland Government.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: They told us they were satisfied.

MR. GODFREY MORGAN: The fact remains the money cannot be advanced. Evidently the other States passed legislation

that was suitable, because settlers in those States have already received assistance.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: We cannot satisfy the Commonwealth requirements unless we amend the Bill they approved of originally.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Why did not the Government pass a Bill of the same nature as the Bills passed by other States.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: The Commonwealth Government never informed us.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It is all very well for the hon. the Minister to blame the Commonwealth Government. It seems extraordinary that Queensland is the only State that neglected to pass legislation that entitled farmers to get assistance under the Commonwealth scheme.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: We passed a Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I wish to refer to the very important matter of a man's right to work. It seems to me that one has the right to work in Queensland only so long as one is prepared to pay into a political fund. So far as the Australian Workers' Union is concerned—and perhaps some of the other unions, although not to the same extent—the money derived in this way is used principally for political purposes. Figures at our disposal reveal that the Australian Workers' Union has accumulated a huge amount of wealth; but during the period of the great depression, when it was alleged that men, women and children were on the verge of starvation, I am not aware of any instance where that wealthy union—which obtained its wealth from the contributions of the workers—contributed any sum to any charitable institution to help those on the verge of starvation. It did not use the money for charitable purposes, but for political purposes. It would have been much more to the credit of the Australian Workers' Union had it contributed £50,000 or £60,000 to some of our charitable institutions who were appealing in the Press and over the wireless for funds in order that people in necessitous circumstances should have enough to eat and wear. The union that is supposed to represent the worker and to exist for his benefit contributed nothing to prevent the alleged starvation and suffering of people during the worst period of the depression! Of course one hardly dares to quote Press extracts or other reports of speeches, because in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, if it suits the speaker, he either repudiates the statement or says that he was misreported.

Mr. KING: Are you speaking for yourself?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: Not in this matter. I do not remember ever repudiating a statement or getting behind it by stating I was misreported. Sooner would I let it pass. In his policy speech, delivered in Mackay in 1935, the Premier stated—

“The aim and policy of Labour is to give each and every individual the utmost opportunity to achieve a full and complete life. It is realised by Labour that the fundamental essential of such a high objective is, first, the provision

of economic necessities by the payment of an adequate basic wage in conjunction with good working conditions.

“Our policy aspires to ensure the right to live; the right to work; and the right to enjoy.”

That is all right from the point of view of getting votes, but the Premier has now an opportunity to put his theory into practice, assert his authority, and interfere on behalf of the men at the Breakfast Creek sewerage works. These men and their wives and children have the right to work, live, and enjoy themselves. The shearers in the far West, perhaps in your own electorate, Mr. Speaker, supporters of the Australian Workers' Union, are contributing to the help of these unemployed. Recognising the principle for which they are standing, small bodies of individuals throughout the State are sending in their donations. The Australian Workers' Union should never have asked these men to contribute more than the pro rata equivalent of their period of work. But this wealthy and prosperous organisation, instead of being prepared to help these men, makes arrangements with the city council to provide three months' work for a certain number of men, from each of which is collected £1 5s.—the annual fee for a union ticket. At the expiration of this period these men are dismissed and replaced by others for another period of three months, and another £1 5s. is collected from each of the latter. If the original men were employed for twelve months—the term of their union tickets—it would affect the revenue of the Australian Workers' Union inasmuch as instead of receiving £5 a year in respect of a job it would receive £1 5s. In view of the policy speech of the Premier it is incumbent on him to take action. I feel sure that he does not believe in the policy being pursued by the Australian Workers' Union in this respect. The policy of the Government is that a working man must be a unionist or starve. He is conscripted into unionism, although during the Great War the policy of the party they represent was that men should not be conscripted to fight for their country, wives, and children. The defence of their country was a voluntary matter, but when it comes to the right to work, which is necessary for existence, they pursue the policy of conscription. The men at Breakfast Creek have to be prepared to pay a liberal donation to the Australian Workers' Union for the right to work. It is incumbent on the Premier to take a stand and insist that this union shall collect from those men only a proportion of the cost of a union ticket, the amount to depend on the period for which they are to be employed.

Another very interesting deduction can be made from the policy speech of the Premier delivered in 1932. He said—

“Give Labour the opportunity to bring light and happiness into the lives of men and women where at present there is darkness and despair.”

Are the wives and children of the men at Breakfast Creek not entitled to light and happiness? Are their lives not just as important as those of union secretaries, organisers, and agitators? Some union officials receive higher salaries than do members of Parliament. The men at Breakfast Creek are being denied the right to

Mr. Morgan.]

live. They are denied the bright lights and the happiness that the Premier was so fond of quoting during the 1932 election. We also find that there must be a split in the Cabinet, because the Secretary for Public Lands seems to have different views from the Premier on the question of unemployment. Speaking on the 14th July, 1936, the hon. gentleman is reported to have said—

“If I were Premier—”

No doubt he would like to be Premier, but I do not know if the Premier will oblige him by retiring, or going into Federal politics, and giving him the opportunity. Evidently, however, the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with the Premier's action so far as unemployment is concerned:—

“If I were Premier, I would abolish relief work to-morrow morning. In the departments which I control, Irrigation, Forestry, Lands, and P.E.I., we do not employ relief workers. Every man on these works has a full-time job.”

Some of us know it, to our regret, especially on the P.E.I. works.

“I send men from district to district.”

That means he does not say in his department that they must work three months and pay a certain amount for union tickets—he has permanent men throughout his department. It does not matter where the men may live or where their homes may be, they are employed from year to year.

“We cannot cope with the unemployed of Australia.”

That is an admission that no matter what they do they cannot succeed.

“We have only a certain taxing power and the people of Queensland are taxed to the limit. The people in this State pay higher taxes than in any other part of the Commonwealth.”

That is an absolute contradiction of the Premier, who has often said that the people of Queensland are not the highest taxed in the Commonwealth of Australia. Yet the Deputy Premier says definitely that we have only a certain taxing power and the people of Queensland are taxed to the limit! Who is right? Is the Premier? I have seen statements by the Premier in the Press that that is not so. The Secretary for Public Lands, in his sober moments (laughter)—I do not mean in point of intoxication, but in the moments when he is not agitated by interjections on the floor of the House, but is able to give the matter in hand his calm consideration—has told the truth.

We were told by the Premier during the electioneering periods, both in 1932 and more recently, that the Moore Government were a wage-slashing Government. That may be true—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: But what is the difference between the Moore Government and the present Government in that respect. In replying to a combined deputation of public servants and unions, the Premier said that employees on the basic wage in Queensland had suffered a reduction of “only”—he used that word—13 per cent. since June, 1932. That was the cut brought about owing to the Premier's Plan by the

Moore Government. He said that the cuts in the other States were:—

Victoria	23 per cent.
South Australia ...	22 per cent.
Western Australia ...	19 per cent.
New South Wales ...	16 per cent.

In terms of cash, the basic wage man in Queensland lost 11s., he said, whereas his fellow workers in the other States lost:—

Victoria	£1
South Australia ...	19s. 6d.
Western Australia ...	16s. 6d.
New South Wales ...	15s. 6d.

The Premier added that the cost of living was lower in Queensland than in any other State. Those remarks were reported in the Press. The position actually is, however, that when those cuts were made, the Victorian cut of 23 per cent. and the South Australian cut of 22 per cent. were brought about by Labour Governments. The Western Australian 19 per cent. cut was made by a Nationalist Government, a New South Wales Labour Government made a 16 per cent. cut, and the Queensland Nationalist Government a 13 per cent. cut. The people were told for electioneering purposes that wages had been slashed to a greater extent in this State, whereas the fact is that wages were slashed to a greater extent by Labour Governments during the period in question. We also know that the other Premiers of the day were not satisfied with the reductions that had been made by the Moore Government, on the ground that they were not heavy enough or commensurate with the reductions that had been made in their respective States. The figures quoted by the Premier definitely prove that the reductions made by the Moore Government were smaller than those made in any other State in the Commonwealth.

The Moore Government have repeatedly been charged with slashing the basic wage, but has it been increased in this State during the period of the present Government? It is the same to-day as it was during the term of the Moore Government. The Moore Government had nothing to do with the reduction in the basic wage.

The PREMIER: Yes. They applied to the Industrial Court three times for reductions. Mr. Macgroarty, who was the Attorney-General in the Moore Government, attacked the Industrial Court because it had failed to carry out the wishes of his Government. He mentioned the “ringbarking” of the court.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: If the Premier is correct in his contention that the Moore Government applied to the court for a reduction in the basic wage, and the reduction that was granted amounted to a “slashing cut” why has he not applied to the court to restore the wage to its former level? He has been satisfied to pay the basic wage that was fixed by the court during the Moore regime. The court should be responsible for any increase or decrease in the basic wage and should not be influenced by the fact that the application is made by a Government. The Premier is quite content to accept what he terms the “slashing cuts made by the Moore Government.” He has taken no steps to have the basic wage increased. I think it was the seconder of the Address in Reply who referred to the fact that the basic wage in Queensland to-day is higher and that the cost of living is lower than in any other State. That is true, but

[Mr. Morgan.]

exactly the same position prevailed during the time of the Moore Government. Even the Premier will not deny my assertion that whilst the basic wage has remained at £3 14s. a week the cost of living at the present time is slightly higher than it was in 1929. We are all aware that bread and other commodities have increased in price, which means that the effective basic wage to-day is less than when my Government were in power.

The PREMIER: Your Government denied the right to all Crown employees to approach the court.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I recognise that, but the hon. gentleman seems to forget that during the election campaign he threw the blame for the depression on to the Moore Government and that when he submitted figures to the union officials to prove that the wage reductions in this State had been less than those in the other States, he was paying—intentionally or otherwise—a compliment to the Moore Government. The Premier is quite prepared to take shelter behind those favourable figures. According to Mr. Bolger, secretary of the State Service Union, the restorations in salaries have been greater in the other States than in Queensland. That also is true, but the Premier relies on the fact that the wage reductions in this State were less than in any of the other States in support of his contention that restoration of salaries to public servants should not be on a greater scale. To sum up, the Premier takes advantage of the fact that the wage reductions imposed by the Moore Government were less than those imposed in any other State.

I desire to refer to another important matter that arose during the tour of the Premier abroad.

The PREMIER: I am glad that you have been improving your mind by reading my speeches.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I have been improving my mind by reading the hon. gentleman's speeches, but it is my duty to correct his utterances where I find them to be incorrect. I want to quote an extract from an article contributed by the Premier to the Glasgow "Forward" and the Manitoba "Commonwealth" which has probably been printed in many other papers. I ask hon. members to realise that this is an article contributed by the Premier and not a speech—

"The Labour Party of Queensland has quite definitely a socialistic objective, and with this end in view, various forms of State activities have been entered upon . . . The State undertakings of Queensland, however, despite all difficulties, were a great benefit to the community. The State sheep and cattle stations and State butcher shops effectively controlled the price levels of meat . . . These enterprises live to-day."

The Premier knows perfectly well that those enterprises do not exist to-day. (Laughter.) He knows perfectly well that they were disposed of. He knows perfectly well, too, that the public debt was increased by £5,000,000 because the State embarked on those State enterprises. To-day we are paying interest on the £5,000,000 that was lost on those State enterprises.

The PREMIER: Are you prepared to lay the alleged article on the table of the House?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I am prepared to place the cutting on the table of the House.

The PREMIER: Put the article on the table of the House and let me have a look at it.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I will give the hon. gentleman the date and everything connected with it.

The PREMIER: Will you put the article on the table of the House?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: I have gone so far as to state that the article appeared in the Glasgow "Forward" and the Manitoba "Commonwealth." If it is not true, it is up to the Premier to say so.

The PREMIER: I have never seen the Manitoba "Commonwealth."

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: This all goes to show that when a man of the standing of the Premier goes overseas it is necessary for him to tell the truth, because if he does not he will sooner or later be found out.

The PREMIER: You put the article on the table of the House.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The Premier, speaking at a welcome by Scottish Socialists in the Keir Hardie Institute, Glasgow, is reported in the Glasgow "Forward," of 16th June, 1934, as having said—

"He was still proud to be a Socialist and more than ever convinced that Socialism provided the only radical remedy for the great problem of poverty amidst plenty which faced the world to-day."

The PREMIER: All intellectuals are Socialists.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: That is so. (Government laughter.) My point is that the Premier, when he was in Scotland, posed as a Socialist; when in London he was an Imperialist; in the Commonwealth of Australia he is an Internationalist, and in Queensland he is an economic nationalist. He is an economic nationalist because only recently he advocated restriction in the production of sugar. He not only advocated restriction, but he also passed legislation to enable the production of sugar to be restricted.

The PREMIER: Where is that legislation?

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The hon. gentleman knows that under that legislation if a man went to the trouble of growing sugar without an assignment he could not sell it to a sugar mill.

The PREMIER: Have a look at the Act your Government passed.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: If our Government did pass that legislation and were responsible for restricting the growth of sugar cane, then the hon. member's Government has accepted that legislation.

The PREMIER: You cancelled some assignments and limited others.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: The hon. gentleman cannot escape his responsibility, because he adopted that legislation and has since advocated the restriction of the growing of sugar cane. He cannot deny it. Nor can he deny that he passed legislation giving existing coal mine owners a virtual monopoly of the coal trade in Queensland.

Mr. Morgan.]

It has prevented any one else establishing a coal mine without first obtaining permission. He cannot deny that restriction is practised there. I want to know when the Premier is a restrictionist and when he is not. He believes in restriction in the sugar and coal industries, but if some poor unfortunate wheatgrower gets only 2s. a bushel for his wheat and loses 1s. 6d. a bushel in consequence, he does not advocate restriction. He says, "Let him continue." He can go on growing wheat "until the cows come home," or until he cannot grow and handle it any longer. But the Premier is a restrictionist in some respects because that policy plays into the hands of the sugar growers and the people of the North. It is popular legislation with them. The Premier as a restrictionist passes legislation enabling the coal mine owner and employee to meet together and profiteer and force public utilities to use coal whether it is of the desired quality or otherwise.

Mr. FOLEY: That is not so.

Mr. GODFREY MORGAN: It is true and the hon. member knows it. The Lord Mayor of Brisbane stated definitely that not only had the cost of coal been increased, but also they had to take any sort of coal—good, bad, or indifferent.

The Premier is a restrictionist in some regards and in other regards he is not. We should like the hon. gentleman to explain his attitude. The hon. gentleman cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds for all time. He must be on one side or the other.

I am especially interested in the Railway Department and that makes my regret the keener in having to record the deplorable condition into which that department is slipping. When I assumed control of that department in 1929 it was in a deplorable condition and was losing millions a year—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

REAPPOINTMENT OF GOVERNOR OF THE STATE.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) [12.38 p.m.], by leave: I desire to inform hon. members that His Excellency the Governor has been informed by the Secretary of State for the Dominions, that if he is willing to accept a fresh term of office as Governor of Queensland, His Majesty the King will be prepared to approve of such an appointment.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Intimation to this effect was also given to me when I was in England, and, accordingly, on my return I informed His Excellency that it was the unanimous wish of my colleagues and myself that he should accept that fresh appointment, if he was prepared to do so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: At the same time I informed him that I was fully assured that such a fresh appointment of five years as Governor of the State would meet with the general desire of all classes of the community and would be cordially welcomed by the people of Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Morgan.

The PREMIER: His Excellency accordingly notified the Secretary of State that he would be willing to accept a fresh appointment, if such were offered to him, and His Majesty the King has now approved, as has already been announced, of His Excellency's appointment for a second term of five years from the date of the expiration of his present appointment—namely, 13th June, 1937.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) [12.41 p.m.], who was received with Government cheers, said: I desire to speak in favour of the resolution and against the amendment.

First of all I extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the resolution. Those new members of Parliament indicated in their speeches that they were well acquainted with the problems of the day and are capable of giving good service to the people of Queensland. I feel sure that both of them will have long and honourable political careers and give good service to the people of their electorates and the State.

I listened with interest to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. I have noted from time to time the wholehearted manner in which His Excellency has carried out his duties. There can be no doubt that Sir Leslie Wilson has been eminently successful as Governor of this State. His appointment for a further period can be taken as an official recognition of that fact, and will meet with the general approval of all sections of the community. Of this I feel sure.

The debate on the Address in Reply is an opportunity for members of this House to review the policy of the Government of the day. That is the undoubted right of every hon. member. It is also the right of the Leader of the Opposition to move an amendment to the Address to the effect that the Government have no longer the confidence of this House. This he has done. In my opinion his amendment is futile, time-wasting, and fore-doomed to failure. It is fore-doomed because the excellent record of the Government since its election in 1932, confirmed by a record majority in 1935, and supported by further victories in the by-elections in Toowoomba, Brisbane, and Bowen, proves that the Government possess the full confidence, not only of this House, but also of the people of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is necessary, however, because of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, that the record of the Government should be presented rather fully. For that purpose it is necessary that we should examine the basis of that record—i.e., the policy speeches of this party delivered in 1932 and 1935 respectively. I take it that when the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment he regarded it as an opportunity to confirm in the eyes of the public his selection as Leader of the Opposition. If he had such an intention in mind, then I can only state that he has failed dismally to secure his objective. His speech was not that of a leader and fell far short of the type that could be expected from his predecessor. It was based very largely on hearsay—what

somebody said in a refreshment-room, what somebody said over the fence—or on sarcastic propaganda taken from various sections of the Tory Press.

The hon. member dealt extensively with the unfortunate position of the relief workers at Breakfast Creek, which he used, not to make an attack on the basis of the case those men may or may not have, but to exploit it to develop a case against the principle of preference to unionists. It is not sympathy with men on rotational relief work that animates this criticism of the Australian Workers' Union. It is based on his and his supporters' definite hostility to unionism in every shape and form.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: When in office—having the opportunity—they did everything to undermine and diminish the aims of unionism in the State and Commonwealth. Preference to unionists is no new policy. It exists all over Australia and in many other countries. Preference to unionists and the "open shop" is debated and contended in every country in the world. The hon. member's own ex-Leader, in the person of Stanley Melbourne Bruce, when he was Prime Minister of Australia, stated that preference to unionists was the logical corollary of compulsory arbitration.

I take this opportunity of giving a friendly warning to the new Leader of the Opposition. Basing his remarks on hearsay, he made an attack on the Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited. My reason for giving my warning is that men in public positions would be well advised never to accept *ex parte* statements.

Mr. MAHER: I rise to a point of order. The Premier has stated that I attacked the Intercolonial Boring Company, Limited. I did not attack that company at all, but referred to the policy of the Government. The remark of the hon. the Premier is offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I am dealing with the Intercolonial Boring Company and the hon. gentleman's strictures thereon. What are the facts? Tenders were called for a number of windmills. Tenders were put in and the Intercolonial Boring Company's tender was accepted. The Leader of the Opposition stated quite definitely—as definitely as any words can—that the Intercolonial Boring Company was only a retailer and imported from other States the component parts of those windmills. If his language meant anything, that is a clear and concise statement of his case. A condition of the contract was that the work should be done in Queensland. The hon. member says that that condition is not being fulfilled. The facts are that the work is being carried out in Queensland in the works of this company at Yeerongpilly, and I am authorised by the manager of that company, with whom I have been in touch, to invite the Leader of the Opposition or any other members of his attenuated party, to visit Yeerongpilly to see the work actually in hand.

Mr. MAHER: Who put in the lowest tender?

The PREMIER: That, Mr. Speaker, justifies me in warning the Leader of the Opposition with all the friendliness I am capable of showing, to be careful of what he hears. If he were acquainted, as the hon. member for Rockhampton and others

are, with the works of that illustrious poet, Robert Burns, he would know that

"Rumour is a lying jade";

and that one of the first elements of Parliamentary wisdom is to disregard rumours and to rely at all times upon facts. I hope that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will accept the advice that I have given in the spirit in which I have given it, and will, in future, follow it.

I stated, in dealing with the question whether or not this Government had the confidence of the House, that the whole case hinges on the policy speeches I delivered on behalf of my colleagues in 1932 and in 1935. It will be remembered that the 1932 policy speech, after setting out the case for a change of Government, concluded with this statement:—

"I ask you to co-operate with the Labour Government in the great work of national reconstruction."

Three years of steady constructive work on the part of the Government were sufficient to warrant the people in re-electing the Government and the Labour Party with the greatest majority in the history of this Parliament. The 1935 policy speech set out that there were hopeful evidences around us of the return to prosperity and that confidence in the State had been restored, and it concluded with an appeal to re-elect the Government to carry on the great task of national reconstruction. How well that task has been carried out, Mr. Speaker, it would take a great deal of time to outline fully, but at this juncture in the Address in Reply debate, I content myself with setting out twelve reasons why this Government continue to possess the confidence of this House and of the people of Queensland.

The first with which I propose to deal is the increased production of the State. The Leader of the Opposition had to admit—no doubt grudgingly—that that increased productivity had taken place. A test of the success of a Government is the production of the State, for producers cannot and will not produce under a system of government that places them in an insecure position. Queensland's recorded production in 1934-35 was £52,562,000, which was £1,250,000 greater than that of the previous year.

Primary production showed an increase of approximately £400,000, and manufactures an increase of £1,000,000. These figures in themselves, I submit, are evidence in support of my contention. Queensland's primary production per head of population is the highest of all the eastern States, being equal to £32 2s. 10d. This, added to manufacturing production, gives a total production per head of £46 11s. 4d. On the basis of the average family of three it is £138 per family. That this production is regarded as satisfactory is indicated by the recent "Courier-Mail" industrial supplement which, in a full review of secondary industry, published headlines such as these:—

"Growth of Secondary Industries is Aiding Onward March of States.

"Cement Industry Has Kept Over £5,000,000 in Queensland.

"Brick Making Progress—Upward Tendency in Queensland."

The Leader of the Opposition was content to repeat stories that he had heard in refreshment-rooms, over fences, and elsewhere, and quoted a newspaper contention

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

that has no basis at all, as he knows, but he took no notice of the Industrial supplement of the "Courier-Mail"—a paper that tries—it makes Herculean efforts—to state a case for the Opposition.

Mr. CLAYTON: It only tries.

The PREMIER: It only tries, the hon. member for Wide Bay says. There is a world of pathos in that interjection—"It only tries." He evidently recognises that even the journalists on the "Courier-Mail" cannot accomplish the impossible. The "Courier-Mail," in its industrial supplement, stated—

"A study of this supplement should convince the most sceptical that Queensland provides opportunities for vast expansion of its secondary industries, side by side with the continued growth of those great primary producing industries which have built up the prosperity of the State."

In his endeavour to build up a case against the Government the Leader of the Opposition relied very largely on factory figures, taking the figures from 1914 up to the latest available. He contended that the increase in this State had not been equal to that in the other States, and as he was making use of the figures I interjected that he was guilty of malversation of figures. In dealing with matters of State-wide importance it is a pity that hon. members opposite will not endeavour to place all the facts before the House and the people. Queensland is a State that we are all entitled to be proud of. As I said the other day the people who have the privilege of being the citizens of this State and this Commonwealth should thank God for that privilege every night when they say their prayers. If the contentions by the Leader of the Opposition were correct, then this Parliament would be called upon to consider the position seriously. The facts are that the total factory output for the whole of Australia declined from £416,000,000 in 1927-28 to £281,000,000 in 1931-32. So that when we deal with the value of factory output and the decline in that value, all facts have to be taken into consideration. The other States that the Leader of the Opposition is fond of quoting—New South Wales and Victoria—also suffered heavy declines in factory output—and those during periods of anti-Labour Governments. In New South Wales the total factory output dropped £67,000,000 from 1927 to 1932, and in Victoria it fell away by £35,000,000, whereas in Queensland it fell £10,000,000.

The statistics show that there has been a decline during the period under review in all the States. I point out that in order to get a correct perspective of all the figures dealing with factory output, one must get the figures in relation to each State on a comparable basis. Such figures will indicate that the Leader of the Opposition made no reference at all to this factor. Take for example South Australia, another State quoted as being one that was carrying out a policy that met with his commendation. The falling off in factory output in South Australia during this period was £16,000,000 sterling, and in Western Australia it was £4,000,000.

Mr. MAHER: During what period?

The PREMIER: During the period I have quoted—from 1927 to 1932. Instead of the Queensland Government being culpable,

[Hon. W. Forgan Smith.

statistics will show that all States showed a reduction but that in Queensland there has been an appreciable increase since 1932 in the number of factory employees and output.

I shall go into this matter further at a later stage of my speech. I think I have said enough under this heading to indicate that the figures used by the Leader of the Opposition are of no value unless they are comparable as between all the States.

The second point I desire to call attention to is bank clearings. If Queensland were badly governed and if this Government were unworthy of the confidence of the House it would be found that money in circulation would decrease and industries would be stagnant. That point cannot be emphasised too much. It is the velocity of currency circulation that is the true index of prosperity or otherwise in the community. If that velocity increases it is obvious that employment has increased, and if employment has increased it is obvious that more people are receiving incomes—their spending power has improved accordingly. The clearings of the Associated Banks in Brisbane increased by more than £40,000,000 sterling in the first three years that this Government were in power. The total in 1932 was £141,000,000 sterling in round figures. In 1935 it had increased to £181,000,000 sterling and, as the "Courier-Mail" stated on 4th January, 1935—

"such clearings were a good indication of the trading and industrial improvement."

The "Telegraph" in its financial supplement on 20th January, 1936, headed its front page—

"Finance in 1935
Steady improvement."

The "Telegraph" in its review of banking business during that year put up the heading—

"Banking business was active 1935."

The excellent bank clearing figures have continued this year, and the returns for the four weeks ended 27th July, 1936, gave the total at more than £15,000,000, whilst the half-yearly clearings for 1935 were £2,500,000 higher than for the same period in the previous year. These figures are proof positive that the gloomy forebodings of the Opposition are unfounded.

Let me now look at another point, the stock exchange position, which is regarded as a good index of the development or otherwise of industry. It is well known that stock-brokers and investors in shares are very shrewd judges of investments and are quick to feel the effect of Government action. In Brisbane, in June, 1936, the share market was steady and the Queensland Bureau of Industry's index of share prices rose to 103.9, the financial and trading section advanced, and there were individual movements showing considerable increases. Remember that figure, Mr. Speaker—the share price index is now 103.9! During the period the Government that the Leader of the Opposition supported were in power the share price index was 69.6. An increase from 69.6 to 103.9 can be regarded as a very marked increase and indicative of the improvement in industry that has been effected as a result of restored confidence under the policy of this Government.

The fourth point I wish to make is in connection with building operations. Any one who has taken the trouble to study conditions in any country knows that the building operations in a city or a country are a sure indication of its prosperity or otherwise. Immediately a slump begins building operations are practically brought to an end—people are not likely to extend their buildings or their homes if a depression is imminent. So that a revival in building is a sure indication of revival in industry generally. When the present Government came into office they launched out on a building revival scheme as part of a general rehabilitation of industry. It was appreciated that a lead to industry would set private building moving, and this has followed, with the result that the Queensland Master Builders' Association in its annual report for the year 1935 set out that building in Queensland had increased considerably, and in Brisbane was 66 per cent. higher than the previous year. The report states that the year showed a further upward trend in building operations generally, the total buildings in Brisbane being valued at £1,761,000.

What is true of Brisbane is true of the whole State. Proof of the confidence of big business houses was the start of the erection by the "Courier-Mail" of a building estimated to cost £100,000, by Finney, Isles, and Company, Limited, of a building estimated to cost £60,000, by the Australian Estates and Mortgage Company, Limited, of a building estimated to cost £36,000, by the abattoir of additions estimated to cost £40,000, by the Queensland Egg Board of a building estimated to cost £23,000, by T. C. Beirne and Company Proprietary, Limited, of extensions estimated to cost £20,000, and many others that could be mentioned if time were available.

The Master Builders' Association, which is not a union affiliated with the Labour Party—and consequently does not come under the suspicion with which the Leader of the Opposition views other organisations—paid this high tribute to the Government—

"Doubtless the Government, stepping in as it did with its public works programme, rendered a great service to building trade industrialists, and to the business community."

That in itself, I repeat, is a very high tribute.

Point No. 5 is "recent changes," and these are set out fully in the June issue of "Economic News," showing that pastoral production increased in 1935, agricultural production has been stable, cotton production has increased, as has the manufacture of construction materials and log timber. It is shown that the number of bricks produced increased from 13,000,000 to 22,000,000; the value of output of timber mills from £1,250,000 to nearly £2,000,000, and that this was followed by an increase in consumers' demand which has been felt in almost every industry. In a note on the external trade figures, it is shown that there was an aggregate increase of 3½ per cent.; that interstate trade increased, and overseas exports for the first ten months were £1,000,000 in excess of those for the corresponding period in 1934-35.

But this is not all. It is estimated that there is some further £2,000,000 or £3,000,000

worth of unrecorded production, which further improves our position. What I mean by unrecorded production is production that is either exported to other States or through other State ports and consequently is credited to those States.

There is Point No. 6. For a moment let us look to the position elsewhere. I made reference earlier to the production per head in Queensland, and showed that this was £46. Let me now quote the figures for the production in the other principal States. During 1934 New South Wales was closest to Queensland with £45 and then came Victoria with £44 9s. 8d. The average for the whole of Australia was nearly £45. These figures indicate very clearly—and they are definitely comparable figures calculated for the same period and under the same conditions, and are irrefutable—that our productivity in regard to both agriculture and the secondary industries is, on a per capita basis, higher than that of any of the other States. That is further proof of the success of the policy of the Government. It is proof of our ability to hold our own with the other States and this in face of the fact that factory production in New South Wales and Victoria is largely concentrated, because of the great populations centred there and the consequent local demand. Hon. members opposite seek to argue against that well known fact. Is it not obvious that where there is a large centre of population—over a million consumers living in one centre—the market demand for manufactured articles will be greater than in the more sparsely populated centres of the Commonwealth? And as a natural corollary capital and manufacturing industries flow to the centres where there is an aggregation of population. But a complete reply to the charges of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to factory output and in regard to productivity generally is contained in the figures that I have given.

My seventh point deals with business houses. We find that many Queensland companies, instead of losing ground, as the Opposition seek to declare, have made remarkable progress. It is a remarkable thing that during the whole period that I have been in this Parliament the Opposition party, irrespective of their appellation, at any period did everything in their power to create a lack of confidence in Queensland. They have preached a gloomy tale as to our industries and our achievements. If investors had taken notice of the speeches of prominent members of the Opposition no investments would have taken place in Queensland. But fortunately people outside this House know better than that. They know that the facts I have given are correct. They know that the statements appearing in the financial review of the "Telegraph" and in the industrial review of the "Courier-Mail" are far more effective documents and far more reliable than any statements made in this House by hon. members of the Opposition. I suggest that hon. members opposite when dealing with this important matter do something to help the State instead of defaming it. As an example allow me to take the case of Finney, Isles, and Company Limited. In 1931, the last year of the Moore Government, this company showed a net profit of just under £7,000. For 1935 the net profit was £54,000. Is that

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

not an indication of greater spending powers in the community?

Mr. NIMMO: Not necessarily.

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to look upon the hon. member for Oxley as an authority on any form of business enterprise. The figures I have quoted cannot be challenged. We know that during the period of the Moore Government the spending power was seriously limited, with a result that such firms suffered accordingly in their turnover. As employment grew, the increased spending power was reflected in the greater returns shown by this company I have mentioned. I will tell hon. members something more. When the Government of hon. members opposite were in power, carrying out their deflation policy, they were supported to some extent by the leading Press in Brisbane through their leader columns, which impertuned people to spend less and to economise more, but at the same time invited people through their advertising columns to purchase clothing, textiles, house furnishings and so forth. So bad did the situation become that it is a well-known fact that a number of large advertisers in Brisbane approached the newspapers responsible and in effect said, "Look here, you are charging us thousands of pounds per annum for advertisements inviting people to come into our warehouses and purchase our stocks. But after having made those charges upon us you advise people in your editorial columns not to purchase anything more than they can avoid. They threatened that if the policy was continued they would withdraw their advertising. Those are facts that cannot be denied. Increased spending power results in increased activities of those firms. Allan and Stark Limited in 1931 showed a loss of £4,500 and last year a profit of £8,500, an improvement of £13,000 in the period under review.

Mr. MULLER: Tell us what the spending power in New South Wales was under Lang in the same period.

The PREMIER: I am not concerned about the spending power under Lang. The charge is a charge directed against this Government. It is the duty of the hon. member, if he has any case, to put it forward. So far as I am concerned, as far as I have gone I have refuted the case put forward by his leader and by the seconder of the motion. No doubt the hon. member for Fassifern does not like these facts being brought to light. The reactionary policy that he stands for is such that he would like to get the people to believe certain things, but members of this House cannot get away with it in that fashion. What I am saying to-day is not so much for the purpose of informing members of this House, as to counteract false propaganda outside by giving to the public the facts of the position.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: McDonnell and East Limited showed a loss of £970 in 1931 and a profit last year of £13,000. The Brisbane Permanent Bank showed an increase in profits of £13,000 over the last five years. Eager and Sons Limited increased its profit from £5,000 to £31,000; Queensland Cement and Lime Company Limited from £18,000 to £25,000; and Walkers Limited from £811 to £8,702. Those are just a few illustrations

[Hon. W. Forgan Smith.

to show the improvement that has taken place in well-known companies in Queensland.

The hon. member for Oxley knows—none better—that the companies in which he is interested have done better during the last five years under a Labour Government than they did during the period when his own party were in power. Those are facts, and are known to him thoroughly; but for political reasons he would seek to make the truth appear otherwise.

The most eloquent testimony to the success of the present Government is forthcoming from three companies in Maryborough. During my visit to that city last year I went to one of the large sawmills there—one of the best equipped sawmills I have ever seen. I refer to Hyne and Sons. The employees, numbering 130, assembled, and a representative informed me on their behalf how deeply they appreciated the improvement in their wages and conditions as a result of this Government's policy.

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

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. P. Pease, *Herbert*) [2.21 p.m.]: I move—

"That the Premier be granted an extension of time to enable him to complete his speech."

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House that an extension of time be granted to the Premier to enable him to complete his speech?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I thank hon. members for their courtesy. The management of the mill endorsed those remarks, and said that no words could express the gratitude of the firm to the present Government. Three years earlier, during the term of the Government supported by the Leader of the Opposition, I had inspected the mill and found machines idle and men working on short time. Following that second visit I received a letter from the director of two big companies in Maryborough, one of which had just spent £60,000 on an extension of plant. The directors pointed out that this was evidence of confidence in this Government. This gentleman was also the director of another company which, he stated, during the Moore period employed only 60 men and at that time was employing 300 men and was busier than it had been for years. And the best test of all is employment!

Every one in this House knows that in the second quarter of 1932, which was during the period of the Moore Government, unemployment reached its highest point in the history of Queensland. The Commonwealth figures showed that 19.9 per cent. of trade unionists were unemployed, but that tragic figure has been reduced to 8.5 at the present time, which is one of the lowest points in the history of the State.

Mr. MAHER: And still the unemployment relief tax is retained.

The PREMIER: The Government's efforts to relieve unemployment are well known, but the Leader of the Opposition does not like these facts to be so clearly stated. I should like to remind him, and any other hon. member opposite who interjects, that no interjections from them will cause me to deviate one iota from the

speech that I have decided to make. They would like me to follow side-tracks of discussion, but having raised the question of confidence in the Government, the Leader of the Opposition and his following must take their gruel when it is served.

I said earlier in my speech that I would deal later with factory statistics. The true position is that since 1932, when the Government came into power, the output of factories in Queensland has risen by almost £10,000,000. When we came into office in 1932 the factory output, in round figures, was £36,000,000, whereas to-day it is £46,000,000. The number of factories has increased during that period from 2,013 to 2,470 and the number of employees from 38,325 to 44,773. This is the best possible proof of the benefit of the Government's policy and notwithstanding any comparisons that the Leader of the Opposition may make with past years it stands as a record achievement by the Government.

Any comparisons of labour must take into consideration the advent of the machine. It is useless to argue that we ought to have 50,000 more factory workers to-day than we had fifteen years ago. The introduction of one labour-saving machine often dispenses with 1,000 workers. The problem of mechanisation of industry is a factor that cannot be ignored in considering factory employment. That applies also to agriculture. Consider the machinery used in agriculture to-day with that used some years ago! Take the machinery used in secondary industries compared with that of a few years ago! In my own district some thirty years ago there were thirty-three sugar mills and to-day there are eight, but those eight sugar mills have a very much greater output than the thirty-three mills together. That is an indication of the trend in the mechanisation of industry and I repeat that in dealing with factory figures and employment in factories the mechanisation of industry cannot be ignored.

If we look for a witness to support the Government's case we could not put into the box a better person than the Right Hon. W. M. Hughes, one time Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and a member of the party to which hon. members opposite belong—that is, if they have any cohesive party. Mr. Hughes has a particularly good knowledge of Queensland and its conditions and on a recent visit to Queensland—not his last visit—he paid a tribute to our progress. He is reported in the "Courier-Mail" of 24th July, 1935, as saying—

"The only conclusion I can reach is that Queensland is the most prosperous of all the States. What struck me since my last visit, is the increase in traffic beyond all expectations, the dozens of new buildings and evidence of vigorous commercial and national life."

In his typical fashion, Mr. Hughes topped this off with a characteristic remark—"Remarkable growth. Remarkable!"

The next point in my case deals with Treasury figures. In 1932 the deficit of the Moore Government was more than £2,000,000. After three years of Labour Government the position had improved by nearly £2,000,000, for the revenue receipts had so improved that the budget was almost balanced. Since then we have experienced a severe drought and at the

end of the last financial year there was a deficit of £741,815, which was most satisfactory in view of the severe drought. The Queensland Government's financial policy has been favourably commented upon at Premiers' and loan conferences, and the Government have, from time to time, been commended upon their handling of the Treasury.

Added to all this, Mr. Speaker, Queensland is still in enjoyment of the highest basic wage of all the States. We are also able to give our workers the shortest working week in the Commonwealth, yet, in spite of these two important factors compete with other States. In spite of the gloomy statement of the Leader of the Opposition the young sterling has a higher purchasing power in Queensland than elsewhere. That is a benefit that is felt and enjoyed by everyone. No doubt the Opposition are not proud of these facts—the highest wages system, the best working conditions, the least amount of unemployment, and the lowest cost of living. Why, the idea of hon. members opposite, reading between the lines of their statements, is in favour of a twenty-five shillings a week standard such as in the case mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition! The Leader of the Opposition argued that men should accept 25s. a week and then went on to say—he spoiled his case by doing so—that the orchardist concerned was willing to pay 1s. a bushel for pulling citrus fruits in addition to that amount. I asked him how many bushels could a man pick in an hour, and he judiciously refrained from answering the question. Anyone who knows anything about the citrus industry knows how ridiculous his statement is. The facts are, he was merely attempting to build up a case on the basis I described, of repeating mere hearsay, something which somebody told somebody else over the fence, or something which some Tory writer told him in some Tory newspaper.

The business and prosperity index rating as at May, 1936, was 97.2 per cent., and the trend was upward. If evidence were necessary of the futility of this motion and the reason why the Leader of the Country Party, the hon. member for West Moreton, and the Leader of the United Australia Party, the hon. member for Hamilton, are still in opposition, it is forthcoming from the Leader of the United Australia Party in this Parliament. In a speech the hon. member for Hamilton made at the Queensland Women's Electoral League he is reported in the "Courier-Mail" of 14th July, 1936, as having said—

"The present apparent hopeless position of the forces opposed to Labour should not be allowed to be a deterrent; the pendulum must swing their way sooner or later."

There is a wealth of truth in those words, for in the admission of the Leader of the United Australia Party, the Country Party and the United Australia Party are in a hopeless position and can only sit down with their arms folded waiting for what he describes as a swing of the pendulum. On the record of their performances they will have to wait a very long time indeed.

The Leader of the Opposition is always in an unfortunate position when he handles figures. I interjected when he dealt with certain figures that if necessary I would give him the assistance of a clerk to help

Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]

him to work them out. I want to call attention to the statement made by him in reference to loans and subsidies granted to local authorities. Following the well-established practice of every class of agitator—Tory, Communist, and otherwise—he endeavours to pit one section of the community against the other. He attacked the financial policy of this Government on the ground that more loans and subsidies were being granted to Brisbane than to any other part of the State. He thereby showed the Tory agitator's desire to discriminate as between the city and country with the object of trying to divide them from the point of view of their interests. He made the statement that in 1934-35 the Brisbane City Council were granted loans amounting to £97,159 and subsidies amounting to £361,661, while shire councils received only £212,000 in loans and £176,000 in subsidies. The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Government had shown discrimination in granting these loans and subsidies, but the facts show that the only discrimination that has been used is by the Leader of the Opposition in his selection of the figures. The position is that the figures quoted by the hon. member for West Moreton do not show the actual amount of loans and subsidies approved by the Treasury in a particular year. The real test is not what a local authority has spent in one year, but how much money has been approved by the Treasury—the rate of progress is determined very largely by conditions over which the Treasurer has no control. Furthermore, the hon. member for West Moreton refrained from mentioning that his figures did not include loans and subsidies to cities and towns outside Brisbane. Why did the Leader of the Opposition compare shire councils outside Brisbane with Brisbane? Why did he not have the ordinary decency to take into account the loans and subsidies granted to local authorities generally? The amount of cash advanced to all local authorities outside of Brisbane in 1934-35 was—

Loans	£552,365
Subsidies	331,644

Those figures place an entirely different complexion on the position from that which the Leader of the Opposition sought to convey. A close analysis of the Treasury returns will show the Treasury of this State has due regard to all sections of the community and the needs of every centre in Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: For the financial year just concluded Brisbane got no loan money at all. It did get a subsidy of £330,000. The subsidy to the country was £498,000, and loans £686,000. Those figures again show a remarkable disparity between the figures used by the Leader of the Opposition and me, the reason being that I gave all the figures and the Leader of the Opposition only gave the part that suited him. Imagine assuming that shire council loans outside Brisbane were comparable with expenditure of the Brisbane City Council!

Mr. MAHER: They represent the country interests.

The PREMIER: I am dealing with the country interests. Is it not obvious that loans and grants to municipalities should be taken into account. It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition suppressed those

figures. I have now given them and they indicate very clearly that every section of the State has received a fair allocation of the funds that are available.

I claim that during the time at my disposal I have completely answered the case against this Government. I have shown a record of achievement, of reconstruction and development of which any Government have a right to be proud.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: When I say that I am not speaking with any degree of complacency. I know a great deal requires to be done in Queensland. A great deal requires to be done in the Commonwealth. It is the duty of every citizen of this country to aid its development along sound lines so that we shall build up resources whereby people will have that standard of comfort, that standard of living which free people have a right to expect and demand in any community. It is along the lines of Labour policy that these things will be achieved. I feel satisfied that the case for the Government is irrefutable. If any persuasion were necessary, anyone who heard the Leader of the Opposition would decide to give the verdict against him. I am sure the vast majority of members of this House will vote against the amendment. They will support the Government, as will also the people of this State.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. DEACON (*Cunningham*) [2.40 p.m.]: I listened to the remarks of the Premier with much interest, although the story he told to-day was very similar to the story he has told us on other occasions.

The PREMIER: You cannot tell a good thing too often.

Mr. DEACON: It gets a bit stale at times. The story that the Smith Government made the world, told year after year, and containing very much the same figures, gets a bit stale. The Premier compared the conditions obtaining in this country under the Moore regime with the conditions obtaining now. In order to be quite fair the hon. gentleman should have stated the conditions that existed all over the world during that period.

He knows there is an improvement all over the world under all Governments. In the course of his speech he quoted a letter from a Maryborough firm bestowing praise on the Government. The hon. gentleman has made use of that on two or three occasions but he should remember that a few months before the receipt of his letter a similar epistle had been received by the Moore Government bestowing praise also on them. The two letters, coming from the same firm and in practically the same terms but to different Governments, would indicate that they were in the nature of a "smodge." To make use of such a letter to bolster up his case indicates that he is hard put to it for arguments.

However, the hon. gentleman has made one thing perfectly clear and that is that to-day, according to him, there is practically no unemployment in the State. In other words, the Government of which he is the leader has solved that problem. According to the hon. gentleman his Government have extinguished unemployment. He states that Queensland has the lowest ratio of unemployment in Australia. Nevertheless, his Government are collecting the highest unemployment relief tax in the world, so

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

far as my knowledge goes. At least his Government are collecting the highest unemployment relief tax in the Commonwealth although, according to the hon. gentleman, the unemployment is non-existent. He says that the disease has been cured. If this is so why should the people be taxed for the relief of something that does not exist—on his own showing? Is it not time that the Government were honest in this matter?

Mr. WATERS: Who said that unemployment did not exist?

Mr. DEACON: The Premier said so.

Mr. WATERS: No, he did not.

Mr. DEACON: The Premier stated that the problem was solved. He stated that Queensland had the lowest amount of unemployment.

Mr. FOLEY: You are distorting his statement.

Mr. DEACON: I presume the hon. gentleman knew what he was talking about.

Mr. FOLEY: He did not say it.

Mr. DEACON: He did say it. He stated that Queensland had the lowest ratio of unemployment in the Commonwealth.

Mr. FOLEY: He did not say that Queensland had solved unemployment.

Mr. DEACON: He did.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEACON: Although Queensland is said to have the lowest ratio of unemployment in Australia we know as a fact that the Government are collecting the highest rate of tax for unemployment relief in the Commonwealth. The two things do not dovetail. If it is necessary to collect that amount of unemployment relief tax there must be the unemployment to be relieved. If there is no unemployment then the Government are not justified in the collection of that tax. The unemployment relief tax was imposed only for a special set of circumstances that existed during the depression period when there was a large number of unemployed. However, the Government led by the Premier increased the amount of unemployment relief tax to three times the amount originally imposed. I am not at all satisfied with the argument put forward by the hon. gentleman. He to-day proved that the unemployment relief tax is no longer necessary and that everybody has obtained employment. He showed conclusively that there is no necessity for even the original amount of tax to be collected. In fact, he made out a good case for its complete abolition. According to him things are back to normal and every industry is prosperous, factories are fully employed, and there is greater wealth production. If such is the case there must be work for all. At least he made out a clear case for the taxpayers' claim for a considerable reduction in the incidence of this taxation.

In support of his argument the hon. gentleman quoted extensively from an industrial supplement to the Brisbane "Courier." I would remind him that on the same day the Taxpayers' Association issued a statement making a comparison between other States and Queensland that was unfavourable to the latter.

In production of all those States there is a greater proportional increase. The Premier did not quote that. The article showed that in Queensland people were taxed more than the people in other States—at a

higher rate in proportion to their income. The income tax here is the highest in Australia. The Premier did not say a word about that, although he quoted the same paper in support of his argument.

The Premier has been to England and apparently has learned nothing, for after all his travels he comes back with the same ideas as to how this State should be run, and with the same speech, not altering a line of it. We have had nothing from him to-day to show how the situation could be improved.

The matter of the relief tax and the way in which it is managed alone would justify a vote of no confidence in this Government. I do not say there is not unemployment. I do not say that there are not men who need relief, because every man who tells the truth admits that there are men who need work and cannot get it. There is a necessity for public works to keep them going. If the Premier were fair he would admit that. The loan and subsidy work has this feature—to get it a man has to be on rations. Some men will not draw rations at all if they can possibly help it, but they are told they must do so to get this work, no matter whether they like it or not. Men have told me that they have never drawn rations in their lives, and would not do it because their credit is good and they could live without drawing Government rations. Then again, if those men take a job in the off-time—casual work of some sort—they cannot get on the loan and subsidy work, and the consequence is that in the country men refuse work on the farms, because if they take such work, even for a few days, they are barred from receiving loan work.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. HILTON: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. DEACON: It is correct. The hon. member does not mix with working men as I do. He does not know as much about it as I do, because he does not talk to them. At the same time I know that men dodge casual work because they want to get on municipal and shire jobs where, for a certain time, they are on a good rate of pay and where on the average they may earn more money than if they trusted to casual work.

Mr. HILTON: Your leader said this morning that they did not want it.

Mr. DEACON: There are reasons for everything. There are men who say they do not want work, and very often they are on relief work and know that if they take anything else they will forfeit their chances of getting relief work. It surely ought not to be necessary to compel a man to draw rations when he does not want them, in order that he may have a chance of getting this work, yet that occurs in every district in Queensland. The Income (Unemployment Relief) Tax Act does not provide for the statutory exemptions or deductions that are set out in the income tax law, which means that the farmer has to pay relief tax on almost the whole of his gross income. This is a grave injustice to the farming community, especially when it is remembered that it is nearly impossible to conduct a farm without the use of the family labour. It is very difficult to obtain outside labour for farm work, and it is extremely difficult to get juveniles. It is not fair that equitable exemptions and deductions are not allowed for relief tax purposes when it is nearly

Mr. Deacon.]

impossible to conduct a farm without the aid of the family labour. There can be no excuse for continuing the present tax, especially when there is not the same necessity for revenue from this source. The whole incidence of relief tax needs revising, if only to provide for a reasonable statutory exemption. There is certainly every reason why the tax should be reduced and levied on the net income.

Mr. KING: If your argument is good to-day then it was good during the period of your own Government.

Mr. DEACON: No. I did not hear any hon. member opposite argue in that way when we were in power. They certainly did not oppose the tax.

Mr. KING: What were your arguments on the proposal?

Mr. DEACON: We had to support the Bill, which had been approved by the party, but there is no reason why the relief tax law should be continued without provision for a fair exemption, especially when we are told that the necessity for collecting the tax has disappeared. According to the Premier, we could very easily do without the income from relief tax sources altogether, but I do not agree that we can yet do without the tax altogether. I feel that relief tax must still be collected, but its burden should be more equitably distributed over the community. The Premier has not intimated that he is prepared to remedy this injustice. According to him the country is prosperous on account of the beneficence of his Government and that therefore everything must be right. Still, it is the duty of the Government to remedy whatever abuses are apparent from time to time, but apparently they are not prepared to remedy anything that will interfere with their votes. In these circumstances it is impossible to have any confidence in them or to believe that they have good intentions for the future.

We have no confidence in the Government also because they have no intention of assisting primary industries generally. The Secretary for Agriculture, in common with other Ministers of the Crown, is always placing burdens on the primary producers. I admit that the hon. gentleman is animated by good intentions, but he never seems to realise the difficulties that he is creating for the man on the land. To-day he tabled a number of regulations that amount to small, annoying, and irritating burdens upon the producer. The farmer has every reason to complain about these little irritating burdens that do very little good. I also blame the Government—the Minister tried to excuse them—for their delay in administering the Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Act.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: You must blame your own Federal Government for that.

Mr. DEACON: All the other States passed Acts in accordance with the Federal Act and they are being sympathetically administered. Considering the fact that the Federal Government passed their Act first it is not a bit of use for the Minister to interject. The Minister is now seeking to excuse himself, but he is to blame for the position that has arisen for not passing a Bill in accordance with the Federal Act. In any case, his Government were to blame, as they could have advanced the money. They had the

money. They had plenty of loan money and they could have come to an agreement with the Commonwealth Government and, pending amending legislation, advanced the money they had to the people who were in distress.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: That is absurd.

Mr. DEACON: It is not an absurd suggestion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: Of course it is.

Mr. DEACON: It is not, considering that the hon. gentleman's Government was to blame for not passing legislation to conform with that passed by the Federal Government.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: The Commonwealth Government approved of our Bill and later on informed us, with apologies, they were sorry but it was not quite what they wanted.

Mr. DEACON: How is that possible?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: It is incredible, but nevertheless possible.

Mr. DEACON: How is it possible? Other States had to deal with the same problem. They passed legislation in conformity with the Federal legislation, obtained the money from the Commonwealth Government, and distributed it. We are a year behind in Queensland. Many of the farmers who applied for relief are not able to benefit from it now because they have failed altogether. Some of their creditors could not wait any longer. If help were given then, or even if the Government gave an assurance to each applicant as to the amount of assistance that would probably be allotted in his case, the plight of many farmers would have been avoided. No assurance has been given in any case that I know of.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: It is only within the last fortnight that the Commonwealth Government gave us any suggestion at all on the matter, in spite of repeated communications.

Mr. DEACON: If the Secretary for Agriculture is right now, then his contributions to the Press at different times were quite wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: Oh, no.

Mr. DEACON: At different times in the last twelve months paragraphs have appeared in the Press referring to the difficulties between his Government and the Commonwealth Government. The Minister must have been aware of the present position then, otherwise those paragraphs would never have found their way to the Press.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: There is only one way to correct a legal anomaly and that is by putting amending legislation through this House.

Mr. DEACON: The legislation passed by the hon. gentleman's Government did not conform with the Federal Act, nevertheless his Government could have stepped in and assisted necessitous farmers out of loan money in anticipation of the money being received from the Federal Government. There was no risk, as the money would eventually be received from the Federal Government. If the Government deemed it advisable to help the farmers they could have found the money, but they would take no risk. Had they adopted this

[Mr. Deacon.]

course a number of farmers would have been saved from being turned off the land. There was no harm in their adopting the procedure I suggest, but the Government chose to sit down and say, "An amending Bill must be put through next year; we must first amend the Act." Why, the Government had nearly enough power in the regulations to bring the Act into conformity with the Federal Act.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: Don't be silly.

Mr. DEACON: A blunder has been made.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: By the Federal Government.

Mr. DEACON: The State Government have not helped in any way to adjust it. They apparently did nothing to help the Federal Government in the administration of their Act, and thus assist farmers who were in trouble. Had the farmers been unionists they would have jumped at the opportunity to help them, but because the men involved were farmers on the land, they merely say it is not possible to help them until amending legislation is brought down. The Government have blundered badly in this matter. I do not blame them so much for the faulty nature of their legislation as I do for not doing something when they found that the legislation was wrong. They could have advanced the money to the farmers in distress, or they could have informed the applicants for relief whether their applications would be accepted or rejected. Some of the creditors waited. Others could not, and had to go into possession.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: In those cases it is very doubtful whether they could have got assistance under the rural credit scheme.

Mr. DEACON: As I interpret the Act any man worthy of assistance could have got it.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: That is not the Act.

Mr. DEACON: Provided the creditors were willing to forgo a certain amount.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: The Act says: provided the man has a reasonable chance of resuscitating his farm.

Mr. DEACON: That meant that every man had a chance of obtaining assistance, because nobody contracts a debt greater than the value of his asset. No creditor will advance an amount over and above the value of the farm.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION interjected.

Mr. DEACON: The hon. the Minister ought to know that trades people sometimes want their money and cannot wait. They may require what is owing to them in order that they may meet their obligations or satisfy the bank that they will be able to pay a certain amount in a specified time. Nothing has been done to afford help to these people.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK: We have been writing to the Commonwealth until we are sick of it.

Mr. DEACON: The Minister should have ceased writing to the Commonwealth and tried writing to people who would reply. He could have made a reasonable agreement with the Commonwealth that the money would come forward. Owing to their

omission in this regard the Government do not deserve the confidence of the country. I sincerely trust that the Act will be amended in such a way as to obviate any confusion.

I hope the Minister will hasten to grant assistance to those who are eligible to receive it, because it is urgently necessary in many cases.

Were it not for the fact that the Secretary for Public Instruction interrupted a while ago I might have forgotten one of his shortcomings. I might have forgotten that the Minister visited an area in the Warwick district with the hon. member for Warwick where the number of children did not reach the number considered necessary by the department before a school can be opened. Nevertheless, the Minister had a school opened at this centre and made a great boast of it. During this year several schools have been closed down in outlying districts in my electorate, and every country member can say the same regarding his electorate. Each school that was closed in my electorate had more children attending it than attend the school that was opened by the Minister in the Warwick electorate. That school is still open, yet at the same time other schools are being closed and the children brought under the correspondence system. The children of farmers in the outlying districts are entitled to at least equal educational facilities as are enjoyed by the children in more populous districts. Whilst I admit that the correspondence system is a good one where it can be availed of, it is not suitable for those children whose parents have very little time to help them in their studies. In those cases the schools should not be closed when the attendance falls below a certain number. I do not desire to mention the name of the school opened by the Minister. The hon. gentleman can obtain from his department the names of schools in country districts that have been closed. In order to assist those people in the outlying places the number of children required before a school can be opened should be lowered. The number of children necessary to keep a school open should be much smaller than the minimum at present required by the Department of Public Instruction. Money is being saved at the expense of the children and their education.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It would mean a higher rate of taxation.

Mr. DEACON: Perhaps it would mean that the playgrounds at some of the city institutions would not be so brilliant. It might mean that some of the city schools would not have the amount expended on them as at present, but it must be remembered that children in the city areas have other facilities for education. This is not the case in the outlying districts of the State, and greater consideration should be given to their needs. That much more than anything else shows that the Government are not worthy of the confidence of the people.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [3.15 p.m.]: It gave me great pleasure to hear the announcement this morning made by the Premier that His Excellency the Governor, Sir Leslie Wilson, had accepted a further term of five years in that capacity. Pleasing as I believe it was to the members of this House, I am sure it was just as pleasing to the people of the whole of the State. At least I can

Mr. Brand.]

speak for the vast area that constitutes the electorate I represent in this Parliament. From his exalted position, Sir Leslie Wilson, during extensive travels throughout Queensland, has given the benefit of his experience and said encouraging words to the primary producers and others of the country districts. He has offered them advice worthy of acceptance and this has acted as a spur to them to continue the great task that they have in hand—to increase the wealth production of Queensland for the benefit of Queensland.

My congratulations are offered to the hon. member for West Moreton upon the excellent speech he made this morning in his new role of Leader of the Opposition. He drew attention to the grave disabilities that exist in this State and moved an amendment to the Address to the effect that the Government do not possess the confidence of this House. In his reply to the amendment the Premier made use of the return of members of the Labour Party in the by-elections in the Toowoomba, Brisbane, and Bowen electorates. In my opinion that is not a full justification of the contention that the Government possess the confidence of this House. If figures can speak at all they say that the Labour Party has lost a considerable amount of support in the respective areas. Throughout Queensland people are realising that the Government are not all that they claimed to be at the last election, and that the State is in need of an Administration that is more progressive and at least will indicate to the people that Queensland is going further along the road to progress. What would be the position in this State if we were again faced with the depression of 1929-1932? Recently the Cabinet of the Commonwealth Government held a meeting in Brisbane, and during their sojourn in this city its members made many public statements. The Prime Minister made it clear that "Every day in every way Australia was getting better and better," but in no instance did he indicate that he had fulfilled his mission. He realises that there is much yet to be done for this great Commonwealth of Australia. The Prime Minister has stated that there is general prosperity throughout the whole of Australia, but for this some credit must be given to legislation that has been passed in the Commonwealth Parliament. There has been a general improvement in Queensland in common with the other States.

Listening to the Governor's Speech yesterday, I think we were all seized of the fact that if one excluded from it the tributes of praise of the Government, and what had been done over the past twelve months, one would find it a colourless and uninspiring document. There is no indication in its pages that we can expect relief from the terrific taxation that falls upon the people of this State. There is no indication that we are likely to participate in any considerable activity in that development of new industries that is so desirable in the interests of the people of this State. On the other hand, on looking round one finds dissatisfied sections in every part of the State—citizens of Queensland who are demanding something better than their present conditions. I stand with all those people who believe that we should march on to greater progress, and that, the depression having lifted, we should lay down a programme in this House that

[*Mr. Brand.*

will mean a greater prosperity for every person within the State.

I listened with great interest to the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply yesterday, and congratulate those two young men on their discourses. Each of them gave his unbounded blessing to the Government and claimed that the Government of the day had brought about a paradise in Queensland. I was surprised to hear that they regard the wages paid in this State with pride. Personally, I am of opinion that the present basic wage is lower than it was in 1932.

Mr. WALSH: Give us the proof.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member for Mirani asks for the proof. In 1932 the basic wage was £3 14s. a week, and the cost of living index in that year was 704. In May last the cost of living index was 758—an increase of 7.7 per cent. In other words, the basic wage to-day, compared with that of June 1932, is £3 8s. 4d. I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether any member of this House looks upon that as an effective wage with any measure of pride. I at least do not.

Mr. MANN interjected.

Mr. BRAND: If the hon. member for Brisbane can get a great deal of satisfaction from such a statement, he is entitled to it. At least I will say that I cannot understand how people earning that small wage are able to exist and to bring up families in our country.

Mr. POWER: Your relief scheme provided for 17s. for a man and his wife.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member is always referring to what happened in the depression years. I should like to ask him if he wishes me to refer to the unenviable record of the Labour Administration in the Federal sphere during that period. I should like to ask him if he has followed the history during that same period of all the States of Australia whose rulers came from the Labour Party. We know that at that time Australia was governed by four Labour Governments and three anti-Labour Governments, and it is the Labour Governments of Australia that must stand responsible for the heavy reductions that took place in all wages throughout this Commonwealth.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: The then Premier of Queensland, Mr. Moore, had no alternative but to accept the advice of the then Prime Minister, Mr. Scullin, and introduce a Bill to reduce the salaries of public servants and other controllable expenditure. But he it said to the credit of the then Premier, the wages of the workers in this State were reduced to a lesser extent than those in any other State in Australia, even those controlled by Labour Governments. Even though the present Premier, in Opposition at that time, relentlessly criticised the action of the Moore Government in reducing the wages of the workers, to-day he is claiming that they were better treated than the workers in any other part of Australia. Only recently, when replying to a deputation from the public service unions—

The PREMIER: That is tedious repetition. That has been said already.

Mr. BRAND: I have not heard it yet. After Mr. Bolger had spoken, the Premier replied that the wages of the workers in this

State had not been reduced to the same extent as those in other parts of Australia. In other words he intimated that the Moore Government had not reduced the wages of the workers in this State to the same extent that they had been reduced by Labour Governments in other States. I can quite understand the uneasiness of the Premier at my recalling to his mind his remarks to the members of the deputation from the public service unions when Mr. Bolger reminded him that in the anti-Labour governed States the cuts were being restored. In the Federal public service full restoration has been made to all officers in receipt of a salary not exceeding £474 per annum, and in Victoria the Country Party Government have remitted all salary cuts. We claim that in this State we have not yet reached the 1929 wage level nor is there any indication in the Governor's Speech that that is the objective of the Government. Throughout the length and breadth of Queensland there is a clamour by all sections of the people that we should get back to the pre-depression level. We can recall that in his policy speech delivered at Mackay the Premier clearly intimated to the people that it was the intention of his Government to return to that level and we look forward to the fulfilment of his promise. Of course we recognise that it is impossible for the Government to give full effect to their programme during their first term of office of three years. The present Government are in their fifth year, but the wages to-day are still lower than when they assumed office in 1932, and the economic condition of the working man has improved only to the extent of the general improvement that has taken place throughout Australia.

Mr. WALSH: God help the people if your party is returned to power for another three years.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member for Mirani fears that my party may be returned to power, and I can quite appreciate his uneasiness. There is no intimation in the Governor's Speech that the so-called prosperous times that prevail to-day are to continue for a reasonable time.

Speaking during the election campaign in 1935 at Mackay, the Premier said that the aim of Labour was to give each and every individual the utmost opportunity to achieve a full and complete life. He went on to say that it was the policy of his party to assure the right to live, the right to work, and the right to enjoy life. The Leader of the Opposition has already dealt with the peculiar position of the workers formerly engaged at Breakfast Creek. I do not desire to go over the same ground that has been covered so effectively by him, but I want to ask the Premier: Does he consider that the Breakfast Creek workers have the right to enjoy life? From one end of Queensland to the other to-day there is evidence that workers are meeting for the express purpose of helping the Breakfast Creek workers in their demand for justice. The Secretary for Labour and Industry does not seem to be able to adjust this difficulty. Here is a small section of workers dissatisfied with their position. They claim that they are entitled to certain advantages. The Government are not helping them and the Minister is incapable of straightening out the position. No Government has a right to allow such a condition of affairs to exist, a condition that affects all the people of

this State. Recently, a body of workers in North Queensland met and voted a sum of money to assist the Breakfast Creek workers in their distress, and in forwarding that money claimed that it had been voted at a properly constituted meeting of the Australian Workers' Union. Here is a properly constituted meeting of members of the union in question meeting and discussing the plight of the workers concerned and criticising the action of the Government in the matter.

I claim that the policy of the Government is not being carried out, that the effective wage of the worker is much less than what has been stipulated to be the basic wage, and that the intermittency of work is such that it is questionable whether the average nomadic worker is averaging £2 a week. That being the case it cannot be said that the Government are successfully conducting the affairs of State. We all know that this is a State of great potentialities. Possibly no State in the Commonwealth has greater potentialities.

Mr. KING: Now, do not defame the State.

Mr. BRAND: I am not defaming the State. I will not defame the State of which I am a native. I am only concerned with its progress and welfare, no matter what Government may be in power.

We are deeply concerned with the future and what may happen should another depression arrive. It is quite possible that a disturbance in the economic position may occur at any time because this State has no control of the monetary machine. That is controlled by the Federal Government.

We are anxious to see that industry should be successful and prosperous. On the 5th July last, I observed in the city Press, the following statement purporting to be an interview in London with Mr. L. Withall, Secretary of Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia:—

"He predicted big industrial developments in Australia within twelve months, involving the investment of millions of pounds of English capital. Factories are shortly to be opened in the Commonwealth for the manufacture of several basic commodities not yet made in Australia. These include many iron and steel products, cotton textiles, pharmaceutical and chemical goods, and supplementary lines. Half a million capital will be invested in cotton alone."

It is very pleasing to know that there is a likelihood of new capital entering Australia for the development of our secondary industries, especially industries which are not established to-day. Queensland supplies much of the raw material for the secondary industries of the Commonwealth, and as she possesses that raw material in abundance we are anxious to know what the Government are doing to divert the flow of some of that capital to this State. It is believed by many persons that the high rate of taxation in this State and the heavy deficits it has had, as compared with other States in the Commonwealth, have a deterrent effect to the entry of new capital into this State. The people of Queensland will suffer greatly if this State does not obtain its fair share of that new capital. It is all very well to say that the capital of countries operating in Queensland already has been increased and that the price of

Mr. Brand.]

their stocks is very high. We know that the value of those stocks is not affected by conditions in Queensland alone. There are many factors to be considered.

The position of other States is such that Queensland is likely to lose, and consequently I hope the Government will realise the necessity for developing new industries here. Only recently an application was made by one of the biggest organisations in the State, Mount Isa Mines Limited, for rights to enable it to undertake further development, yet, I understand, that application was not agreed to by the Cabinet. The result may be the loss of investment of capital in the State that would have had the effect of creating further employment in new industries. The Government are in the position of a board of directors and they should do their utmost to encourage the establishment of industries that would create permanent employment for our citizens. The object of the Country Party is to assist to develop industry with that objective.

As a primary producers' party we appreciate the fact that unless the great body of people have a high purchasing power they will not be able to pay to the primary producer the price that he desires for his commodity. The viewpoint of the primary producers should be considered, because they are a very important section of the community. Although they create most of the wealth they receive but a small portion of it in return for their labour. The Governor's Speech gives no indication that the primary producers of this State will receive improved prices for their commodities.

I listened with interest to the remarks relating to the visit of the Premier to England in defence of the sugar industry. They would lead one to believe that the only man who went to England to help the sugar industry was the Premier of this State.

At 3.38 p.m.,

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

Mr. BRAND: That is not so. The interests of the sugar industry have been defended by many people who have rendered a great service to the industry.

It was gratifying to learn that the Sugar Agreement has been renewed for a further period of five years, and that renewal has been approved by the Federal Parliament by an Act. It is as well to recall the fact that it was the present Federal Government that first gave security to that agreement by legislative enactment some years ago, and thus did a great service to the industry.

Mr. O'KEEFE: You are not finding fault with the agreement?

Mr. BRAND: The only fault I can find with the agreement is that it is not as favourable as the one arrived at by the Moore Government. I recognise that the sugar industry is a very important one in this State and plays a great part in the economic life of our people.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY interjected.

Mr. BRAND: Its value to our economic life cannot be overestimated, as the Secretary for Labour and Industry knows. It is an industry of great importance in agricultural activities within our tropical region. It is the only industry that has satisfactorily

[*Mr. Brand.*

settled population along our north-eastern seaboard. In that respect I have found that the sugar industry has received the full support of every political party in this House. Generally speaking, Governments in Queensland take considerable notice of the organisations within the industry in all matters that require legislative enactment. I believe also that in dealing with all matters requiring administrative attention, Ministers give to the sugar organisations an opportunity to express their views.

Yesterday I listened with interest to the hon. member for Bowen. He made reference to the sugar industry, particularly to the speech made by the Premier at Mackay wherein the hon. gentleman suggested that the industry should get down to a datum point and make adjustments to that point. There is a good deal to be said for the remarks made by the Premier, but he left the position very vague. For a considerable number of years the organisations within the industry have been endeavouring to get down to a datum point. At Mackay the Premier made reference to his visit overseas and said:—

"The Moore Government gave effect to the peak year scheme. Since then it has been found for one reason or another the peak year scheme has not been given effect to the extent that it was anticipated, for the reason that most canegrowers look at it from their own individual point of view. There is too much individualism in the industry and not enough appreciation of the need for collective security."

I know of no body of people in this State who have a higher regard for collective security than those engaged in sugar-growing. Almost every year the canegrowers meet in conference and at such conferences attention is given to the peak year scheme and its effect upon the individual and the industry as a whole. As a matter of fact, the scheme was established in 1929-30 by the Moore Government on the recommendation of the sugar growers' organisations of this State, organisations that the then Premier was pleased to call the Parliament of the sugar-growers. The conferences to which I refer have always upheld the principles of the present peak year scheme. Possibly there have been one or two instances in which it has not worked as well as was expected, but on almost every occasion there has been a unanimous decision of the canegrowers in conference, both of the Queensland Canegrowers' Council and the Australian Sugar Producers' Association, to confirm the principles of the scheme. Consequent on the disabilities that exist and the prominence given to them I cannot see how any Government can overlook the mature decisions of the canegrowers and the industry as a whole.

It has to be remembered that the sugar-growing industry developed rapidly. When the peak year scheme was established in 1929-30 it gave to the mills the right to set their peak. Each mill was to say what was its peak year—either the highest crushing point up to and including the year 1929 or twenty weeks of its estimated crushing capacity. Thus arrived at, the peaks established a total tonnage of 611,000 tons. We in Queensland produce most of the sugar of Australia. In New South Wales there are only three mills, and in Victoria only some beet sugar is grown. In Queensland

alone our total production in 1934 was 611,727 tons, of which we exported 324,828 tons, and of the amount exported 69,659 tons was excess sugar over the peak. In 1935, of a total production of 612,299 tons, the amount exported was 339,675 tons, the excess being 45,251 tons. It is this excess sugar that is worrying the industry, and I felt that the Premier was speaking on that matter in Mackay.

The PREMIER: Quite so.

Mr. BRAND: I am pleased to have that assurance. It is on this point that the organisations have expressed a desire to get back to their peaks by the year 1937, and the reasons are quite obvious. For the sugar grown in Australia we regard a fair price as £24 a ton for 94 net titre, taking into consideration the cost of production. The exportable surplus was sold in 1934 at £7 11s. 3d. a ton and in 1935 at £7 8s. 9d. a ton. It is quite obvious that it is impossible to produce sugar for that amount under the conditions that prevail in this white man's country, and consequently the organisations are anxious that we should get back to the production of the peak year. I hope that the speech of the Premier at Mackay means that he proposes to give some attention to that matter. He said that the sugar growers themselves should rectify the position, but we know that an Order in Council could bring about the very thing that he desires. From His Excellency's Speech one assumes there is no likelihood of any such action, but the Government should realise that the desires of the canegrowers are sound. The difficulty is accentuated by the fact that in Queensland this year we expect to produce 671,000 tons of bag sugar, and perhaps when it is brought down to 94 net titre and with a possible increase in the production we may have in this State alone 700,000 tons. We cannot over-estimate the significance of that.

The PREMIER: The estimate for this year is 720,000 tons.

Mr. BRAND: That is the latest estimate for Australia—33,000 tons is for New South Wales. At all events, in many of the districts where people are complaining of the effects of the peak year scheme they have themselves to blame. When the peak year system was established, it involved extreme care by the Central Cane Prices Board in fixing assignments, and ever since that date the board has asked the canegrowers and the millers what were their wishes in the matter. If one of those bodies objects to the assignment, the board does not give it consideration. In many cases I have found that the growers have not fulfilled their function. They seem to think that, say, Tom Jones or Bill Smith is a very good sort of chap and should be entitled to something and they do not object to his having a little more land assigned to him. Then he is producing above his quota and with the peak year scheme in mind forces his land up to the limit to get the greatest quantity in what is called No. 1 Pool. The position is very serious and deserves more consideration than it has had. Let us hope, that for the sake of this great industry, which means so much to the life of our people, it will have that attention that the sugar organisations desire.

At 3.53 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Question—"That the words proposed to be added (Mr. Maher's amendment) be so added"—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 15.

Mr. Bell	Mr. Nicklin
" Brand	" Nimmo
" Daniel	" Plunkett
" Deacon	" Russell
" Edwards	
" Maher	Tellers:
" Maxwell	" Clayton
" Morgan	" Walker
" Muller	

NOES, 39.

Mr. Brassington	Mr. Kane
" Bruce	" Keogh
" Bulcock	" King
" Clark	" Larcombe
" Cooper	" Mann
" Copley, P. K.	" McLean
" Copley, W. J.	" Mullan
" Dash	" O'Keefe
" Donnelly	" Pease
" Duggan	" Power
" Duustan	" Riordan
" Foley	" Smith
" Gair	" Stopford
" Gledson	" Walsh
" Hanson	" Williams, H.
" Hayes	" Williams, T. L.
" Healy	
" Hilton	Tellers:
" Hislop	" Collins
" Hynes	" Conroy
" Jesson	

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. DUGGAN (*Toowoomba*): 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 4.5 p.m.