

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 23 OCTOBER 1936**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

EMPLOYEES AT IPSWICH RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.

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

“What was the number of employees at the Railway Workshops at Ipswich on the last pay day in May, June, and July last, respectively?”

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. J. Da-h, *Mundingburra*) replied—

|              |        |         |
|--------------|--------|---------|
| “ May, 1936  | ... .. | 1,968   |
| “ June, 1936 | ... .. | 1,966   |
| “ July, 1936 | ... .. | 1,954 ” |

EXAMINATIONS UNDER DENTAL ACTS.

Mr. DANIEL (*Keppel*), for Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*), asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“1. How many persons sat at the recent examination held under the provisions of section 8 of the Dental Acts Amendment Act of 1935 ?

“2. How many (a) passed, (b) failed at such examination?

“3. Did an examinee named Wright secure a pass at such examination?

“4. Is he now entitled to practise as a dentist and to use the letters L.D.Q.?

“5. Did this examinee fail twice at the first year dental examinations at the University?

“6. Are there any students who passed at the same examinations, but despite this, are not yet through their course?”

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) replied—

“1. Thirty-nine applicants were certified by the Dental Board as being entitled to examination.

“2. (a) 31; (b) 8.

“3. Yes.

“4. He is entitled to practise as a dentist, being registered as such; the use of the letters L.D.Q. has become general amongst registered dentists over a period of years.

“5. Yes.

“6. Yes, these students have not completed their course. The examination of this man has been brought under my notice, and I have called on the board to explain how they came to certify this applicant as being suitable for examination.”

FEES PAID TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) asked the Attorney-General—

“When may the House expect to receive the return of payments made by the Government to barristers and solicitors in 1935-36 in accordance with the resolution passed on 27th August last?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*) replied—

“I lay on the table the information asked.”

GOLDEN INVESTMENT COMPANY'S "GOLDEN CASKET" AGENCY.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*), for Mr. GODFREY MORGAN (*Dalby*), asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“1. Will he lay upon the table of the House all agreements and all variations

FRIDAY, 23 OCTOBER, 1936.

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

QUESTIONS.

CARNIVALS, BAZAARS, AND FAIRS IN AID OF LABOUR PARTY'S FUNDS.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*) asked the Attorney-General—

“1. How many permits were issued in 1935-36 for carnivals, bazaars, or fairs in aid of the funds of the Australian Labour Party or branches thereof?

“2. What was the total profit certified in respect of all such permits?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Carpentaria*) replied—

“1 and 2. Under the provisions of the Art Union Regulation Act of 1930 passed by the Moore Government, ‘bingo’ and other permits have been issued to the Returned Sailors and Soldiers’ Imperial League of Australia, Incapacitated and Wounded Sailors and Soldiers’ Association of Queensland, T.B. Sailors and Soldiers’ Association, Brisbane Institute of Social Service, Public Hospitals Radio Installation Fund, Australian Labour Party Literature Fund, Creche and Kindergarten Association, Hospitals, Ambulances, Bands, Life Saving Clubs, Douglas Credit Association, Young Nationalist Party, religious bodies, and other bodies covered by the term charitable and educational in the said Act. The audited returns of all these carnivals are carefully checked by the department in accordance with the Act and Regulations, but it is considered undesirable that details of the profits in respect of any carnival held by any of these bodies should be furnished to the hon. member.”

thereof with the Golden Investment Company relating to the sale of tickets in the mammoth and ordinary caskets?

"2. How many shareholders are there in the Golden Investment Company, and what are their names?"

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, *Ithaca*) replied—

"1. No. This document is the property of the Golden Casket Organisation, but it may be seen by any hon. member of the House on application to the Under Secretary, Department of Health and Home Affairs.

"2. (a) Two; (b) Herbert Patrick Partridge and Dorcen Clare Gray."

#### FEEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

##### RETURN TO ORDER.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Return to an Order made by the House on 17th August last, on the motion of Mr. Walker, showing the payments made by the Government to barristers and solicitors in 1935-36.

##### PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Twentieth annual report of the State Government Insurance Office, being for the year 1935-1936.

Recommendations of the Timber Industry Advisory Committee on the proposed organisation for the stabilisation of the timber industry.

Report of the Commissioner of Police for the year 1935-1936.

#### FARMERS' ASSISTANCE (DEBTS ADJUSTMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION.

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

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend 'The Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Act of 1935' in certain particulars."

Question put and passed.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

##### APPROPRIATION BILL, No. 2.

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

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the receiving of resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means 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.

#### SUPPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

VOTE ON ACCOUNT—£4,200,000.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) [10.41 a.m.]: I move—

"That there be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-37, a further sum not exceeding £4,200,000 towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State."

Hon. members of the Committee will know that it is necessary from time to time, until the final Appropriation Bill is passed, to appropriate certain moneys for the carrying out of the services of this State. By the Appropriation Bill that was passed during the last session of Parliament the services of the State were carried on, so far as finances were concerned, up to about the middle of August. At that period Appropriation Bill No. 1 of this session was carried, and we are now asking for a further supply of £4,200,000, made up as follows:—

|                             | £         |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Consolidated revenue ...    | 2,000,000 |
| Trust and Special funds ... | 1,500,000 |
| Loan funds ... ..           | 700,000   |

With the Appropriation Act No. 3 of last session and the Appropriation Act No. 1 of this session the total provision for the whole of this year, up to the end of December at any rate, is as follows:—

|                             | £           |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Consolidated revenue ...    | 5,400,000   |
| Trust and special funds ... | 3,700,000   |
| Loan funds ... ..           | 2,000,000   |
| Total ... ..                | £11,100,000 |

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [10.42 a.m.]: I have given some thought to the elusive political characteristics of the hon. the Treasurer. For some time I have been endeavouring by question and by discussion in this Chamber to elicit from him some information in regard to the amount of money that is being transferred from the Unemployment Relief Fund to consolidated revenue. It seems very difficult to pin the hon. gentleman down to a statement as to his intentions in this respect. Of course, I recognise the right of the Treasurer to refuse to give information in answer to questions, but this is a matter of importance to the people of the State, who are called upon by Parliament to pay relief tax for the specific purpose of relieving unemployment. If there is a departure from the original intention of Parliament in this respect—that is, if the present Government policy differs from the policy of the Government that introduced the relief tax—it is only right that the people of the State should have the fullest information on the subject. I think it is perfectly legitimate for the hon. the Treasurer to furnish the information to this Chamber and to the people when asked.

The elusiveness of the hon. gentleman is well established by the replies that were given to the various questions that I submitted on the matter, and also by the fact that when he spoke in the House he walked right round the important point as to how much of the £600,000 provided for relief purposes was to be paid to consolidated

revenue. Subsequent to that two questions were asked as to the amount of money that had actually been transferred during the quarter ended 30th September, and Mr. Speaker disallowed those questions. It is obvious that the hon. the Treasurer is characteristically politically elusive—as is demonstrated again by his action in another matter to which I wish to refer. The hon. gentleman makes many promises, but has a string on them all, and it is rather interesting at this point to quote from a speech that he delivered at the St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Queensland Irish Association on the 14th March, 1935. A report of his remarks reads—

"He was not a prophet, and was not going to prophesy, but he would not be at all surprised if in twelve months St. Patrick's Day had again become a public holiday. . . . The great Irish people had entered into every walk of life in almost every country of the world, and their influence had been very great in the determination and solving of the big problems of civilisation. They were a people noted for their patriotism, sincerity, fervency, and eloquence, and one must truly admire their desire and determination ever to fittingly honor the day of their patron saint and give adequate expression to their national sentiments."

Prior to the Treasurer's making this statement the Secretary for Public Lands had in his absence stated that this Saint's Day would be restored. The Treasurer also wrote to the Irish Association, saying—

"The Government has decided, provided the improved financial and economical position of the State is maintained and continued, to introduce amending legislation in the new Parliament to restore the Saints' days as full public holidays throughout the State."

I am not concerned to-day with the merits or demerits of the argument about Saints' holidays, but the remarks and letter of the Treasurer illustrate the elusive political characteristics of that hon. gentleman. How nicely he worded his speech and his letter that give the inference to patriotic Irishmen that they were going to have St. Patrick's Day restored! But he also leaves a very big loophole so as to make good his escape from such an obligation.

During the last election campaign the hon. gentleman also promised the wage-earners of the State a restoration of their salaries and wages. In case my statement is doubted, I have here an extract from his speech delivered at the Princess Theatre, South Brisbane, on 25th May, 1932, and published in the "Daily Standard" of 28th May. It says—

"There was no doubt a rot had set in under the Moore Government, and the best way to stop it was by returning a Labour Government to power which would restore to the people the advantages which had been filched from them during the past three years."

In the midst of that election campaign he gave the impression to his audience that the wage-earners of the State would have a restoration of all that had been filched from them, but he cleverly concealed his loophole. The wage-earners who heard that statement are in the position to-day of not having had a restoration of the advantages

filched from them, and these men are thinking very hard. It will be increasingly difficult for the Treasurer to maintain the confidence of the people as a whole when it becomes clear to them that there is always a political catch and a string attached to every promise made by him. Instead of the wage-earners' having a restoration of the advantages that had been filched from them we find that in consequence of the Government's activities there has been an increase of about 9s. a week in the cost of living in this State. These figures are furnished by Mr. Brigden. The basic wage-earner, for example, is still receiving the same basic wage that was prescribed during the depths of the depression, but at that time the cost of living was low. To-day the cost of living has increased by 9s. a week, but the basic wage remains the same. These are things that the wage-earner is thinking about to-day, and he takes into account the fact that the Treasurer, the leader of the country, told him at South Brisbane in 1932, that all the advantages that had been filched from him by the Moore Government would be restored to him? Have these advantages—alleged to have been filched from him—been restored to him? That is the question that is being seriously discussed by men who were duped in this way in 1932.

Not only has the cost of living increased by 9s. a week, but the Government have also increased the relief tax by 2d. in the £1 since they have been in power. This increase bears heavily not only on industrial undertakings and upon men engaged in primary production, but it also bears very heavily indeed on the wage-earners of the State. This tax was increased by the present Government, and to-day a record sum is being collected. This sum is in addition to the amount collected by way of ordinary income tax.

It is evident from the elusiveness of the Treasurer that an increased amount is being abstracted from the Unemployment Relief Fund for purposes of consolidated revenue during this fiscal year. To that extent a new and additional income tax is being imposed upon the people. Once that tax becomes a set thing it will be just as difficult to remove it as it is to remove public officers for whom no further work exists. It becomes difficult in such circumstances to make any alteration. There is a growing fear outside this Chamber that the unemployment relief tax has come to stay—at least while the present Government remain in power. It is feared that increasing sums will be required for consolidated revenue to meet the dire needs of the Treasurer as time proceeds with the ever-increasing expenditure going on to-day and the increased expenditure that seems likely to occur in the near future in other directions.

The Government, as I see things, are day by day drifting into a very difficult financial position. With the promises they have made they deluded many people for a period of four years, but we are reaching a stage just now where those to whom the promises were made are asking that they be redeemed. There is dissatisfaction in the public service in consequence of the decision of the Industrial Court in the matter of their application for a restoration

*Mr. Maher.]*

of the salary cuts that were made during the period of depression.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that whilst a preliminary judgment has been given by the Industrial Court in connection with a claim made by public service unions, the claim is still before the court, and under consideration by the court, and is, therefore, sub judice. I ask the hon. member to bear that in mind.

Mr. MAHER: At any rate, I think I shall be in order in going this far: The Treasurer promised a restoration of salary cuts to public servants, but so far the full restoration of those salaries has not been made by Act of Parliament. Apart from the dissatisfaction that exists in the public service in consequence of these things, there is a general dissatisfaction among different sections of the people because of the things to which I have referred. The wage-earner objects to the increasing cost of living. He objects, and all sections of the people object, to the increased relief tax. The wage-earner in particular regards it as a wage cut. If any hon. member on this side were to suggest that the wage-earners should have a wage cut of from 2½ per cent. to 5 per cent. imposed on them to-morrow they would be loud in their condemnation of such an action; but, after all, the relief tax imposed a wage cut of from 2½ per cent. to 5 per cent. upon the wage-earners. The fact that such a wage cut is imposed surely amounts to a recognition by the Government that there is not enough money in the wage pool to absorb those who are unemployed. Why not come out in the open and declare for a reduced wage in order to absorb those who are unemployed? The Government resort by other methods to achieve precisely the same thing. The wage cut is made by the imposition of the relief tax.

As I see things, the general trend is such that the Government will find it necessary to do this sort of thing more and more. We find, by the report of the Commissioner of Taxes, that the number of people in receipt of substantial incomes is limited. If you were to confiscate the whole of their earnings it would not provide a sum sufficient to pay the relief workers for many weeks. More and more we are reaching the position in the State where it will be impossible to obtain large sums in taxation from big companies. At one time we got substantial amounts in taxation from the Brisbane Tramways Company, but that enterprise was municipalised, and, of course, that taxation was lost to the Treasury. It is now suggested that the City Electric Light Company may be municipalised—perhaps the better term would be “socialised.” If that is done, there will be less money available to the Treasury. We are, therefore, reaching by degrees the stage where the number of those who have been making substantial incomes in the State are becoming less and less. But the expenditure of the Government will not grow any less. The result is that the Government will be compelled to fall back more and more on the wage-earners and the great mass of the people to maintain the needs of the Treasury. There is nothing new about that. It has happened in other countries in the world. Under the Russian system, the soviets, when in need of money for public works, resort

[Mr. Maher.

to precisely the same principle as is embodied in the unemployment relief taxation in Queensland, namely, the wage-earners are told when their monthly pay is due that a cut of 10 per cent. is necessary to finance sewerage or other public works to give employment to others, and in the spirit of comradeship they must accept the cut. Of course, under a dictatorship nothing else can be done, but it illustrates the truth that neither a Government nor an individual can have it both ways. The more socialisation is embarked upon, the greater the breaking down of the capitalistic system and the less the receipts by the Treasury and the more the wage-earners, the farmers, and the other smaller people of the State are called upon to meet the growing burden of taxation.

Reverting to the argument I was advancing at the commencement of my speech: the Treasurer has a habit of making these promises, and up to the present has always been able to elude the result. Abraham Lincoln's words still hold good—

“You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time; but you cannot fool all the people all the time.”

The Treasurer has so far been successful. He has wrapped up all his speeches in a very skilful manner, but the people are beginning to murmur, and as the murmuring increases he must look out for the results of their wrath.

The Treasurer also promised a reduction in taxation, but we find that he is unable to sacrifice any of the taxable receipts of the State because of the growth in expenditure. Apparently pushed on by his supporters, he is gradually increasing the disbursements, and, therefore, the need for increased taxation becomes greater each year. For the last four years the Treasurer has made promises to all sections of the community, but has failed to redeem them. Those people who do not study these matters closely accepted his statement as definite promises, but those who do study them know that in many cases only inferences are involved, and, to that extent, the Treasurer is able to make a good political getaway. But conditions are becoming increasingly difficult for the hon. gentleman. The people to whom those promises were given are asking for their fulfilment, and the Treasurer's path during the next eighteen months will not be so strewn with roses as it has been for the past four years.

The Committee are entitled to know the amount being drawn from the Unemployment Relief Fund for the purposes of consolidated revenue. During the discussion of the Estimates of the Sub-Department of Forestry I drew attention to an amount of £600,000 drawn into revenue from that department in a period of two years. The needs of the Treasurer were so great that the buoyant revenue from forestry sources had to go into the Treasury, and was not used for reforestation purposes. Here again, the expenditure is rising at such a rapid rate that the Treasurer finds the need of each year increasing the sum to be paid from our Unemployment Relief Fund into consolidated revenue. It is not fair to those people who pay the tax that this should be so. It is not fair to those who believe that they are paying unemployment relief tax for the purpose of easing unemployment in the State to find that that money is being

increasingly used for general budgetary needs. So I say the matter is causing a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the people, as are those elusive promises the Treasurer has made from time to time—promises he did not intend to redeem, promises intended, rather, if I may say so, to delude his hearers.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Rockhampton*) [11.7 a.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition, in the course of his speech and his short indictment of the Government, made four points.

First of all, he said that the Premier and Treasurer is elusive, that he cannot be pinned down, that he is a kind of parliamentary wrestling champion, the Tom Lurich of the parliamentary ring. It is a case of a fair field and no favour. It is an open ring, and the Leader of the Opposition has had his opportunity. If he cannot pin the Treasurer the decision goes against him. The Treasurer has placed the Leader of the Opposition on the mat, and has scored three falls without having one fall recorded against him. That is the complaint of the Leader of the Opposition. He needs some miraculous intervention in order to enable him to score.

His second point is that the Treasurer is a prolific promiser. Just fancy a charge of that kind being made by the Leader of the Opposition! Does he recollect the promises of himself and his party of no interference with arbitration, no reduction of wages, no interference with court awards as far as the public servants are concerned, lower taxation for the man on the land, repeal of the hospital tax, averaging of incomes, "£2,000,000 for 10,000 jobs," and "Give the boy a chance"? Surely the Leader of the Opposition has a very short memory, a very defective one, for, with such a record as that with regard to promises, I think his charge against the Premier and Treasurer is very ill-founded. The mantle of the moralist suits the Leader of the Opposition but poorly. Hon. members opposite are always blushing at the thought of their own political virtue. The Government are elusive promisers, deceivers, and tricksters! They—hon. members opposite—possess all the virtues in the political calendar.

The Leader of the Opposition, too, fell back upon Abraham Lincoln, and endeavoured to show that there was some warning to be observed from that great man's famous remark and even from the history of Moses, which the Treasurer should heed. This party can truthfully say that they are a party of action, not a party of idle promisers. Many promises have been made and many promises fulfilled.

The Leader of the Opposition asks what we have done to make good our promises to public servants. Although there has not been a full restoration to the 1929 standard—and such a promise was never made by the Government—a substantial restoration has been made, and over £1,000,000 has been made by the present Government by way of additional payments to public servants. We have partially fulfilled our pledge and promise. We have honoured our pledge and promise to the extent that we promised, and at no time did we make any rash promise such as is suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOORE: You should have made a full restoration in four years.

Mr. LARCOMBE: We have been helping year after year. We quickly restored the 44-hour week, which meant an additional cost to the Railway Department alone of £100,000 per annum. Was that not a substantial contribution to the fulfilment of our promise? On two occasions now the court has reduced the percentage reduction imposed as a burden on the public servants by hon. members opposite when they were in power. By their interference with arbitration court awards, substantial reductions were made in the purchasing power of the public servants, and now they are complaining that there has not been a full restoration after four years.

In the Railway Department the railway men lost about £750,000 while hon. members opposite were in power in consequence of the wages and salaries reduction policy alone—apart from retrenching. No political party in Queensland has a blacker political record than have hon. members opposite. If we are to be indicted or attacked let it be by a party with a sound and wholesome record, not by a party with the political record of hon. members opposite, who ought to be the last to raise the question of promise-breaking or of sacrificing the interests of the public servants.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition dealt also with the financial position of the Government and taxation. That brings me to the point that I rose really to discuss. Is it not time that hon. members opposite abandoned their ostrich-like attitude of burying their heads in the sand and also of blaming this Government for the financial, economic, and social position of Queensland? We know that the causes are deep-seated. We know that the Labour Government have done all that is humanly possible to mitigate the intensity of the ill effects of the economic and financial system at present operating. We know that the present Government have been responsible for a substantial recovery in the production of primary and secondary industries, for a substantial reduction in unemployment, and for many other improvements in the affairs of the State.

Mr. MOORE: We are responsible for the drought, I suppose? You claim credit for everything else.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Hon. members opposite would be foolish enough to accuse us of being responsible for the drought conditions. We say that the fundamental causes of the country's difficulties are so deep-seated that they cannot be attributed fully to either the Moore Party or the Labour Party. It is about time we directed our attention to the need for an improvement in the economic and financial system existing in Australia. The question is beyond the power of the State Parliament, so what is the use of railing at the Labour Government for not producing a Utopia with ideal conditions when they are the victim of circumstances over which they have no control? The financial and banking and monetary systems are obsolete, and should be attacked by the Federal Legislature—our national administrators. They have the power to handle the problem; the State Labour Government have not. Until something is done to reform banking, to utilise public credit in the proper manner, and to bring about a better monetary system, all the State Governments of Australia will have a burden of debt and taxation and difficulty.

*Mr. Larcombe.]*

There is no doubt that the Lyons Administration are shirking their responsibilities in that respect. They are dictated to and controlled by vested interests. They will not lift a finger to deal with the real reform that Australia needs.

Mr. MOORE: Why did not Mr. Scullin lift his finger when he was there? He only accumulated deficits.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Mr. Scullin did lift his finger, and he had a particularly difficult task. He did it satisfactorily though he was not there for as long as the Moore Government were in power. Just fancy the Deputy Leader of the Opposition talking about accumulated deficits!

Mr. MOORE: I am talking about lifting his finger.

Mr. LARCOMBE: Does the hon. gentleman realise that he put up a Bradmanseque record—that no Government who ever occupied the Treasury benches were responsible for such an accumulated deficit as his? The Scullin Administration did their job well, and went down fighting for banking, monetary, and financial reform.

Mr. BRAND: They were not fighting; they collapsed.

Mr. LARCOMBE: The Scullin Government staked their political existence on this very question that I am appealing to hon. members to consider. The Scullin Government took control of affairs when appalling conditions existed—an adverse trade balance of £60,000,000 having been created in the previous six years by the Bruce-Page Administration, an average of £10,000,000 a year, before that Government were hurled into political oblivion by the people of Australia.

The Sydney "Bulletin," which cannot be called a Labour journal, had this to say about the much-despised Scullin Administration—

"We had to reduce our exports by at least £34,000,000 a year plus whatever the fall in the value of our exports amounted to. It was either that or default. To his everlasting credit Scullin decided that it must not be default. Only one way was open to an honest Government in 1929-30, and Scullin took it by raising tariffs, and imposing prohibition. That saved the situation and Australia from default."

That is the opinion of the Sydney "Bulletin," which is not in any way associated with the Labour movement. It said that the Scullin Government had saved Australia from default, that although they had been in power for only a short period they were able to lift Australia out of the financial quagmire that resulted from the reckless spending and squandering by the Bruce-Page Government, which had reduced Australia to insolvency. They were able to do that and to lay down the foundation for a better social, economic, and financial system, the advantages of which are being reaped by the Federal Government to-day.

In contrast with that excellent opinion of Mr. Scullin and his leadership, we have a scathing criticism of the Nationalist Party from one of its leaders in Western Australia. This report of his remarks appeared in the "Courier-Mail" of the 1st of this month—

"The President of the National Party of Western Australia (Sir Walter James,

[Mr. Larcombe.

K.C.), addressing the annual meeting of the party, said that for years the party had been lacking not only in convictions but in courage."

Going on to speak about the Lyons Administration, he said—

"It seeks a comfortable and quiet time in office. It has lacked principle and the backbone to fight for principle. It is no wonder that people grew tired of such a party. To me the wonder is that we lasted so long."

There we have a scathing indictment of the Federal anti-Labour Administration—the Lyons Administration—by the Leader of the Nationalist Party in Western Australia. Out of their own mouths they are convicted.

There is no need to go to Labour speakers or Labour authorities for condemnation of the Lyons Government because of their apathy, ineptitude and failure to live up to the conception of statesmanship. To-day they are a rabble. Did not Sir Frederick Stewart accuse them in the Federal Parliament of inconsistency, of following a wrong policy, and of slowing down the wheels of progress? Did not the Hon. H. Gregory also attack this self-same party, which he supports in the Federal House of Representatives, because they had asked their members to close their mouths in connection with the trade war between Japan and Australia? He complains that for two months they have been told to close their mouths and say nothing, and that they refuse to do it any longer because Australia was getting into a great difficulty, and the producers are suffering as a result of the inaction of the Government. He complains that despite all the economic ruptures they are still advised to keep their mouths closed. That is a swinggoing attack upon the Lyons Administration. There is a cave in the party that will at any moment now attack the Lyons Government. In connection with their attitude towards finance, banking and monetary reform, which is so important as to be vital to interests of the people as a whole, the Lyons Government have been weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Mr. MAHER: What did Joek Garden say about Lang?

Mr. LARCOMBE: What did Sir Henry Parkes say about Sir George Gibbs in 1884? That is just as much to the point.

Hon. members opposite are not giving their attention to the problems of the State and the nation in a way that they should, particularly in connection with the consideration of finance and legislation generally. They are constantly attacking Labour when Labour is not responsible. They should devote more time to the problem of monetary and banking reform. If they did that the probabilities are that their party might not be undermined by the Douglas Credit Party or any other social credit party. Why is the party opposite being undermined in the country by the Douglas Credit Party? It is because they are not living up to their responsibilities in connection with banking and monetary reform. If they would concentrate upon that problem instead of attacking Labour they would probably strengthen their own position in the country and their prestige in this Chamber would be higher. It is no use their condemning Labour Governments

whilst the present system exists, and whilst we have the present obsolete monetary and banking system.

Mr. MAHER: Printing more bank notes will not cure the trouble.

Mr. LARCOMBE: No. We know that a stupid proposal to print an unlimited number of bank notes would not solve our problem. But there is a way out. To-day we can go much further with safety in the way of banking, monetary and industrial reform. A Labour Government have proved that. We know a Labour Government established the Commonwealth Bank. Wherever one goes throughout the big cities of this country one sees grand concrete symbols of the success of Labour's policy in creating that bank. It has earned profits amounting to over £25,000,000, without the investment of any capital, but by merely utilising the social credit of Australia. Is not that something more than mere lip service? That is a remarkable result. In addition, approximately £6,000,000 profits were made from the note issue, and altogether considerably over £30,000,000 profits have been made from the banking and currency reforms instituted by the Labour Administration when in power. Labour has endeavoured to continue that work, but Labour has not been in power in the true sense of the word since that time. For the last twenty years Labour has been out of power, and has not had the opportunity of further implementing its banking, currency and monetary policy. We do not suggest for a moment the absurd policy of issuing paper money in the manner the Douglas Credit Party suggest.

Mr. MAHER: That is where it will lead to.

Mr. LARCOMBE: It will lead us to nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman, struggling in the stream, fears to head for the shore because he may drown. He will not endeavour to save himself when he is immersed in the whirlpool. How absurd! For instance, we normally consume meals three times daily. That food nourishes the body, gives strength, and tones up the system. The hon. gentleman might just as sensibly say that that is going to lead us to gluttony, that it is going to lead us to ill-health—to death. It is all a question of moderation—the application of sound rules of health in human economy—and the same applies to political economy. The application of sound principles in political economy, in banking and monetary reform, will not lead us to the absurd lengths suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MAHER: More people die from over-eating than over-drinking.

Mr. LARCOMBE: How does the hon. gentleman know that? Both are objectionable, but both are unnecessary. To show how absolutely absurd, incorrect and unsound is the objection of the Leader of the Opposition, let me remind him that his party were quite prepared to borrow £400,000,000 for the purposes of destruction. Money was available for that. They issued paper money that way. They enslaved the nation, increased the debt, inflated the interest rate, and raised the level of taxation by that policy during the war. It is one of the greatest scandals in the history of the nation. If that money could have been procured by

way of loan, the money could have been secured equally as well on the assets of the nation, and the debt and interest bill could have been largely saved. We know that in that time of war millions were made available for the purposes of destruction. We know that if war were to break out again to-morrow hundreds of millions of pounds would be found by the political friends of the party opposite in the Federal Parliament for the prosecution of that war of destruction of human life; but immediately it is suggested that £10,000,000 or £20,000,000 should be issued in Australia to finance works that would engage our unemployed in constructive and peaceful occupations hon. members opposite exclaim, "There is danger! It cannot be done." That is the paradox and the contradiction of the attitude adopted by hon. members opposite. We know that our national assets are considerable. We know a reasonable amount of credit could be made available for the purpose of placing the unemployed in work. Even before the greater monetary and banking reform takes place, the Federal Government should step in, as they could do, and make a reasonable amount of credit available to put back in work some of the 300,000 who are now unemployed in the Commonwealth. It is a disgrace to the Federal Administration in this country to say they cannot find employment for those 300,000 citizens, or a fair proportion of them.

Hon. members opposite shriek for mass migration, for people to be brought into the country in large numbers. They assert it is a reflection on Australia to say we cannot carry an increased population. Is it not a reflection upon the Federal Government to say Australia cannot put back in work a number of its citizens who are at present unemployed? Any system of migration should be preceded in Australia by an unemployment relief scheme that will put back into work at least two-thirds of those who are at present unemployed. Until that is done mass migration schemes should not be tolerated or entertained by the people of Australia. The first essential of any sound migration scheme is that our own unemployed shall be again placed in industry.

Therefore, Mr. Hanson, I do hope hon. members opposite will cease their continuous attack upon the Labour Administration for imaginary political and financial sins which are not committed at all by this Administration. We are desperately faced year after year with the financial plight illustrated by the words of Robert Burns—

"Doomed to the sorest task of man  
alive,

To make three guineas do the work of  
five."

These words apply with equal force to the present Administration in Queensland, as to other State Governments in Australia. Each year we are placed in that desperate position. We cannot accomplish the miraculous. We are not superhuman. Hon. members opposite should cease to complain and attack; they should endeavour, in a co-operative spirit, to help the Government with constructive ideas. By doing that, and by actively supporting banking and monetary reforms, they will be rendering a service to Queensland and to Australia.

*Mr. Larcombe.]*



Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [11.31 a.m.]: In his criticism of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Rockhampton endeavoured to establish that the Labour Party did not make promises, or, in the alternative, that they have partly fulfilled their promises. If the latter is the case, we on this side desire information as to the nature of the promises. Has the hon. member ever heard this promise, "The Labour Party will return the privileges that were filched from the public servants by the Moore Government."

Mr. LARCOMBE: We have returned many.

Mr. BRAND: I ask the hon. member: Has he heard of that promise?

Mr. LARCOMBE: We have returned many.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member admits that he has heard of that promise. We in this Chamber heard it. In 1930, the Labour Party were on the Opposition benches of this Chamber, and I remind hon. members opposite of a debate that took place then similar to this. The complaint made by the hon. member for Rockhampton against the criticism emanating from this side this morning can be applied with equal force to the criticism of his party on that occasion. In not one instance did a Labour Government at that time deal with banking reforms or the monetary system.

It is all very well for hon. members opposite to endeavour to get away from the actual facts. Their demand for a reform on the banking and monetary system is an endeavour to evade the responsibility that must be accepted by the Government and that every other Parliament in Australia are endeavouring to meet—the responsibility of making a full return of the salary cuts made in the depression years in order to create a greater purchasing power in the community. The action of the Opposition in criticising the policy and actions of the Government is an endeavour to establish the greatest amount of purchasing power for the benefit of the whole of the people. We claim that the policy of the Queensland Government is not doing that.

It may be claimed with some force that the man on a salary up to £600 a year is the greatest factor in increasing purchasing power. Admitting that, this anomalous position in the salaries of the public servants is found to exist as a result of the recent judgment—

| Nominal.    | 1929 Salary per annum net. | Amount of restoration. |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| £           | £ s. d.                    | £ s. d.                |
| 1,000 .. .. | 820 0 0                    | 90 0 0                 |
| 520 .. ..   | 462 0 0                    | 44 0 0                 |
| 320 .. ..   | 284 0 0                    | 7 8 0                  |
| 300 .. ..   | 266 5 0                    | 4 15 0                 |
| 255 .. ..   | 226 0 0                    | Nil                    |

Public servants, particularly those with large families, have a difficult job to keep their homes on £300 a year. The Government must recognise that position. No matter what our politics may be, either inside or outside of this Chamber, we cannot accept as right the policy that the higher salaried man should have a greater restoration than that given to those on the lower salaries. We as a Country Party have made that claim consistently because we are anxious to increase

[*Mr. Brand.*

the purchasing power of the people. The primary producers depend upon a healthy purchasing power. The home market for their products is the best market, and just as the Country Party in Victoria restored the whole of the salary cuts to public servants, so we are anxious to see justice done for our public servants so that the purchasing power of the people will be increased, and the backbone of the community, the primary producers, who are anxious to improve prices, will receive some benefit.

My criticism this morning with respect to these matters is backed up by men who, I have reason to believe, are not of my political persuasion. I am backed up by men who claim to lead the public service unions of our State. By their criticism in the Press, they are showing their dissatisfaction with the position as it is to-day, and are calling upon the Government to do the right thing, just as we are in this Chamber this morning.

The hon. member for Rockhampton, despite his speech this morning, surely must admit the truth of my remarks, that it should be our duty to see that these injustices are removed. We know what brought about the salary reductions to public servants throughout Australia. The men who were in power in the Federal Parliament at that time—whose jurisdiction, after all, supersedes that of the State—made it abundantly clear, through their Prime Minister and his Deputy Leader, the Treasurer, and the Minister for Trade and Customs in that Government, that the reason why we were in the position in which we were was because of a slump of £100,000,000 in prices abroad and that that, combined with the inability to secure loan moneys overseas, had forced all Governments to reduce governmental expenditure—that there was no other way out. But I desire to add this morning that when those salary reductions were made a definite promise was given to the public servants that as soon as the pressure on Government finances was relieved those reductions would be restored. Complete restoration has not yet been made.

Mr. H. Bond, the secretary of the Queensland Government Professional Officers' Association, is reported in the Brisbane "Courier-Mail" of 21st October, 1936, as having said—

"It was regrettable that the lower-paid men would derive practically no benefit, or very little, from the court's judgment. The onus, he thought, now would be upon the Government to do on their behalf what the court had not done."

I do not know Mr. Bond, but I should say that in the face of the position of the lower-paid men, as I have illustrated it this morning, the Government should adopt Mr. Bond's suggestion. They should not allow the position to rest where the secretary of the State Service Union, Mr. T. Bolger, says it rests. In the "Courier-Mail" of the same date, that gentleman is reported as having said—

"Officers in receipt of £270 would benefit to the extent of £1 7s. 6d. a year, while an under secretary on £1,100 a year would benefit to the extent of £99 a year."

He goes on to make this interesting statement, which I think cannot fail to catch the eye of the Government of the day—

"An officer in receipt of £225 continued to suffer a reduction of 12.89 per cent., one on £270, 10.74 per cent., on

£320, 9.06 per cent., on £600, 8 per cent., on £1,000 and £1,100, 9 per cent., on £1,200 to £1,500, 9½ per cent., and on more than £1,500, 10 per cent."

It will be seen from that that the man in receipt of £225 per annum is suffering the greatest percentage reduction of all public servants. There is something wrong when such a state of affairs is allowed to exist.

Public servants are very disappointed with the position. Naturally, whatever may be our walk in life, whether we are farmers, artisans, or professional men, the return from our labour is our most vital concern, and I say definitely that the dissatisfaction existing in the service to-day is greater than it was in 1930. We must pay this tribute to the public servants of the State: that they accepted the reductions without a great deal of complaint. It could have been expected that they would complain bitterly, but they realised the position of the country at the time, and their complaints about the salary reductions were not as loud at any rate as they are to-day. I certainly sympathise with them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I think you should repeat that. It is worth putting in black type. You said they did not complain as loudly in 1929 as they do to-day—am I to understand that?

Mr. BRAND: Yes. Their complaints are very loud indeed, for they are trying to make the Minister hear their cry against injustice. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not remain deaf to their appeals. I hope that the Minister does not think there is anything wrong in placing the complaint before him?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I only want to know how you heard it in 1929 and how you are hearing it to-day.

Mr. BRAND: Of course, we know the Minister. He would like to avoid the effects of the situation. We hope that he can hear as far back as 1929, and that he can hear the complaints to-day of men who have a thorough understanding of the State's financial position and feel that their work deserves some recognition by the Government.

Mr. MAXWELL: Labour misled them.

Mr. BRAND: There can be no doubt that Labour did. Public servants are saying that they are disappointed with their own Government in the matter. I sometimes feel sorry for people who put a great deal of reliance upon Governments, particularly Labour Governments, who make an appeal to the mass of the people when their votes are needed, by offering them many promises and much sympathy. I believe that the expressions of sympathy with the people of Queensland are greater at election time than when the elections are over.

Mr. POWER: You should know. You have been in government.

Mr. BRAND: I know that my sympathy is just as real after the election as before.

Mr. POWER: Now, you are not serious!

Mr. BRAND: That is evidenced by the increasing vote I have received at every election I have contested.

I am expressing my sympathy in this Chamber to-day as I did on the hustings a few months ago. If every hon. member here

were with me, those men would get the justice that was promised to them at the elections. I hope that the hon. member for Baroona will be just as loud in supporting my appeal this morning as he was just before the elections. There is no section of the community that cannot sympathise with the public servants on account of the unfortunate position in which they find themselves by reason of the salary reduction. It was claimed by the Leader of the then Government, Mr. Moore, at the time the reductions were brought about, that the higher salaried men could better bear reductions, and they were made to bear the greater reductions. The man on the basic wage was then left absolutely alone, and did not suffer any reduction as a result of the Salaries Act.

Mr. POWER: That is not right.

Mr. BRAND: He did not suffer any reduction in consequence of the Act. If the hon. member for Baroona will look up the Act for himself he will find that what I say is correct. I was in Parliament when that was done and he was not. To-day the public servants on the lower salaries are suffering a larger cut as compared with the others, and we want to rectify that anomaly. The hon. member can get up in this Chamber and make a speech in support of my demand and no one will stop him. He can make the same claim that I am making to-day on behalf of the lower-paid men, and he should do that instead of trying to heckle me. I will not interrupt the hon. member at all during the course of his speech if he will only make a reasonable claim on behalf of the men in whose interests I am speaking.

We should recognise the disadvantages that the lower-paid men labour under, and we should give consideration to their case when considering the Supply that we are asked to grant to-day. We can well be proud of our public servants. In my experience it is equal to the public service in any other State or the Commonwealth itself. I am satisfied that the public servants give service for the salaries that they receive, and every man is worthy of the consideration that I suggest. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in calling upon the Government to honour their pledge to the public servants to restore to them the privileges taken from them during a period of adversity. Now that the country is in a much better financial and economic position the Government should at last honour their obligations.

Mr. McLEAN (*Bundaberg*) [11.51 a.m.]: I have listened attentively to the speeches by the hon. members opposite. They can be aptly described as political eye-wash. They have a guilty conscience concerning the acts they perpetrated on the public servants, and they are now seeking to justify their administration by claiming that certain benefits should be restored to the workers. They wish to appear now as the saviours of the public servants.

The hon. member for Isis said that the Country Party Government in Victoria had restored the salary cuts to the public servants in that State, but they have done nothing of the sort. Restorations were made at a time when they were supported and kept in power by the Labour Government, so that they could exclude the United Australia Party from the Treasury benches. The salary restorations were made at the instigation of the Labour Party. Did not Mr. Lane,

*Mr. McLean.]*

the hon. member for Barton, in the Federal House of Representatives, say that he would not trust the Country Party or any political party from the country?

Hon. members opposite have repeatedly said that as a result of the recent decision of the Industrial Court in the public servants' case greater consideration was given to officers in receipt of big salaries, but their object in stressing that point is to delude the workers, particularly the public servants, into believing that the Industrial Court does not function in a just way. They are endeavouring to justify their action in removing the public servants from the ambit of the Industrial Court by insinuating that the court has not acted justly towards them now. They also desire to break down the system of arbitration so that they may return in the industrial arena to the good old days of the survival of the fittest. I have been actively associated with industrial unionism for approximately thirty-five years, and my experience convinces me that the uppermost desire in the minds of our opponents has been to break down industrial standards. In furtherance of their objective they have endeavoured to belittle the Government in the eyes of the workers so that they may have an open "go" once more in the industrial field.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about taxation and complained that the Treasurer did not reduce the unemployment relief tax. If hon. members opposite are as sympathetic with the workers and the unemployed as they profess to be, let them endeavour to convince their political friends in the Federal Parliament to do something for these people. The Federal Government could have done something for the unemployed with their surpluses of £10,442,000. I find that since the financial year 1931-32 the direct taxation decreased by 8s. 4d. a head and indirect taxation increased by £2 1s. 3d. a head and the taxation revenue increased by £1 3s. 1d. a head. In 1931-32 the amount collected in taxation by the Commonwealth Government was £52,000,000, and in 1935-36 the amount had increased to £63,000,000. Taxation remissions granted by the Commonwealth Government in respect of land tax, property tax, tax on life assurance, and tax on shipping companies is approximately £7,000,000, whereas the old-age pensioners only received £3,492,000. Notwithstanding the record of their political friends in the Federal Parliament, hon. members opposite have the colossal effrontery to come into this Chamber and claim that this Government should have restored the wages of public servants.

It is not the function of the Government to interfere with the wages or salaries of public servants. Once a Government started to meddle with that matter there would be general dissatisfaction. It is entirely the function of the Industrial Court. Every hon. member who is a believer in arbitration should support the Government in their attitude of allowing the Industrial Court to deal with the matter. If the principle of arbitration is abandoned then the only alternative is the law of the jungle. The wealthy interests and profitmongers have always opposed arbitration and industrial awards. They are resentful of the fact that they have to pay award rates, and they are anxious to attack the Industrial Court at every opportunity. I contend that those on

[Mr. McLean.

the lowest rung of the ladder should be the first to have their conditions alleviated, but the fact remains that the court has given a decision, and it ill becomes any hon. member of this Committee to endeavour to create a feeling of distrust in the minds of the public servants for the purposes of political gain to himself. The Labour Party are not responsible for the decision of the Industrial Court. The Premier and Treasurer has not dictated what proportion of salary cuts it should restore to public servants.

Mr. MOORE: You read his Estimates.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: How do you know?

Mr. McLEAN: That statement means that the judges of the Industrial Court are susceptible to suggestion by the Government. I say that is a damaging and damnable statement to make regarding the integrity of Industrial Court judges. That is the kind of propaganda being disseminated through the public service in order to discount the benefits of the judgment of the Industrial Court, which makes its decision after hearing the case of both the employers and the employees. This sort of propaganda is merely put forth for political gain. There is the innuendo that the members of the Industrial Court have been "got at" or interfered with. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the amount allocated in the Estimates, and the inference is that as the amount allocated is equal to the amount involved by the decision of the court there was collusion between the court and the Government. That is an unwarranted attack on the integrity of the personnel of the Industrial Court. If the Government thought for one moment that there was a suggestion of impropriety and dishonesty on the part of the Industrial Court they would have the matter brought before this Assembly to enable such accusations against Mr. Justice Webb and Messrs. Ferry and Riordan to be actually made, and not drawn from innuendos and suggestions.

The economic position of the public service is wrapped up in the decision given by the Industrial Court, but, Mr. Hanson, you have already pointed out that the claims of the public service unions have not yet been finally dealt with by the court, and consequently the matter is sub judice. I do not desire that hon. members opposite should infer that I am attempting to influence the decision of the court. They have drawn attention to the differentiation in the restoration given to the lower-paid and higher-paid salaried officers of the State, but I would draw their attention to the discrimination made by the Commonwealth Government in the matter of reduction in taxation, which is as follows:—

| Salary.                | Reduction. |
|------------------------|------------|
| £                      | £ s. d.    |
| 317 per annum ... ..   | 0 15 8     |
| 583 per annum ... ..   | 3 4 3      |
| 2,000 per annum ... .. | 15 7 10    |

Where the rate of salary is seven times higher the remission is twenty times greater, and if the court were to base its decision on the amount of the exemptions from taxation, which would justify the remarks of the hon. member for Isis, there would then be no need for the court to determine the wages of the workers.

Mr. BRAND: I was only talking about the return of salaries.

Mr. McLEAN: The court heard the plaint and will adjudicate. Hon. members opposite assert that certain salaries should have been restored, but I repeat that the suggestion behind such statements, emanating from the Opposition, is purely to mislead the public servants, and weaken their confidence in the Industrial Court. That is entirely wrong. The Communists do not believe in arbitration but in direct action, and hon. members in opposition are advocating the fundamentals of Communism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No!

Mr. McLEAN: They are. Hon. members opposite do not understand industrial arbitration, but they apparently do understand the bosh enunciated by the communistic Press, and to-day they are advocating direct action. They desire to sabotage the machinery of the Industrial Court. Whether they are advocating it innocently or otherwise I cannot say, but they are advocating precisely similar principles as the Communist Party. They remind me of Mark Twain's "Innocents Abroad." They think that by keeping on saying a thing eventually it will appear to be real. Apparently they want to-morrow morning's Press to publish laudatory comments of their speeches. "See what they are saying. They are the great Messiahs. They go forth preaching that the Government should restore the public service cuts." That is obviously the motive behind it all, and it is right that there be an exposure of their political insincerity. The Leader of the Opposition quoted Abraham Lincoln as to fooling all of the people all of the time. Allow me to tell him that the industrial workers do not desire to pull his leg, nor do they desire that he should pull theirs.

I repeat that hon. members opposite have advocated direct action against the Industrial Court. They are trying to incite the public servants in an endeavour to obtain political gain for themselves. They are trying to create a feeling of want of confidence in industrial courts and endeavouring to prove that the Government can do all these things that they ask. The Labour Government believe in arbitration. Every common-sense person believes in arbitration. When hon. members opposite realise that they have been advocating communistic doctrines in this Assembly this morning in their keenness to gain favour in the eyes of the public servants they will perceive how serious their statements have been. I predict that the speech of the hon. member for Isis will be published in communistic journals throughout Australia.

Mr. BRAND: I rise to a point of order. If the hon. member is saying that I advocated communistic principles, it is offensive to me, and I ask him to withdraw. It is not true.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did not understand the hon. member for Bundaberg to make such a statement at all.

Mr. McLEAN: I was endeavouring to state in quite emphatic terms that one who has been associated with industrial organisations for as long as I have been—

Mr. MAXWELL: How long were you with them?

Mr. McLEAN: For thirty-five years. I have been an advocate in the Industrial Court for the railway employees and I was

a union official for a considerable time, fighting the policy of hon. members opposite when they were in power. By virtue of that experience, I know the danger of advocating the policy of the Communist Party. The desire behind the speeches of hon. members opposite this morning was to destroy arbitration, to endeavour to incite the public servants, and to encourage them to believe that the members of the Industrial Court—Mr. Justice Webb and Messrs. T. A. Ferry and W. J. Riordan—had not done the right thing by them. Their speeches suggest that if the court does not do what they want, they should have a "go" at the Government. I repeat that the Government believe in arbitration, as does every common-sense man or woman in the State and the Commonwealth.

We have known what communistic influences have done. We have known cases where arbitration has been destroyed, and whether hon. members opposite have done it innocently or otherwise, the fact remains that their speeches are really in advocacy of communistic principles. A fair analysis of their words will disclose that if they mean anything at all it is, "If you cannot get a thing justly and by the proper means, then you must get it by some other means." What is that other means? It is to get rid of the present system and substitute something else. What is that something else that they desire to substitute? It is direct action. I have had great experience in these matters, and I know that in the public service, as elsewhere, an attempt is being made to create a feeling of distrust. This must be accentuated by the statements emanating from hon. members opposite. I regret, as I am sure does every decent-minded citizen in the State, the statements made by hon. members opposite to-day in favour of direct action and repudiation of the Industrial Court by public servants, and their endeavour to create a feeling of want of confidence in the Industrial Court and to throw the responsibility on the Government.

In reply to the innuendo in the remark of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, "Have a look at the Estimates," that Mr. Justice Webb and Messrs. T. A. Ferry and W. J. Riordan gave a decision coinciding with the amount allocated by the Government. I am sure the Premier and Treasurer will be here to-day to give the hon. gentleman the lie direct.

We have had newspapers advocating the 40-hour week and saying that the Government should bring it about. Yet when the employees of those newspapers went to the court with a claim for a 40 hour week, the newspaper owners fought the claim on the question of their ability to pay. I suggest again that what has been done by the Government was not done by hon. members opposite.

Mr. BRAND: Why are you justifying them?

Mr. McLEAN: I am justifying arbitration as against the hon. member's suggestion of direct action and communistic principles.

(Opposition interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McLEAN: The Federal Government, supported by hon. members opposite, gave £7,000,000 to the shipping companies' combine and to the big insurance companies

*Mr. McLean.]*

and the wealthy taxpayers by way of tax remissions, while they restored to the old-age pensioners a sum of only £3,000,000. Yet hon. members opposite come to this Chamber and ask this Government why we did not give the public servants back their salary reductions, in face of the decision of the Industrial Court!

I was never against high wages, but, for all their talk about purchasing power, hon. members opposite howled against the Government when we desired to increase the number of employees. The Leader of the Opposition asked why the farmer was taxed while we employed 3,900 odd extra employees in the public service. That was made necessary by the reduction of hours. Although he asked why expenditure should be increased, he comes here to-day to ask why the public servants do not get increased wages and salaries. He cannot eat his cake and have it at the same time. Neither can hon. members opposite logically advocate in the country a reduction of taxation and a reduction of wages, when they come to this Assembly to endeavour to embarrass the Government in regard to a restoration of wages and salaries to State Government employees when the Government properly left the matter to the court.

Mr. BRAND (*Isis*) [12.15 p.m.]: The hon. member for Bundaberg has accused me of advocating direct action and espousing communistic principles.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: I give that statement the lie direct. I did not make any such suggestion.

Mr. WATERS: You are running away now.

Mr. BRAND: I am not running away at all. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove can do all the running away from our gentleman friend in the lobby. I say definitely that the Parliament of Queensland has made certain salary cuts, and that in the absence of any justice to the public service it is the duty of the Government to make restoration. I quoted in support of my argument a statement made by Mr. Bond, as secretary of one of the unions concerned. For the hon. member for Bundaberg to endeavour to throw a smoke screen over his support of the decision of the court is not in keeping with the high principles of the Labour Party.

Mr. POWER: Do you deny that your party asked for the second vote of the Communists in the Bowen by-election?

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member for Baroona is very facetious this morning. (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BRAND: I have no Communists in my electorate.

Mr. POWER: How do you know?

Mr. BRAND: I know of none. I know that in the Bowen by-election the Labour Party had a compromise with the Communist Party to exchange preferences, and that they received them.

Mr. POWER: That is not so. You had the arrangement to get them.

Mr. BRAND: What I have said is the case, and the Labour candidate for Bowen received the second preferences of the com-

[*Mr. McLean.*

municistic candidate. The hon. member is only being facetious. My advocacy in this Chamber this morning is in keeping with the just thought of public servants throughout the State, and my attitude is one that public servants are expecting the Government to adopt.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) [12.17 p.m.]: On this vote I desire to take the opportunity of placing before the Committee the position of prospective producers at the present time. There is no occasion for me to refer to statements made by the hon. member for Bundaberg. He worked himself into a state of frenzy, and evidently thought that the best speech he could make would be one that blamed everybody else for what had happened, even to the extent of accusing hon. members on this side of being communistic. That, of course, is not true.

This vote draws attention to the Government's need of a further sum of £4,200,000 in order to carry on, and to the fact that the need must be met by raising that sum of money. Their request reminds us of the cost of government and the method of raising money needed for administrative purposes.

What is the position of many of the people who are called upon to contribute towards this sum? All wealth comes from the soil. In what condition are the people on the land? How are they able to bear the present burden of taxation? There has been a reasonably good season in the sugar industry, yet the people engaged in it are not altogether satisfied with their position. We also know that the people in the cities are not satisfied. We read of their complaints in the Press. Whether they are right or wrong I do not know. Generally speaking, the people as a whole are disturbed, but my object in rising to speak on this question is to put in a plea on behalf of the men on the land, the people who produce the wealth of the State. The residents of the city never seem to appreciate the significance and the importance of production in the country, and never try to visualise the difficult conditions under which the farmer works. He is isolated in many cases and he often has heavy financial obligations to carry. They are always with him, but he carries on without grumbling very much until, as a result of a drought, he is unable to help himself because fodder for his stock is exhausted and his credit at the bank is in jeopardy. The people in the cities do not realise his ever-present difficulty. I am delighted to know that the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock is visiting Warwick to-day with the object of helping the primary producer in his difficulty. I am sure that the deplorable state of the country now will be a real eye-opener to him. Most of the farmers in the country are carrying overdrafts in some form or other, and their land is burdened with all sorts of difficulties; and when nature is unkind to them, as she has been during the past two years, they are unable to help themselves.

I agree that the primary producer should be asked to contribute some of his income towards the cost of governing the State, but when he is unable to help himself on account of circumstances over which he has no control, it is the duty of the rest of the community to make a generous contribution towards his assistance. There are many people in my electorate, and in other electorates, too, who cannot help themselves

to-day. The Secretary for Agriculture and Stock realises that because he proposes to convene a conference of representatives from such districts to consider what can be done to help them. In many cases they are producing the wealth of the country through their dairy cows. These cows are their assets, and if they are destroyed the production of that wealth must cease. How can they be expected to continue to produce wealth after their assets have disappeared, even if wonderful seasons follow? Their means of production have disappeared for the time being, and their loss of stock deprives them of the means of meeting their obligations in the way of bank interest, taxation, and payment to local authorities.

I have often felt, and I feel now, too, that the people in the city have not a true conception of the difficulties that confront the man on the land. I suppose that if I lived in a city long enough I, too, would forget all about these poor unfortunate beggars outside. That is why I urge hon. members to do something on behalf of the primary producer. I urge them to warn the people in the cities that they are suffering under extreme difficulties. I must appeal to someone to help them during this critical drought, and it appears to me that the Government are the only people who can help them. We have in this State a Co-operative Dairy Companies' Association with which each co-operative dairy company is associated. It has an executive, and it is a non-political body. Any suggestion made by it would be in the best interests of the community as a whole. I will give the Committee the names of the members of the executive of this association. These men are holding responsible positions, and they have made a unanimous request to the Government. The names of the members and the companies they represent are as follows:—Mr. Hill, managing director, Gladstone Co-operative Association, 6 factories; Mr. Mahoney, chairman, Maryborough Co-operative Association, 5 factories; Mr. Cushon, director, Downs Dairy Association, 7 factories; Mr. Muller, chairman, Queensland Farmers' Co-operative Association, 4 factories; Mr. Heading, chairman, South Burnett Co-operative Association, 2 factories; Mr. Hornibrook, chairman, Caboolture Dairy Association, 3 factories; Mr. Plunkett, chairman, Logan and Albert Dairy Association, 1 factory. Total, 28.

I am associated with the lastnamed organisation. This association is not a political body, and its members are in direct contact every day with the conditions that operate throughout the dairying districts of Queensland.

First, they passed a resolution asking the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock to forgo the precept of £4,000 per annum that his department receives from the dairying industry. They feel that the industry is in such a parlous condition that the department should forgo this amount. Another motion that was passed unanimously was that the Government be asked to assist the dairying industry financially to enable farmers to keep the balance of their cattle alive. If we do not do something immediately, a great many more stock will die. It is imperative that we should prevent the loss of a national asset in the form of dairy cattle.

A subsidy-loan could not be advanced for a more useful purpose than to enable farmers to save their dairy cattle. I hope the conference that sits next week will ask the

Secretary for Agriculture and Stock for a subsidy-loan. If such a loan can be made available—and I have no doubt it can be—it will result in a great benefit to this State. It is no use talking about water or fodder conservation during the drought; it is imperative that something should be done—done now.

The Minister has explained that there was a misunderstanding in regard to the Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Act. The Queensland farmers have not received any assistance yet, and I appreciate the fact that the Minister has given notice of the introduction of a measure to make that relief available to them. I hope it will be passed quickly in order that many of our farmers will be able to get their debts adjusted and thus be enabled to carry on.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It was put on the business-sheet to-day.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I appreciate that fact; but at the same time I say I think it is belated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order on this resolution in anticipating discussion on proposed legislation.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I apologise. I did not wish to speak on it except that it dovetails in with my contention that something must be done to help the dairying industry of Queensland in its present position. I impress on the members of this Assembly, irrespective of party—I am not concerned about that—the need of a co-operative effort being made by Governments, through Parliament, if desired, to assist these primary producers. If that is done relief will have been afforded to one of the national industries of Australia. I do not desire to quote figures of its value, but my hope is that the few words I have said will inspire hon. members to take vigorous and immediate action. There is no need for me to paint a harrowing picture of the existing conditions—hon. members who have to travel through the countryside during the week ends know only too well what they are like—but, I repeat, there is nothing that requires the immediate attention of Governments more than the dairying industry. It can only be done in one way, and I sincerely hope that after Tuesday next the Minister will find that way, with the aid of the Government, of making available substantial subsidy-loans.

Mr. FOLEY (*Normanby*) [12.31 p.m.]: In connection with the Animals and Birds Trust Account, I find that there is no power to make use of the amount collected from the royalty, imposed some years ago, on opossum skins. The late Mr. Gillies was responsible for the passing of the Act, the underlying intention of which was that the funds raised would be used for the building up of the industry or improving it wherever possible. The Treasurer's Tables disclose a credit in that account of £71,861 at the 30th June, 1936, and the royalties for the recent open season, calculated on the number of skins, amount to approximately £23,000, increasing the credit of the fund by that amount. Inasmuch as the Minister administering the Animals and Birds Acts has not control over this fund, that can be treated as merely a nominal credit. Since the passage of the Act only £2,000 a year has been used for its administration and the greater amount of the fund is apparently

*Mr. Foley.* }

used for other purposes. I have no knowledge as to whether the money is actually in hand, but men who trap opossums in the open seasons as a means of livelihood, paying to the Government a royalty of 5 per cent. on the value of the skins, desire that the amount of the royalty be used by the Government in building up and stabilising the industry. Much could be done in this respect. Opossums abound in the Springsure district, and big money is made there by the trappers, but there only one ranger is allotted to this and the Rolleston district. This lone ranger patrols an immense area extending to Alpha, Jericho, and Clermont, an area that cannot be successfully patrolled by one man. Illicit trappers operate, and during this last open season the recognised trappers found on reaching sites applied for that in almost every instance others had been there beforehand. They found it very difficult to carry on their work, as they had to keep moving at short intervals. There is an illicit trade all the year round because of the inadequate supervision in these districts. To control them properly requires the services of four or five rangers, but apparently there is some obstacle in the way of the appointment of an additional number. To-day we have a certain firm purchasing skins cheaply, enclosing them in wool packs, and forwarding them overseas in that way.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is virtually smuggling.

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, a good deal of that is going on because of lack of supervision. If the Minister had more control over this fund, or if he was allowed to set aside an amount each year for the purpose of building up the industry, much better results would accrue and more satisfaction would be created amongst the men who contribute this enormous sum of money. A fund of £90,000 odd has been built up over a number of years, but a very small portion indeed has been put back in the industry each year. Some of this money could be used to transport live opossums from places where they are plentiful to areas where they are now extinct. This could be done during the close season, and in the course of a very few years it would be possible to carry on trapping operations in those areas to which the live animals had been transferred. By that means a valuable industry could be established in the State. Last season I think something like 2,000,000 skins were won in Queensland, the value being between £300,000 and £400,000. If that money could be circulated in the State every second year, it is obvious that the benefit to the State would be considerable. This year the Unemployment Relief Tax Fund benefited by between £6,000 and £8,000 in addition to the benefits enjoyed by those station hands and labourers who were able to supplement their meagre earnings by trapping for a few months. I commend to the Government the suggestion that some consideration be given to the men who contribute to this fund by allowing the Minister a greater amount to be used in building up the industry.

This money could be used with great advantage in another way. I made this suggestion some years ago, but it was turned down by Mr. Macgregor, who was later appointed Trade Commissioner in Canada. He investigated the matter and found that there were certain difficulties, such as storage for long periods and the

maintenance of a staff. But with a fund of £90,000 it should be possible to establish a pooling system whereby arrangements could be made to dispose of the skins through one selling agency overseas. This money could be used as a first advance to trappers, and after the sale of the skins through the pool a dividend could be returned to them. I feel confident that in this way a good deal more money would be circulated among the men engaged in the industry than is the case to-day. I remember that in one season a few years ago the catch was about 1,500,000 skins, and the average price received by the trapper in Queensland was 44s. a dozen, while the average price received in London was 10s. a skin. Of the total amount received for skins in London the trappers in Queensland lost approximately £396,000 during that season because the business was conducted through brokers and agents. That system still obtains. In my district one agent, who did not spend one night in the bush or experience any of the hardships suffered by the trappers, received a cheque for well over £1,000, while the trappers received probably only £100 each. The commission paid to the agent for grading the skins and forwarding them to Brisbane was well over £1,000 for one season! That is going on all over the State. What is required is a pooling system so that the skins could be forwarded direct to a central agency here in Brisbane, properly graded, and forwarded to London and sold there as is done at present, so that the full return would go to the trappers instead of to the agents and brokers, who do not do any of the actual work of the industry. This £90,000 would be a very useful fund for the purpose of first payments and other necessary expenditure.

I know that there are some difficulties, such as the need for fairly extensive storage facilities and a staff of graders who would be needed for only two or three months of the year. I take it, however, that they could be drafted into other Government departments when there was no grading work to do. The result of such a system would be that the trappers would get a full return, and the profits would not go to brokers in Australia and London and America. I offer these suggestions to the Minister administering the Animals and Birds Acts, so that he can get a larger amount of money from the fund and put it back into the industry for its improvement.

Mr. POWER (*Baroon*) [12.44 p.m.]: The speeches of hon. members opposite this morning on this Bill can be compared with a boarding-house stew. They all contain the same ingredients, though they may be dished up in different ways. The Leader of the Opposition during this debate has charged the Government with failure to carry out their election promises. That is rather amazing from the hon. gentleman, who was a member of a Government that disregarded every promise made at election times, and repudiated every contract that it could possibly repudiate. Yet, such a party have the temerity to accuse this Government of not carrying out their election promises! The Government were elected in 1932 on the policy speech made by the Premier, and were re-elected last year, showing that the people were satisfied that any promises we made were honourably carried out. That is further

[*Mr. Foley.*]

indicated by the fact that the strength of the Government Party has been considerably increased.

An attempt has been made to make political capital out of the position of the Industrial Court in connection with the claim by the public service unions for increases. This Government are not responsible for the decision of the Industrial Court.

Mr. EDWARDS: They made a pretty good guess what it would be.

Mr. POWER: If the hon. member for Nanango will get up and make a charge against the members of the Industrial Court and not indulge in innuendoes—(Interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. POWER: If he will say that influences have been brought to bear by the Government, he will be showing a man's spirit. Hon. members on the other side of the Chamber are making reflections on the court, but they are not prepared to tell us what is in the back of their minds. The Government are not responsible for the decision of the Industrial Court. We as a Government stand solidly behind arbitration and always have done so.

Mr. EDWARDS: You do not always stand behind arbitration.

Mr. POWER: The facts of the case were put before the court by the representatives of the unions and the representative of the Government as well, and the decision has been given by the court on the facts placed before them. We are not responsible for what has taken place. If the court had given the decision to restore the whole of the amounts taken away by the Moore Government, this Government would have been hard hit. The present difficult financial position is in no small measure the consequence of the Moore Government's action in wasting the £5,000,000 that was in the Treasury when they took control, and in creating record deficits during their time of office. If those deficits had not been incurred, we might not be in the position of being unable to restore the salary reductions in full.

The court has given the decision. The Government do not legislate for one section of the community or one part of the State. They have to do the best they can for all the people of Queensland with the limited amount of money that is available. As I said a few days ago, if the Commonwealth Government would withdraw from some of the fields of taxation from which they draw money that contributes to their huge surpluses, and would allow the State to step in, Queensland's position would be very different from what it is.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Albert concerning the plight of the men on the land, and it is pleasing to know that the Government have the matter in hand and that practical suggestions for the alleviation of their conditions will be made at an early date.

During the debate it was stated that the Opposition were allied with the Communist Party, and the hon. member for Isis rose at the first opportunity to deny the accusation. He also said that during the Bowen by-election the Labour Party advised its supporters to give their preference vote to

the Communist candidate. I rose principally to deal with that matter, because I took part in the Bowen by-election, and I can say quite candidly and definitely, here and now, that the anti-Labour Opposition, the Country Party candidate, Mr. Martin, and the Leader of the Opposition were advocating that the (2) vote be given to the Communist Party, and went so far as having their cards printed asking the people of Bowen to vote—

(1) Martin

(2) Paterson.

I can produce the card showing that that was done.

Mr. MAHER: Did you say that I advocated that?

Mr. POWER: I say that your party advocated it.

Mr. MAHER: I demand a withdrawal, Mr. Chairman. I deny it. I took part in the Bowen by-election and never at any time did I advocate that the No. 2 preference be given to the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN: I listened very carefully to the hon. member for Baroona, and so far as I could learn he certainly made no such accusation against the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MAHER: I thought I heard my name mentioned.

Mr. POWER: I said that members of the party advocated the support of the Communist Party during the Bowen by-election, and I repeat that statement. I also said that "How to Vote" cards were printed showing (1) Martin and (2) Paterson.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And they were authorised.

Mr. POWER: Yes, they were authorised. That was necessary to comply with the Elections Acts. They were authorised by the organiser at the time. I think Mr. McDonald's name was at the bottom. I am not quite sure. They were for Mr. Martin.

Mr. NICKLIN: Mr. Martin was not our candidate.

Mr. POWER: Smith was the candidate. I can produce the card, because I was there taking part in the by-election. I go further, and say that the Opposition Party are prepared to ally themselves with any party whatever so long as they can defeat the Government, and they have done it on more than one occasion. I also know this: That the Opposition Party contributed funds towards the payment of the deposit by Mr. Carrigan, the Lang Party candidate, during the last by-election in Brisbane.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) [12.51 p.m.]: The Government are asking for a large sum of money, and it should be well spent if we are to have prosperity in Queensland. There is one thing that I have carefully noted for some time, and that is the extraordinary growth in the revenue from unemployment relief tax. During this session hon. members opposite have consistently argued that this amount should be maintained, so that employment may be given by the State. I should like hon. members to cast their minds back to the time when the Income (Unemployment Relief) Tax Act was passed, to consider the purpose for which

*Mr. Moore.]*



it was passed and look at what is happening to-day. These figures will give some idea of what is taking place in connection with that Act—

INCOME (UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF) TAX ACTS,  
1930-35.

| —       | Salaries Paid from Income from Employment. | Chief Office Relief Rations | Salaries Paid from Income other than Income from Employment. | Total. |
|---------|--|-----------------------------|--|--------|
|         | £  | £                           | £  | £      |
| 1931-32 | 20,000                                     |                             | 1,965  | 21,965 |
| 1932-33 | 23,000                                     | 306                         | 1,723  | 25,029 |
| 1933-34 | 33,000                                     | 9,560                       | 3,042  | 45,602 |
| 1934-35 | 39,064                                     | 12,000                      | 5,309  | 56,373 |
| 1935-36 | 44,640                                     | 17,072                      | 7,641  | 69,353 |
| 1936-37 | 48,477                                     | 21,190                      | 9,466  | 79,133 |

Hon. members will notice that in 1931-32 there were no payments for the administration of relief rations at head office, and that that payment first appeared in 1932-33, when the amount was £306. They should also observe how the Government got into their stride in connection with this expenditure in 1933-34, and the big jumps that took place in the staff from year to year.

At 12.54 p.m.,

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

Mr. MOORE: Just imagine that progression of figures. The total administrative expenditure of £21,965 for the year 1931-32 had gone up to £79,133 in 1936-37, in spite of the fact that the Government claim that unemployment has been reduced from 19.9 per cent to 7.7 per cent.

Mr. COLLINS: 5.7 per cent. now.

Mr. MOORE: That makes it all the worse. If unemployment has been reduced to that extent why should the administrative expenditure rise from £21,965 in 1931-32 to £79,133 in 1936-37? Let us look at the other side of the ledger. This was the expenditure from this department on ration relief and wages and supervision—

| —              | Ration Relief. | Wages and Supervision. | Total.     |
|----------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|
|                | £              | £                      | £          |
| 1931-32        | ..             |                        | 808,035    |
| 1932-33        | .. 150,000     | 1,500,000              | 1,650,000  |
| 1933-34        | .. 200,000     | 1,411,000              | 1,611,000  |
| 1934-35        | .. 350,000     | 1,515,627              | 1,865,627  |
| 1935-36        | .. 225,000     | 1,664,947              | *2,529,947 |
| 1936-37 (Est.) | .. 300,000     | 1,440,000              | †2,518,000 |

\* Including subsidies to other departments, £640,000.

† Including subsidies to other departments, £778,000.

Mr. COLLINS: Is that taken from "Economic News"?

Mr. JESSON: No doubt it hurts the hon. member.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member is the one who should be hurt if the "Economic News" states that unemployment has been

[*Mr. Moore.*

reduced to the extent that is claimed. If the number of unemployed has been reduced to such an extent the hon. member should be hurt at the wasteful extravagance that is going on. If there has been such a decrease in unemployment, why all the increase in the cost of administration?

Does it not seem an extraordinary thing that if the tremendous decrease that is asserted by the Government to be taking place month by month in the number of unemployed, we should have this enormously increasing expenditure in arithmetical progression one way downwards and the other way up? Does it not call for some inquiry? There is a certain amount called subsidy and a certain amount transferred to revenue, and nobody knows what the amounts are. We found out yesterday—the information was dragged from the Minister piece by piece, after the Minister had delivered a panegyric on the generosity of the Secretary for Labour and Industry in giving him £100,000—

Mr. COLLINS: Does not the Public Estate Improvement Branch's work relieve unemployment?

Mr. MOORE: What I am thinking of is: What is the need of keeping up this enormous tax on the people of Queensland and putting it into a capital fund? Why should the people be taxed on income with a £78 exemption in order that a capital fund can be built up to give a subsidy-loan to local authorities, or to give £100,000 for development loans to graziers and selectors? Why should that sort of thing be allowed to go on? Why should the people be taxed for it? Why should they be taxed to pay interest and redemption on the subsidies given previously?

Mr. JESSON: That is only a bogey the hon. member is raising.

Mr. MOORE: It is all right for the hon. member to make such a remark, but the people to-day are paying these taxes. Industry is paying and it is being hampered because it has to pay.

Mr. JESSON: You are the only one squealing. You are saying that for purposes of political propaganda.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member may say that, but it does not matter much. It is like the explanation the hon. member made yesterday of what he said the day before. It does not make the slightest difference to anybody, although the hon. member imagined that what he said was going to alter the destinies of Queensland. The attitude of the hon. member is like that of a fly lighting on to a wheel and saying, "Look at me making this wheel go round."

The position is as I have stated, and it ought to be investigated by hon. members who have the interest of the people at heart.

At 2 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. MOORE: In connection with the extraordinary increase in the administration expenses of the Department of Labour and Industry and the unemployment relief tax, the most serious aspect is the alteration in the vocations of people in various districts. They are being taken from their ordinary vocations and put on Government relief

work. A chairman of a shire in a country district interviewed me and intimated that the authority had finished its subsidy-loan works. He asked, "What chance is there of getting either more subsidy-loan work or main roads work, and giving the fifty men we have had employed some work?" I asked "Are these local men?" and was answered in the affirmative. "What did they do before the council was granted subsidy-loans?" He replied, "They were local men doing ordinary work about the place. They took jobs pulling corn, getting timber, firewood, and other jobs," I said, "Surely they can do the same sort of work again?" "Oh, no," he said, "they will not take that now. They want either subsidy-loan work or main roads work." This is the sort of thing that is being brought about by the policy of the Government in making available subsidy-loans. Men are being drawn away from their ordinary vocations.

Mr. WATERS: In other words, the workers are to be exploited and given 5s. a day.

Mr. MOORE: It may be called exploiting, but the hon. member eats the food grown and there are men on the land that are leaving their jobs in order to find employment on these works. They are being drawn off the land, and if there is any exploitation it is that of the workers in the cities who will have to pay more for what they eat. That is the position. Numbers of them will give up their work on the land, less and less produce will be grown, and the supply will be less than the demand. The worker will have to pay more for his produce. The Government are destroying the balance of occupation by providing a different class of vocation on more attractive terms. All these factors must be taken into consideration. It is not an advantage to the State that a Government should draw people from their ordinary vocations and find them employment in works that are financed by taxing the people. It is making it difficult for industry to function and find employment for them. That is what is happening to-day.

Mr. WATERS: That is not a fact.

Mr. MOORE: It must be a fact.

Mr. WATERS: It is not.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member for Cook suggested that the percentage of unemployment was now down to 5.7, whereas it had been 19.9. If the percentage is now 5.7 we are in a better position than we were in 1929 when the unemployment relief tax was not in existence.

Mr. WATERS: What is your alternative?

Mr. MOORE: My alternative is to give encouragement to private industry by reducing the tax rather than of collecting it, and giving people Government and local authority employment by means of subsidies.

Mr. WATERS interjected.

Mr. MOORE: Can the hon. member justify the position? Last year unemployment relief taxation totalled £2,494,637—a sum greater than income tax collections—and the expenditure amounted to £2,653,182, or £158,000 more than was collected. The amount collected was greater than that from income taxation, and there was an exemption of only £78! Surely there must be an end to all this! The unemployment percentage was only 7.9 in 1929, and it is now suggested

that it has dropped to 5.7. There cannot be any justification for continuing this enormous taxation, which is really a reduction in the purchasing power of the people. The Government are endeavouring to bring employment down to the basis of Government employment, and that is quite wrong.

The suggestion has been made that we made the accusation that the Industrial Court had been dictated to. It was contended that it must be left free and untrammelled. We made no such charges against the Government, nevertheless, the Government were particularly accurate, according to the Estimates, in anticipating the extra cost the judgment would cause. There are not many places in the Estimates where one can find out what is in the mind of the Government, but there are a few. On page 14 we find that there are two parliamentary draftsmen, the salaries of whom totalled £1,730 in 1935-36, the total reduction in salary being £305. In 1936-37 there was an increase of £20, making the total salaries £1,750, and the reductions £221, or an anticipated restoration in salaries of £84. That is roughly a reduction in salary of 2s. 7d. in the £1 last year, and an anticipated reduction of 2s. 2d. in the £1 this year, or a restoration of 5d. in the £1. Take the office of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, where the highest salary is £430. There are seven employees whose salaries total £1,675, and the anticipated reduction is £180, roughly 2s. 2d. in the £1. Last year there was one more highly-paid official. He received £425, and the total salaries for that year were £1,522, with a reduction of £153, or a reduction of 2s. in the £1.

The TREASURER: I rise to a point of order on the ground that the hon. member who has just resumed his seat is discussing the question of increased salaries to Crown employees. That matter is before the Industrial Court at the present time. That court has given a decision on general principles, but the application of those principles has still to be made. In other words, all the respective awards have yet to be made and are under consideration, and before the court at the present time. My point of order, therefore, is that the debate on these matters is out of order on the ground that matters that are sub judice should not be the subject of discussion in Committee or in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: The ordinary rule is as stated by the Premier. My difficulty, of course, is this: The statements that so far have been made by hon. members of the Opposition, and by hon. members on my right as well, have been made in the public Press by officials of public service unions. Mr. Bond, Mr. Bolger, and some other officials of public service unions have definitely criticised a certain decision. Of course, I can hardly allow members of Parliament to be stultified if unions and members of the public are to be allowed to make comments and criticisms through the public Press.

The TREASURER: Speaking to a further point of order, I desire to point out that this Parliament is not concerned with what newspapers may publish, or what people outside may do. This Parliament is governed by the Standing Orders of Parliament and parliamentary practice. Parliamentary practice prescribes that matters that are pending or before a court shall not be the subject

*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.]*

of debate. What people outside may do is not governed by the Standing Orders of Parliament. There is a vast difference between the two things. Is it not obvious that if matters pending before a court are the subject of discussion in Parliament, they are subjected to influence one way or the other? Parliamentary practice is the result of experience, and is based on sound principles. The inviolability and the independence of courts is an essential part of our Constitution, and if matters that are pending before the court or that are the subject for decision by a court are debatable in Parliament, then, to the extent that they are debatable in Parliament we are destroying the inviolability of the courts. After a decision is given by a court the matter is no longer pending, and it is open for Parliament to discuss it. Take, for example, the Dickson award made many years ago by the court. After that was given by the court and the matter was finalised, the then hon. member for Mirani moved that the decision of the judge should be set aside by Order in Council. Anything done by the court on awards generally will be subject to discussion after the awards are made, preferably in the form of a debate on a substantive motion. My point is that in accord with parliamentary practice it is improper to discuss matters pending or before the court. To do so affects the independence of the court and is contrary to sound practice. The fact that people outside Parliament make statements and the Press publishes them has no bearing on the question. We are governed by parliamentary practice and the Standing Orders. The people who are making statements outside are advocates before the court. The newspapers are entitled to report cases before the court and the advocacy of those advocates, just as they do in a criminal trial, where the newspaper is entitled to report evidence given by witnesses and the case put forward by counsel. It does not follow that because the matter is published in the Press Parliament should debate it. The point of order I take is sound, and in accordance with parliamentary practice, and a departure from it, in my view, means quite definitely a degradation of the standards of Parliament.

Mr. MAHER (*West Moreton*) [2.14 p.m.]: On the point of order, I should like to say that I think we have reached rather an extraordinary position when union advocates who are especially interested in a case such as this make public statements, and newspapers publish leading articles and news items relating to it, and any one who cares may use the correspondence columns of the newspapers to discuss it—all debating ad lib the decision of the Industrial Court—but Parliament cannot discuss it. The decision of the court has already been given. If it is a matter of implementing the scheme or applying the judgment to the public service, that is only giving effect to the decision. Everyone knows what the decision is and what it means. It is an extraordinary thing if people outside can talk about the decision as much as they like while the representatives of the people in this Chamber are hamstrung. Parliamentary practice, if it brings that state of affairs about, is entirely wrong, and the sooner it is altered the better. I think we should have freedom of expression, and that the Treasurer is ill advised to raise the point. I think that the Chairman of Com-

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*

mittees has taken the right stand: That there should be freedom of expression in this Parliament on a matter of importance. If hon. members wish to express themselves on a matter of public interest they should be able to do so while the matter is being discussed. Even if the Treasurer is able to rely on parliamentary practice in this matter, it is regrettable that he is pressing the point.

The CHAIRMAN: My information is that the question before the Industrial Court, as submitted by the public service unions, is not yet completed. If that is so I have to uphold the point of order raised by the Treasurer, as the matter is sub judice.

Mr. MOORE: I am not talking about the court at all. What I am saying is found on page 119 of the Estimates. The employees under the Income (Unemployment Relief) Tax Acts are shown. The appropriation for their salaries for 1935-36 was £8,588, less a reduction of £947.

The TREASURER: That is occasioned by automatic increases, chiefly.

Mr. MOORE: In the next column, 1936-37, we have a similar salary set out. There is an increase of four in the number of clerks and an increase of one in the clerk-typists. The amount is £10,487, and the reduction in salary is £1,021.

The TREASURER: The amount on the Estimates for increases in salaries is £63,000 in round figures. The decision, as it is calculated so far, will cost us £130,000. The increased cost of wages will have to be set out in supplementary estimates.

Mr. MOORE: I am not concerned about what will be the extra cost when final effect is given to the decision of the court. I am concerned about its application to the hon. gentleman's own Estimates. The total reduction in salaries in 1935-36 was £947 in that branch. They were all low salaries.

Mr. JESSON: On what page of the Estimates?

Mr. MOORE: On page 119. The total salaries for 1935-36 were £8,588 and the reductions £947. Then, in the next column, showing the amount required for 1936-37, the salaries amount to £10,487 and the reductions £1,021. I am only pointing out that the anticipated restoration in respect of that class of salary was 2d. in the £1. The reduction was, roughly, 2s. 2d. in the £1 last year, and this year it is 2s. in the £1. Therefore, the anticipated restoration of salaries was 2d. in the £1.

Mr. GLEDSON: What are you trying to show?

Mr. MOORE: I am showing that in respect of the lower salaries the Government anticipated a restoration of 2d. in the £1 and that in respect of higher salaries they anticipated a restoration of 5d. in the £1. I am only taking the position as it appears in the Estimates themselves.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Your speech has no reference to the point of order.

Mr. MOORE: No, not at all. I am only pointing out the anticipations or the guessings of the Government.

Mr. McLEAN: You are retracting.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member suggested that hon. members on this side

had suggested that the court had been intimidated or that there had been collusion. I am pointing out that by a coincidence the Government expected the same ratio of restoration in 1934 and in 1936-37. I am pointing out what the Government anticipated. That is all. That does not mean that there has been collusion, but it does show that minds run on a similar plane, taking all the facts into consideration. I suppose the court is just the same as the Government, and that it takes into consideration the index figure of the cost of living and all that sort of thing when it comes to fixing wages, and that when the Government prepare their Estimates they also take into consideration what the court takes into consideration. Possibly the same basis would be adopted in fixing the wages. I am only pointing that out.

Mr. JESSON: What is your objection?

Mr. MOORE: That by an extraordinary coincidence the Government's anticipations coincide with what has already been published.

Mr. JESSON: Are you sure about that?

Mr. MOORE: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They do not coincide.

Mr. MOORE: Then I cannot help it. I am taking definite instances.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Two out of thousands.

Mr. MOORE: I should like the Minister to go through the Estimates and examine the cases that are applicable. If there are high and low salaries in the one section it is difficult to arrive at my conclusion. One can see the anticipations where there are only two salaries, one at £1,100 a year and the other at £650 a year, and when we come to page 119 we find that the highest salary is £425. The same applies to friendly societies on page 51. The Estimates provide for a deputy registrar at a salary of £320 a year, for one clerk at £300 and three at £225. Then there is a record assistant and a clerk-typist at £230. They are all low salaries. They give you a guide. But you cannot get a guide where there are both high and low salaries together. I have taken the salaries that I have mentioned only because they serve as a basis and as a guide to the intentions and anticipations of the Government. There is nothing sinister in taking the salaries of those particular officers. Previously I had looked through the Budget with the object of trying to find out the anticipations of the Government and of arriving at a basis of calculation. In looking through the Estimates it is somewhat difficult in places to see the restorations that were anticipated by the Government. I wanted to find a place where I could get a basis to work on and that is why I have taken the pages that I have mentioned. I have pointed out exactly what the Government anticipated. The Treasurer said that he was 100 per cent. out in his anticipation because he thought that the restorations would amount to £65,000, whereas they are going to cost £150,000. I was only taking the basis of his anticipations.

Mr. JESSON: You were insinuating, were you not?

Mr. MOORE: You can call it insinuation if you like. One endeavours to look through

the Estimates in an intelligent way to find out the basis on which the Government are preparing them. That was what I was trying to do. I wanted to find out on what basis they anticipated reductions or increases. The easiest place I could find a satisfactory solution of that question was the ones I quoted because they were salaries of a similar size. It shows what was in the mind of the Government.

I have an advertisement here—I could only see one—that was used by our party candidate at the recent Bowen election, but I cannot see anything on it about the second vote.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. MOORE: The only card I saw was Mr. Paterson's, and he advised his supporters to give their second preference to Labour.

Mr. GLEDSON: The advertisement appealed to the Communists for their second vote.

Mr. MOORE: Not in that advertisement.

Mr. GLEDSON: Yes.

Mr. MOORE: Here it is.

Mr. GLEDSON: That is not the only one.

Mr. MOORE: Let the hon. member produce the other.

I suppose hon. members have noticed that the Victorian Parliament the other day decided to remove all liability from local authorities as regards main roads. The argument in favour of that policy was that owing to the growth of registrations and the consequent increase in revenue, and the additional revenue the Main Roads Board received as a result of the expansion in the sale of petrol, it should be in a position to meet the whole cost without calling upon the local authorities.

Here we notice, from the Estimates, that the Government have reduced the allocation of loan money to the Main Roads Commission by £300,000. They have collected £44,299 in the Heavy Vehicles Fund, and only £2,204 was paid out of it. It looks to me as if many councils, which we know are having tremendous difficulty—owing to the interest and redemption they have to pay on some of the very expensive main roads in their areas—to meet their liabilities, are being induced to accept further liabilities, or place themselves in the position that if they do not accept further liability in the way of subsidy-loans they will be contributing to the benefits other areas enjoy, without obtaining anything themselves. People do not like to be placed in that position. They think that if there is anything going and they have to contribute to it, they should get their share; consequently, they are placing liabilities on their shoulders that will be a tremendous burden on them in the near future.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In Victoria, is not the charge to local authorities only three-fourteenths?

Mr. MOORE: On a big proportion of it, the part constructed from Federal aid money.

Mr. DUNSTAN: For many years they charged more than that.

Mr. MOORE: In the same way that we did for many years. It was only when the Moore Government came in that we reduced the charge. Prior to that it was 50 per cent. The three-fourteenths only applied where Federal aid was given, but my Government made it all three-fourteenths.

*Mr. Moore.]*

An endeavour is being made to push the responsibility of finding work for the unemployed on the local authorities by the use of subsidy-loans. They are being induced to undertake work that they otherwise would not do and that they really cannot afford but they feel that if they do not do it they still have to contribute and they would get no return. We know what happens. We know that in some places schools and churches get the benefit of relief labour, but when you get to the country districts you can get none of that. There is none available. The Treasurer himself stated that one of the reasons for introducing the subsidy-loans was to give these places an opportunity to secure some of the benefits from it. Then you get the local authority looking around to see where they can spend money, realising they have to contribute to the £340,000 subsidy to Brisbane, to the £350,000 subsidy to Mackay, and the £125,000 subsidy to Toowoomba. They feel that if they have to contribute to all those things, they must see what they can do to get a small share. Consequently, they are being pushed into extravagant administration and into doing work they could do without. It may be a convenience, but if it can't be afforded it is extravagant. A budget should be framed on what they can afford, but these local authorities are placing burdens on the shoulders of the people of the future in their determination to participate in the subsidies granted by the Government.

Then we come to the point that men are being enticed from their ordinary vocations to works financed by subsidy-loans. As such works are completed the workmen do not return to their former vocations, but the local authority seeks further subsidy-loans for social works or money for main roads work to keep them in that form of employment. A very serious position has arisen, and it must be given some thought. It cannot be brushed airily aside by hon. members opposite with the comment that we on this side wish to exploit labour. It is not that at all, but the division and allocation of labour throughout the State that is involved. If the conditions and terms are made more attractive in these callings the greater the difficulty the important industries of the State will have in functioning. The Assistant Treasurer recognises that the primary industries are of immense importance to Australia, and if the supply of labour is gradually drawn from them by more attractive conditions in other callings financed by unemployment relief funds that trickle back in subsidy-loans it means that the primary industries must contend with greater difficulty.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Shire councils get subsidy-loans.

Mr. MOORE: That is what I am drawing attention to. Men are drawn away from their ordinary vocations by reason of the more attractive terms on works financed by subsidy-loans. The local authorities in many instances do not want these works, but accept them because they feel that if they do not get them done they are contributing to works in other centres and getting nothing in return.

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

[Mr. Moore.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Enoggera*) [2.32 p.m.]: Imagine the hon. member for Aubigny standing in this Chamber and telling the Committee that the people in the country should not have employment! Boiled down, that is the effect of the remarks of the hon. member. I am surprised at him. On another occasion he complained as to the taxation levied on the rural districts, and the greater proportion being expended in the city, but to-day he alters his ground and very bitterly complains that the local authorities are forced to take up subsidy-loans—those are the words that he used—against their best interests, although it means that the workers in the country can be found employment. It is extraordinary that in this Chamber there is at least one hon. member who does not believe that the people in the country should get employment.

The hon. member for Aubigny also complained that people in the country were being drawn away from their ordinary vocations. Does he mean that the ordinary vocation of a worker in a country district is to be an "unemployed stiff"? Farm labourers are not being taken off farms and given employment in works financed by the local authority's subsidy-loan.

Mr. NIMMO: Of course they are.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is absolute nonsense, and the hon. member knows that no man will leave a permanent job on a farm or a station to go on to relief work.

Mr. NIMMO: You meet them every day in the city.

Mr. TAYLOR: The system of the engagement of labour will not permit that, and consequently when one hears such a statement from the lips of an hon. member with a political experience of that of the hon. member of Aubigny one begins to wonder what class of representation the country people are getting in this Chamber. The unemployment relief tax is the means of doing a very valuable work, and without it there would be thrown on the people and on the Government of the State an aggregation of unemployed that would be a menace. And the hon. member knows it. He knows perfectly well that if the number of unemployed who are now getting at least from one day's work to three or four days, even if only on relief work, was augmented by an additional 20,000 that menace would be greater. The subsidy-loan programme keeps a lot of men off relief work. The Government are giving of their best.

What would happen, for instance, if the local authorities could not participate in the benefits derived from the Government's expenditure of the unemployment relief tax? Does the hon. member for Aubigny mean to say that it is not beneficial for a local authority to do work by means of a 50 per cent. loan and 50 per cent. subsidy? Does he believe that it would be better to wait until that work had to be done of necessity and that then the local authority should be forced to bear the full 100 per cent. of the cost? Is that not dealing with the matter in a rather ambiguous way?

The point I wish to emphasise this afternoon is that I believe that we have the responsibility of finding employment for the unemployed. I believe also that enough has not been done for the unemployed because

under the capitalistic system private enterprise, in which hon. members opposite are interested, has fallen down on its job. Those who own and control industry owe an obligation to the State. That obligation is to provide employment for those who live in the State. It is not to the credit of the hon. member for Aubigny or other hon. members opposite that they should deal with the question in the way in which they have dealt with it to-day.

Mr. RUSSELL (*Hamilton*) [2.37 p.m.]: The hon. member for Enoggera has said that private enterprise has fallen down on its job. It is no wonder that private enterprise has to some extent broken down, although it has made strenuous efforts to carry on under the tremendous burden of taxation that is levied upon it. The taxation on companies is destroying a very useful institution that was inaugurated in the British Empire many years ago for the purpose of encouraging persons with small capital to band together and enter into enterprise. The taxation in Queensland is diametrically opposed to the formation of such companies. I say that private enterprise has not failed, but that the party now in power have, ever since they have been in office, made every effort to kill private enterprise.

What have they done themselves through their incursion on the domains of private enterprise? We all know of the tremendous failures that were made by Labour in the enterprises they took over. We hear nothing of them to-day. As a matter of fact, they admit their failure, and have "dropped their bundle" with regard to the control of enterprise by the State. The less control we have by the State, the better it will be for the State. The State exists, I take it, for the purpose of seeing that justice is preserved, that there shall be no exploitation by one man of another, or by one class of another class, and—certainly—to encourage initiative and enterprise, and I believe that by that means and that means only can this State hope to prosper.

A good deal of discussion has centred around the public servants' salaries. I understand that a certain ruling has been given, a ruling that we cannot criticise a judgment, and I do not desire to transgress, although that judgment has been announced and is now public property. Whilst I know that you have ruled, Mr. Hanson, that the matter is still sub judice, although the court has announced its decision, nevertheless the matter is public property. I shall confine my remarks, however, chiefly, to the question of arbitration and the methods that were pursued by the Moore Government in dealing with the public servants. I emphatically deny the statement made by the hon. member for Bundaberg and the hon. member for Baroona, that we are endeavouring to break down the system of arbitration, that our party is opposed to arbitration, and that we are in alliance with the Communists. We know that the Communists are in alliance with the Socialists, who have declared their opposition to arbitration. They want direct action. That is the policy of the Socialists, who are the twin brothers of the Communists. It is a fact that their votes always go to Labour. We get none, nor do we expect them. As a matter of fact, the system of arbitration was not devised by the Labour Party or by the Socialists. They announced

their decided opposition to arbitration when it was first mooted many years ago.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Who gets the No. 2 vote?

Mr. RUSSELL: The Communists vote Labour always. We do not get them and we do not expect them. The whole party is white-anted by communistic doctrines. Our objective is co-operation, which, to my way of thinking, is the best antidote to Socialism and Communism.

Mr. TAYLOR: Your chief, McCann, did not say that in the Press this morning.

Mr. RUSSELL: He is not my chief. As it is now, the whole system of arbitration is based on the liberal policy introduced many years ago, despite the opposition of labour unions who were not willing to forgo the weapon of the strike. They held that arbitration was a nefarious scheme foisted on them by the employers to deny them the right of striking. I think that reasonable men on both sides of this Chamber will agree with me that the strike is a barbarous weapon and should be discarded, certainly not encouraged. Are we going to settle our disputes like reasonable men by arbitration? The system was introduced by such notably liberal thinkers as William Pember Reeves, Alfred Deakin, and Charles Cameron Kingston. Many years afterwards a Labour Party man, Chris. Watson, acknowledged his conversion to the principles of arbitration. The first arbitration measure introduced into Queensland was not put in the statute-books by the Labour Party. I admit that it has been necessary to amend the legislation to keep it abreast of the times, but no one wants to go back to the law of the jungle and to use the strike to settle disputes.

There are many unions that would prefer the strike weapon to the court. The Australian Workers' Union itself, which has always been held up as one of the prime exponents of arbitration, to my way of thinking, sadly neglected its duty in the sugar strike by allowing it to continue for such a long period, evidently afraid to fall foul of its supporters, the Communists. The abattoir strike was another example, and the Government allowed it to proceed to the detriment of many thousands of people.

In regard to the present issue relating to the public service, I well remember when the Moore Government took the public service away from the jurisdiction of the Industrial Court. The present Treasurer and his colleagues made a great outcry about outlawing citizens of Queensland. That was one of their election cries in 1932, and it was repeated in 1935. It was said that the Government led by Mr. Moore had "brutally outlawed" a number of our citizens by refusing the right of access to the court.

Mr. TAYLOR: That was correct. The people said so.

Mr. RUSSELL: It is quite correct that they were taken from the jurisdiction of the court at the time, in pursuance of certain arrangements made between the Premiers of the States under the Premiers' Plan, whereby it was decided that there should be a reduction all round in the wages of public servants, the cost of social services, and in many other avenues of expenditure. I think that the Moore Government took the only honourable course in refusing to dictate to the court what it

*Mr. Russell.]*

should do. We preferred that the court should be free, and uninfluenced by any political party, and took the manly course of withdrawing the Crown servants from the jurisdiction of the court and applying reductions to their salaries as agreed upon by the Premiers of the various States. (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RUSSELL: The present Government were of a different opinion. They contended that the Government in office then, if they were bound to reduce the salaries, should take the matter to the court. I did not hold that view at all. I do not believe in dictation to a court by any political party. If the present Government wished to restore the salaries of public servants the right procedure was to restore the salaries themselves and not take the public servants to the Industrial Court. The reductions having been effected by the Moore Government, if the present Government did not believe in them, they should have restored them in part or in full themselves and not resorted to the subterfuge of taking the public servants to the court after waiting for a period of two years before attempting to fulfil one of their election promises.

Mr. McLEAN: You are not suggesting that this Government suggested to the court—

Mr. RUSSELL: I am not suggesting anything. As to whether the restorations are sufficient or not, I leave that for the moment, because I am afraid that if I dealt with it I should be treading on rather dangerous ground and be ruled out of order.

There was one significant statement by a union secretary in the newspaper, I think yesterday morning, that the members of the State Parliamentary Labour Party were to be supplied with a resume of the case. The assumption is that no resume of the case will be submitted to members of the Opposition. I am sorry indeed that that union has taken a strictly partisan view. So far as I am personally concerned, I want to see the public servants receive justice. That is all that I want.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: Then why did you not do it when your Government were in power?

Mr. RUSSELL: It must be admitted that the Government of the day did the right thing in reducing the salaries in conformity with the all-round drop that took place in Australia.

It has been alleged to-day that the percentage of unemployment is only 5 per cent., and if that is so, what justification is there for any reduction in wages at all? We must analyse that statement very carefully before we can believe that only five people out of every 100 are unemployed, as against three times that number in 1930. As a matter of fact, that percentage applies only to trades unionists, and we know very well that it is difficult to obtain the services of bona fide artisans. They are all in employment. The biggest number of unemployed exists amongst the unskilled workers and the majority of them are members of the Australian Workers' Union, a union that does not return any unemployment figures. Therefore, 5 per cent. may be the correct proportion of unemployed unionists registered with the court, but it is safe to assume that the ratio of unemployment

[Mr. Russell.

generally is very much greater than that, because we know that the largest union, which embraces a big section of unskilled workers, makes no return whatever. If 5 per cent. is the correct ratio, why are things not booming to-day, and why is it necessary to continue the reductions in public servants' salaries? The Government have no case, and there is no doubt that they have failed miserably in carrying out their pre-election promise.

Mr. O'KEEFE: I remember when you were a member of the Australian Workers' Union.

Mr. RUSSELL: I?

Mr. O'KEEFE: Yes. You were kicked out.

Mr. RUSSELL: I never belonged to a union in my life.

Mr. BRASSINGTON: That is to your discredit.

Mr. RUSSELL: I preferred to be free and untrammelled, and not dictated to by anybody.

The hon. member for Rockhampton made a very remarkable speech to-day, and as usual endeavoured to take us off the track by discrediting the Commonwealth Government. It was the same old method of attack—when you find yourself in a corner, blame somebody else. According to the hon. member for Rockhampton all the troubles of Queensland are due to the present Commonwealth Administration, whom he describes as a rabble.

Mr. WATERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RUSSELL: If hon. members opposite want an example of a rabble I commend to them the Federal Labour Party—one of the biggest rabbles ever seen in the history of politics in Australia.

I think that the reference by the hon. member for Rockhampton to a trade war with Japan was somewhat unwise at this juncture, although he is only following the example of his chief, who recently rushed into print in an endeavour to belittle the Lyons Government by making sweeping accusations against them in regard to their present trade policy. I think that it is unwise at this juncture when negotiations are proceeding that politicians should rush in and air their views in an endeavour to inflame the populace and so create prejudice. In contradistinction to the Treasurer and the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Curtin, the Federal Labour Leader, has refrained from in any way attempting to interfere with these negotiations, recognising that they are of a very delicate nature. Not until the negotiations are finalised and the result is published should the politicians rush into print and air their views. The Treasurer and his henchman, the hon. member for Rockhampton, are endeavouring to score a temporary advantage on their opponents.

I believe, however, in all fairness to the Federal Government, it is desirable to state what their attitude is in regard to Japan without in any way expressing an opinion as to what should be done. It is right that the public should know where the Commonwealth Government stand in regard to this very important question. Quite recently the Treasurer stated—

“The effect of the Lyons Government policy has been to antagonise one of

Australia's best customers—Japan—to place Australian producers in an unfair and unsafe position, and to affect detrimentally our hope of building up."

Then he says—

"The Lyons Government have already destroyed the direct Australian trade in wheat with Japan and Manchukuo. They have damaged the Australian beef trade with Japan, and detrimentally affected the great wool trade with those countries."

That represents in a nutshell the attitude of the Labour Party in this Chamber. The Labour Party in the Federal Parliament, who say they are there to preserve Australian national ideals and high standards of living, have refrained from expressing any opinion. It is left to the State politicians to obscure the position.

The following statement by Sir Henry Gullett clearly indicates the attitude of the Federal Government in regard to this important question:—

"It should be understood that the dispute with Japan arises from the policy which the Government has found it neces-

sary to adopt in the interests of producers of primary goods for export.

"The United Kingdom is overwhelmingly Australia's best customer for primary products as a whole, the only considerable customer for certain important lines, and the best individual customer even for Australia's wool and wheat.

"It must be patent that we could not reasonably expect the United Kingdom to continue to extend substantial tariff preferences and quota considerations to Australian primary producers and to safeguard their position in the British market unless the Commonwealth on its part was prepared to extend reciprocal treatment to the most important item in British trade, viz., textiles—more particularly as several agricultural countries would readily facilitate the entry of British textiles in exchange for the same benefits as Australian agricultural products are to-day deriving from their preferential position in the British market."

The following table sets out the purchases by the United Kingdom and Japan respectively of Australian wool, wheat, and flour for the year 1934-35:—

| Purchases by—          | Wool<br>(Greasy). | Wool<br>(Scoured). | Wheat.    | Flour.            |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|
|                        | £                 | £                  | £         | £                 |
| United Kingdom .. .. . | 13,500,000 (A)    | 2,343,000          | 6,362,000 | 632,000           |
| Japan .. .. .          | 8,600,000 (A)     | 33,000             | 2,274,000 | (practically nil) |

The total purchases of the United Kingdom amounted to £63,500,000 (Australian) and Japan's to £12,000,000 (Australian).

In regard to other export commodities the following figures are interesting:—

|                  | United Kingdom. | Japan. |
|------------------|-----------------|--------|
|                  | £               | £      |
| Butter .. .. .   | 8,916,000       | 2,000  |
| Meat .. .. .     | 7,514,000       | 28,000 |
| Pig lead .. .. . | 2,328,000       | 26,000 |

That disposes of the statement that we have destroyed valuable markets in many of these commodities.

The Commonwealth Government, in a recent pamphlet issued by them, say—

"The Commonwealth Government is genuinely desirous of maintaining and improving commercial relations with Japan, but it should be apparent that in the interests of producers, the Government cannot ignore the trade position of other countries. The fact that by value Japan has progressed each year from the position of supplying 2.9 per cent. of Australia's import trade to 6.4 per cent. last year and this, notwithstanding the halving of Japanese values as a result of currency depreciation, is irrefutable evidence of the favourable treatment accorded to Japanese goods as a whole. No other country can show anything approaching the same improvement in trade with Australia.

"When it is said that Japan buys more from us than she sells to us it should be borne in mind that the sales to us are almost entirely of completely

manufactured goods, whereas our exports to Japan consist mainly of wool—out of which the manufacturers and traders make far more money than is made by the manufacturers in Australia—and of wheat, which is milled for re-export as flour in competition with Australian flour. In view of these facts the trading balance between the two countries is not disadvantageous to Japan. Of all foreign countries buying our wool Japan enjoys the best trade balance with us."

I merely bring forward these facts in order that we might get the right perspective, and I urge on hon. members to cease their adverse criticism of the Commonwealth Government until the negotiations are finalised. It is to be hoped that an agreement will be entered into that will prove mutually satisfactory, and I object to Labour politicians rushing into print on every possible occasion to score off the Commonwealth Government. If it is not sampans, then it is Fiji bananas—any weapon at all to attack the National Government—and there is no foundation in truth of any of their allegations.

Mr. KING: Those statements are too general. You cannot get away with it like that.

Mr. RUSSELL: If the hon. member wishes he can reply to them. There is plenty of time.

As I have said, the time has arrived when the whole matter of unemployment relief taxation should be very carefully examined. Why is it found necessary to-day to extract from the public the sum of £2,500,000 annually when the ratio of unemployment is

*Mr. Russell.]*



infinitesimal as compared even with 1929 when the proportion was about 8 per cent. or 9 per cent., and there was no unemployment relief taxation at all, especially when in addition to the sum the Government raise by taxation they spend at the rate of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000 annually from extra loan funds.

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

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*) [3.2 p.m.]: I say definitely that the funds distributed by the Secretary for Labour and Industry are devoted to a very useful purpose. In the district I represent they have been spent in providing work and wages for men who have been unemployed for a considerable time, and who would not have found employment had it not been for this expenditure. The Ipswich City Council has taken advantage of the loan-subsidy and given a number of otherwise unemployed persons full-time work. Moreover, in certain districts works are in progress where the workmen are getting full-time employment financed partly from this fund. It is very simple for hon. members opposite to assert that the unemployment relief taxation should be reduced, but if that were done there would not be sufficient finance to provide these men with work. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition objected to the Unemployment Relief Fund being used to subsidise local authorities, but he must remember that that money has to be found somewhere, and if it were not collected by way of unemployment relief taxation it would have to be by way of taxation of some other kind. The Government have no magic wand to wave and bring down a shower of gold.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is a double tax.

Mr. GLEDSON: No double taxation is placed on the people, and the hon. member knows that the taxation was reduced last year, one-third of the tax was taken off on all of the lower incomes. It would be extremely pleasant if the Government could reduce this taxation, but considering that men are still unemployed it would be a criminal act on the part of any Government to do so.

There are certain things, of course, that could be done if the Queensland Government had power to do just what they desire to do. Although the hon. member for Hamilton may complain in this Chamber about the speech of the hon. member for Rockhampton, and ask why the hon. member for Rockhampton should seek to cast the responsibility on the Federal Government and charge the Federal Government with not carrying out their duty, everyone must agree that the State Governments are restricted from doing what they like to do, and would do, if they were in a position to carry out their wishes. They are restricted so long as the Federal Government have control over customs, excise, banking, credit, and finance, and other similar important matters. I think the hon. member for Rockhampton was quite right. I am sure the hon. member for Hamilton would agree with me if he would only take the time to study what the hon. member for Rockhampton did say, and not read into his speech something that he did not say.

The hon. member for Rockhampton said that the Commonwealth Government should co-operate with the State Governments in

[*Mr. Russell.*

an endeavour to provide work and wages for the whole of the unemployed of the Commonwealth. There are many avenues in which they could co-operate. But as the hon. member for Hamilton knows, instead of utilising their surplus funds for this purpose, the Federal Government have removed certain taxes from the shoulders of those people who could very well afford to continue paying them until conditions improved still further. The removal of that taxation has not made the slightest difference to the unemployed of the Commonwealth. If that taxation had been continued and the money used in the best interests of the workless, of whom there are 300,000 in the Commonwealth, the country would have benefited a great deal more.

I do not intend to follow along the lines adopted by hon. members opposite in their speeches to-day, but I should like to say that the whole of their speeches on this matter have been most unworthy. The hon. member for Isis started off by talking about what we were not doing. He said we should have made a full restoration of the cut that was taken from the public servants by the Moore Government in 1929. In the next breath he says that we should reduce the taxation we are taking for the services of the State. That was the general tenor of the speeches of hon. members opposite to-day. We cannot have both full restoration of those cuts and reduced taxation at the same time. The hon. member for Isis should realise that if we are to make the restoration he suggests the Government must obtain money for the services of the State. The Government are only the custodians for the people's money, and they must get what is necessary for the purpose of providing them with necessary services.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition accused hon. members on this side of the Chamber of working hand in glove with the Communists and appealing to the Communists for their support at the Bowen by-election. The hon. member produced an advertisement claiming that it proved that there was no appeal to the Communists. I say emphatically that the National Party, or the Country Party, did appeal for the second preference vote of the Communists at the Bowen by-election. I have here a paper called the "Bowen Independent" of Wednesday, 17th June, 1936. In it there is an advertisement in large type that hon. members can read from the far side of the Chamber, signed and authorised by J. J. McDonald, Powell street, Bowen.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:  
Not the J. J. McDonald!

Mr. GLEDSON: J. J. McDonald, of Powell street, Bowen. That is the gentleman who met the Leader of the Opposition when he went up there, and congratulated him upon his appointment, and took him round the Bowen electorate.

Mr. MAHER: I did not occupy the position at that time.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION interjected.

Mr. MULLER: We will send him to Ipswich shortly. (Laughter.)

Mr. GLEDSON: I lived for five weeks with him in the same hotel at Bowen, and I know the gentleman very well. I shall be glad to see him at Ipswich at the next

election. It would suit me very well. It says in this advertisement—

“If you vote for Communist, Douglas Credit, or the Independent Candidates,

“YOU MUST BE OPPOSED TO LABOUR.

“So fortify your desire, and make it a certainty, with your No. 2 vote for John Smith in the bottom square, but an appeal is made to you to

“VOTE FOR THE FARMER CANDIDATE  
“1. JOHN SMITH.”

He was the candidate in the interests of the Country Party.

Mr. BRAND: We did not have the compromise that you had. (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAHER: It is an entirely different statement to what was made before.

Mr. GLEDSON: The position is that an appeal was made by the Country Party for the second preference votes of the Communist and Douglas Credit candidates.

Mr. BRAND: We did not have a compromise.

Mr. GLEDSON: You had no compromise. You asked straight out.

Mr. BRAND: You had the compromise.

Mr. GLEDSON: Hon. members opposite asked them straight out for their support. From the platform, in their meetings, in the advertisements signed by their agent, they say to the electors, “You are opposed to Labour. We want your second preference vote for the Country Party candidate.” I was challenged to produce evidence, and I have done so, and it will be in “Hansard” now, so that anyone can see the connection between the Country Party and the Communists and the Douglas Party, who are all coalesced and opposed to the Labour Party. They say, “We are all opposed to the Labour Party: if you are voting for Communists give us your second preference vote.” That is the appeal they made at the last by-election.

Mr. BRAND: It was only an appeal.

Mr. GLEDSON: There is no objection to their doing that, but when hon. members in this Chamber, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for Hamilton, say that the party on this side are the brothers of the Communists, that we all are Socialists and all brothers and all working together, they are inconsistent in saying also to the Communists, “You are all opposed to Labour: you and we are in the same boat, and we want you to give us your second preference votes.” If they want to appeal for votes in that way we have no objection, but let them own up to it. They go to some electorates where there is no Communist candidate, and they say, “We have nothing to do with the Communists.” Then they go into another electorate where a Communist is standing, and they say, “We are your brothers; you know that we are all opposed to the Labour Party, and if you cannot give us your No. 1 vote then give us your No. 2 vote, and we shall be able to beat the Labour Party.” Let them be honest and stand to that if they believe it. (Laughter.)

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) [3.17 p.m.]: It is rather regrettable that the debate has taken such a turn as it has.

Mr. POWER: It is very regrettable for you. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: The Assistant Treasurer is getting as bad as the rest. It is no credit to hon. members that they have talked in the strain that they have on such an important vote. At the same time it would not be fair or just to allow them to get away with such statements—not that they injure the party on this side of the Committee, for we know that we shall not lose one vote by it in the country, for the reason that country people think for themselves, and that is more than some hon. members do—(interruption)—at any time.

Mr. JESSON: You are in the soup.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member would look well in the soup. Here is a statement from the Communist Party of Australia, issued by the tens of thousands and distributed all over the Bowen electorate.

Mr. COLLINS: Who issued it?

Mr. EDWARDS: It is issued by the party. It says—

“WHICH PARTY AND WHICH CANDIDATE.

“If you clear your minds of all prejudice, and carefully weigh the policies of each party standing a candidate in this by-election, you will, in fairness to yourselves and to your children, give your No. 1 vote to the candidate of the Communist Party, and your No. 2 vote to the candidate of the Labour Party.”

That places the matter in a different light altogether. That pamphlet, distributed at every turn, urges the people to vote (1) for Paterson and (2) for E. J. Riordan. I do not wish to say anything personal against the hon. member for Bowen, but he knows as well as I do that during the last Federal election campaign he was on the platform with the Communist candidates—

Mr. RIORDAN: That is a misstatement.

Mr. EDWARDS: . . . advocating their policy. Hon. members opposite cannot have it both ways. There is no getting away from that. Let us consider the objective of the Labour Party and compare it with the objective of the Communist Party.

Mr. GLEDSON: Who signed that pamphlet?

Mr. EDWARDS: Are they not both the same? It is a pamphlet that was issued by the Australian Communist Party.

Mr. GLEDSON: Signed by J. J. McDonald?

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member is suspicious of J. J. McDonald. This is printed on the bottom of the pamphlet—“J. C. Henry, Room 2, Turton's Chambers, Stoke street, Townsville.” Now, does the hon. member want to know anything more?

Hon. members opposite—especially the hon. member for Ipswich—know that the communistic policy is the policy of the party opposite. When the hon. member spoke a moment ago he said that it was impossible to reduce taxation under present conditions and he congratulated the Government and

*Mr. Edwards.]*

the Minister concerned upon doing a lot of good with the income from unemployment relief tax by distributing it in various ways. What did he mean by that? He meant that the Government were carrying out the communistic policy. He must know, just as any other hon. member who considers the question must know, that the burden of taxation on industry to-day is killing it, and driving primary producers out of their business. In that way they are achieving their desires. They are endeavouring to achieve the objective that they failed to achieve when they launched a policy of State enterprises. They thought they could achieve their objective in that way, but they did not have enough ability amongst them to manage the State enterprises long enough and so they failed. Now they are adopting a policy of peaceful penetration, a policy of heavy taxation on industry so as to drive people out of business one by one to congregate in the large centres of population where the Government may have control of them. That is definitely and purely the communistic system, and my statement cannot be denied. I say very definitely that from what I know of hon. members opposite 50 per cent. of them stand for the Communist movement to-day. (Government dissent.) It is absolutely correct and hon. members opposite know it. When they think that there is no newspaper representative about they quote Russia, anything at all that will bring about the downfall of industry and the capitalistic system so that everything may be controlled by the Government. That is exactly what has happened in Russia, and what is happening in other parts of the world to-day.

I have repeatedly said that the Labour Party are a distinct advantage in this State as being a safety-valve between Communism and the capitalistic system, but the camouflage policy that they are now pursuing is a most dangerous one, and it is ushering in Communism quicker than ever we thought it would be brought into this country. This State has got nearer the communistic system than any other State in Australia since the days of Mr. Jack Lang in New South Wales. No other State is nearer that system, and I intend to prove my statement by quoting the remarks of the Secretary for Public Lands. He is not going to get away with the answer that he gave to the Leader of the Opposition the other day in connection with the cutting out of interest, I intend to quote from "Hansard" to show what he actually did say and to show where the party stand.

When speaking on the Debt Conversion Agreement Bill on the 23rd June, 1931, the Secretary for Public Lands made the following statement, which is to be found on pages 3 and 4 of "Hansard" for that year:—

"Action is now being taken in regard to interest, and, although there is only a paltry 22½ per cent. reduction involved in this measure, we welcome the Bill, although it is belated. If we could, we would increase the reduction to 50 per cent., and even more, but we realise that the amount now stated is the greatest extent to which the money power will go. . . . I want the interest-mongers, not only in Australia but of the world, to sacrifice all their interest. (Government interruption.) There are people in Brisbane to-day who are starving. . . . If the Premiers' Conference had done the

[Mr. Edwards.

right thing, they would have devised plans to wipe out the whole interest burden. . . . If we on this side had power to do so, we would reduce the burden of interest payment to nil."

Is the statement that was made by the hon. member for Enoggera any worse than that statement? I say definitely it is not. It is exactly the same statement, but being a private member, the hon. member for Enoggera is forced to make an apology in this Chamber and the Secretary for Public Lands gets away with it.

I ask: "Where are the Government going to? What is their policy in regard to money matters?" The hon. member for Ipswich appears to be proud of the fact that money is being taken from the people by heavy taxation and spent. Is the hon. member aware of the fact that many people, who are called upon to pay unemployment relief tax, have not enough food for their families? The hon. member does not appear to have given enough study to the matter to know that that is happening. The result is that these people are driven off their farms and eventually migrate to Brisbane or some other large city and are forced to appeal to the Government for employment.

Mr. GARR interjected.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member is not likely to do anything but pat himself on the back. Pride has got the best of him and he has got the worst. There are scores of instances in this State where a man, his wife, and family work all the year and after paying doctors, chemists, and dentists' bills and purchasing food and clothing for himself and family he has not one penny left at the end of the year; but notwithstanding that, the Commissioner of Taxes calls upon him to pay unemployment relief tax. It is a sorry plight for the people of this great State to be in.

I have always contended that there should be no unemployment for those who desire to work, in a State like Queensland. No other State has the potentialities for development as Queensland, but what are we doing to encourage its development? The policy of the Government is causing people to migrate to the cities or towns where they obtain rations or relief work. I appeal to the Government to alter their policy, if it is possible for them to move hand or foot without the control that is exercised over them by outside forces. They are not the Government of Queensland to-day; the Queensland Central Executive are the people who are governing this State.

Mr. POWER: J. J. McDonald controls your party.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. member was as free to speak his opinion as I have been since I have been in this Parliament he might be expressing different views to-day. If the Government desire to do the right thing, they should alter their policy and spend the money in developing the country districts. It is no use making a comparison of the amount spent in the country with the amount in the city. The city can look after itself. Work should be carried out for the development of the country. If the policy of the Government were the reverse of what it is, not only the present unemployed in Queensland, but thousands of additional men could be given work. Are the Government

sincere, are they honest in their endeavours? I am afraid they are not. My fear is that they are attempting to bring about the very state of things that I have suggested, to have the people dependent on them. And that is the principle of Communism all the world over.

Mr. WATERS: Nonsense!

Mr. EDWARDS: They endeavour to get the people into such a condition that they have always to be dependent on those in authority. That is quite wrong. It is impossible to build a nation by this method.

Mr. WATERS: What did they do in Germany?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: You ought to be there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Kelvin Grove must observe my call to order. He is not entitled to interrupt the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. WATERS: I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: The only method of encouraging independence among a people is to allow them to earn something for themselves, give them an outlook, something to aim at, but not to encourage them to come to the Government for every little thing they want. That is absolutely wrong. Hon. members know how many come to them pleading for something.

Mr. JESSON: Don't look at me.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is certain that the hon. member could not give them anything. Never at any time were all the people in this or the other Australian States employed. There has always been a certain percentage of unemployment, and it is foolish for hon. members to make statements that the Government should not do this or that until every man and woman are in employment. When I was a boy and there was work staring everybody in the face there were as many swagmen on the road as to-day.

Mr. WATERS: That is not a fact.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member would not know anything about it. Nevertheless that is correct. If the unemployment statistics in Queensland are correct the unemployment relief tax could be abolished. The Government should encourage the people to go out into the country districts by expending money in those areas. There are hundreds camped along the beaches of Queensland to-day.

Mr. JESSON: Where did they come from?

Mr. EDWARDS: From the hon. member's district mostly, owing to the representation that they are getting. There are hundreds of men camped along the beaches of Queensland and at the seaside resorts, and the Government are responsible. All they do is a bit of fishing and collecting rations. They are living on that. It is to be regretted. It is a sorry sight for a State like Queensland. The Treasurer and his Ministers are forever asserting that they have improved the position of the State.

Mr. JESSON: They have.

Mr. EDWARDS: The marvellous thing about it all is their self-complacency, but a self-satisfied person is never likely to improve

anything. But can it be said that the position has improved? Admittedly it has in the city, but that has been brought about by the expenditure in the city and the encouragement of the people to come to the metropolis. There is no improvement in the rural districts. Conditions are as bad as formerly, and the settlers are shouldering such a heavy burden of taxation and overhead costs that it is impossible for them to develop the country successfully, as they should.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Bowen*) [3.35 p.m.]: It was not my intention to rise in this debate, and I should not have done so had it not been necessary to record in "Hansard" a refutation of an empty statement coming from an empty head—that of the hon. member for Nanango—that the hon. member for Bowen had appeared on the communist platform during the last Federal elections. That is an absolute lie. It may be unparliamentary, but hon. members know what I mean.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "lie."

Mr. RIORDAN: I withdraw it. It was a misstatement. I would much rather appear on the platform of the Communist Party than on the platform of the party opposite, which is purely a Fascist party.

The statements made by hon. members opposite on every possible occasion when dealing with the important question of the unemployed of this State, their methods of utilising propaganda of the kind that has been used in other countries for the purpose of rallying support to their side, their pandering to the unemployed by flinging out promises that they know are empty, their pandering to the public servants and various other sections of the community, in an endeavour to win their support—all this is the same sort of thing that has been done in another part of the world by the Fascist party, where it is now in control.

Mr. BRAND: Do you prefer Communism to Fascism?

Mr. RIORDAN: I prefer anything to a Fascist. The hon. member for Hamilton, on two occasions in this Chamber, has offered us antidotes for Communism and Socialism, but he has never on any occasion made mention of Fascism. We, on this side, know that that is because hon. members opposite have Fascist tendencies. I say emphatically that during the Bowen by-election the Nationalist-Country Party certainly did make an appeal to the Communist Party for support.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not true.

Mr. RIORDAN: It is true. J. J. McDonald, an organiser of the Country Party, signed his name to that advertisement that is an appeal for Communist support.

Mr. BRAND: That was only an appeal.

Mr. RIORDAN: I say it is an appeal. The Country Party were prepared to appeal to anybody in their endeavour to defeat the Labour Party's candidate.

Mr. EDWARDS: You know that the Communists' second vote put you in.

Mr. RIORDAN: I do not know that, because I won on the first vote. I do know that the Nationalist Party lost votes

*Mr. Riordan.]*

in the last Bowen by-election, and in spite of that they continue to rise in this Committee and attempt to prove that we appealed to the Communist Party for their second preference votes. We have proof that the party opposite did that. They certainly have no proof that we did it. The pamphlet that was read by an hon. member of the Opposition was signed by a member of the Country Party.

There is a suggestion that ours was a whispering campaign. It could not have been a dirtier or filthier whispering campaign than that conducted by the Country Party. I did not desire to rake up any muck, but the Opposition raised the matter in a way that certainly does not redound to their credit. They used a decent honest old farmer named John Smith to carry on a slanderous campaign against the Labour Party. They conducted their campaign in the Bowen by-election as if it were a by-election or an election in a sewer.

Mr. MAHER: I never said anything slanderous.

Mr. RIORDAN: You did not say anything slanderous yourself, but you allowed your party to carry on with a slanderous campaign, and you got out of that slander under the name of Whittick.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MAHER: I never saw that.

Mr. RIORDAN: But everybody else did. I have already denied the statement that I appeared on the Communist platform during the last Bowen by-election. I say emphatically that the Bowen Essential Service Association, the officials of which are the leading officials of the Nationalist-Country Party in the Bowen electorate, is purely a Fascist association, and that those officials definitely did approach a member of the Labour Party in Bowen with a bribe to stand and split the Labour votes at that by-election. We can get proof of all these things if that is necessary. During the Bowen by-election also the hon. member for Albert admitted in Home Hill one night that hon. members opposite could never again, or not for a good number of years at least, expect to become a Government. That statement was made in my hearing by the hon. member for Albert when in Home Hill. I think the hon. member for Cunningham was with him.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I did not say it in just those words.

Mr. RIORDAN: Not just in those words, but near enough. I made that statement the other day in this Chamber and hon. members opposite challenged it. The hon. member for Albert definitely did make that statement on the street corner in Home Hill. He said, "We do not expect ever to be the Government again, and if we do it will not be for a good number of years, but we want a real live, virile Opposition."

As another instance of what they are prepared to do, when the Country Party as such began operations recently, they went round with a list collecting funds from the farmers, exploiting everyone they could under the guise of using the money for propaganda purposes in looking after the interests of the farmers in the Bowen electorate. They attacked first of all those

who were least able to understand it—some of the foreign element.

Mr. MAHER: Oh, no!

Mr. RIORDAN: I am going to give it to the hon. gentleman now hot and heavy, because his party started it. They went round and asked for 1d. on each ton of cane sent to the mill, for the purpose of setting up a fighting fund to look after their interests. They went round the Proserpine and Home Hill farmers making that appeal. They said they wanted it on the cane at the next crushing.

Mr. MAHER: Who are "they"?

Mr. RIORDAN: Mrs. Soden, who was one of your organisers, and Mr. McDonald.

Mr. BRAND: Are you sure it was 1d. a ton? (Interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RIORDAN: I will get down to that in a minute or two and tell you.

Mr. EDWARDS: You take it from the poor working man in the shop.

Mr. RIORDAN: Hon. members opposite would take it from a blind cobbler. They went round and took money under false pretences by misrepresenting themselves to the farmers as setting up a fighting fund to help them—not making it a political issue at all. They did not take it out of the next crushing, as they said they would, but out of the final payments on the last crop, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that several farmers went into the mill and demanded the payment of the money that was deducted from those suspended payments.

Mr. MAHER: I do not know that at all.

Mr. RIORDAN: He ought to know, because he was in Proserpine when it happened.

Mr. BRAND: What suspended payments?

Mr. RIORDAN: Out of payments held over by the mill that had not been made when the appeal for the money was canvassed. Certain money was handed back to those farmers when they asked for it.

Mr. GAIR: Filthy practices!

Mr. RIORDAN: The statement that the Country Party was born in the sewer in the Bowen by-election is perfectly true. I had no desire to take part in a debate of this kind, but when the filth is handed out I will pay hon. members back in their own coin.

Mr. JESSON (*Kennedy*) [3.46 p.m.]: The hon. member for Bowen certainly let the cat out of the bag with a vengeance. I have a little to add regarding the 1d. a ton to prove that the Country Party are closely allied with the Fascist or Communist Party. The latter party have been doing the same thing. They have been through the various sugar areas getting the foreign workers to subscribe money to their funds so as to keep British preference out and to look after them with regard to the White Australia policy. That was the wool that they pulled over the eyes of the foreign workers, and members of the Country Party in the Bowen by-election used the same means in the same way, getting 1d. a ton for fighting funds for something that the farmers did not understand. If a person does not

[*Mr. Riordan.*]

properly understand it he puts his hand in his pocket and forgets about it. It is misrepresentation, it is wrong, and it is a leaf out of the communistic book.

I am very surprised, and somewhat disgusted to-day, to think that a debate so important as this should eventually get to such a state as it has. It did not start on this side of the Committee. The first two speakers this morning rose with the express purpose of inciting the public service to revolt, and of making propaganda against this Government. Only last week, or a few weeks ago, hon. members were on their feet crying about the Breakfast Creek workers, in order to cause trouble and embarrassment for the Government. The hon. member for Hamilton spoke about direct action in the meatworks, with his tongue in his cheek. I think it is absolute audacity for him to talk about such matters when his party have done all they can during this session to belittle and embarrass the Government.

Let me read from the leading article in to-day's "Telegraph" for the edification of hon. members opposite. I suppose they did not read that page; they would be inclined to turn it over very quickly. It is headed "The Prestige of Parliament." I frankly admit that hon. members on this side sometimes get a bit out of hand, but it is only right that we should be allowed to defend ourselves against the scandalous attacks by hon. members opposite.

Mr. BRAND: Was it written by Clem Lack?

Mr. JESSON: No. It is in a good paper, the "Telegraph."

Mr. NIMMO: What did you pay for the shares?

Mr. JESSON: I have been a working man all my life. I have not been able to buy shares in companies as the hon. member has, nor have I been able to farm the public. The "Telegraph" says—

"Mr. Maher, however, will find that he will increase his prestige if he sometimes credits the Government with good faith."

Lovely, is it not? The leading article further says—

"As it is, he seems to think it is his duty to criticise every move made by the other side. Goodness knows there are plenty of subjects for genuine criticism without dragging in matters on which the Opposition should be in agreement with the Government. For instance, Mr. Maher actually objected to the Government being praised for its action in making Crown lands available for farmers affected by the drought. Surely that was a trumpery thing to bring up."

I was surprised when I read in the "Courier-Mail" that the Leader of the Opposition had condemned the Government for granting this concession to the dairy farmers. They have taken on a pretty big thing in allowing them to put their cattle on Crown land without previously obtaining permission.

Mr. NIMMO: That has been done by every Government in the past.

Mr. JESSON: I am not saying that it has not, but that is no reason why the Leader of the Opposition should make political capital out of it or continue to indulge in political propaganda, as he has done ever

since the House opened in August last. This will do his party no good; in fact, it will do them harm.

The "Telegraph" further says—

"If Mr. Maher reserved his attacks for those occasions when his shots could be fired with telling force he would find that his criticisms would be listened to with a great deal more attention than they are at the present time."

That is "right from the horse's mouth."

Mr. MAXWELL: What paper said that?

Mr. JESSON: The "Telegraph."

Mr. MAXWELL: I will quote what the "Telegraph" said about your party.

Mr. JESSON: Now that I have relieved myself of my indignation at the attacks by hon. members opposite, I should like to touch on one or two questions of importance.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in his sneering, snide manner, said that no one took much notice of what I said in this Chamber, but I should like to mention something to show that hon. members on this side can do something for the benefit of their country despite the sneering references by hon. members opposite to taxation and other matters. One of my speeches in this Chamber was responsible for the dispatch of three men all the way from Victoria to Cairns to investigate the possibility of establishing a paper manufacturing plant there, involving the expenditure of £500,000. That was something worth while, and it is far preferable to the destructive criticism of hon. members opposite. We are entitled to a little credit for doing some good for our country. These representatives have been to Cairns and have returned to Sydney to make their report, and the Treasurer and the party on this side are now anxiously waiting the result of their investigations. They propose to process grass for paper pulping in North Queensland. It is possible that a factory will be established in Cairns to treat pulp from New Guinea. The company had tentatively agreed to begin operations in Tasmania, but if it can obtain its coal, electric energy, and water at the same cost as they can be obtained in Tasmania it will be more economic to establish a factory in Cairns, because it is nine days closer to New Guinea where it will obtain a large quantity of its supplies of pulp. I suppose hon. members opposite took no notice of my earlier remarks in connection with these possibilities in the North. I am referring to it again, not for the purpose of throwing any bouquets at myself, but to prove that occasionally the Labour Party are responsible for attracting capital from other States and overseas despite the boggy about taxation.

I do not intend to take up the time of the Chamber any longer, because I realise that this appropriation is required to carry on the services of the State, but I thought it advisable to reply to some of the criticism of hon. members opposite. What the "Telegraph" said also applies to me, I suppose, because I do sometimes transgress the Standing Orders, but it is also something that every hon. member should mark, learn, and inwardly digest.

Mr. MULLER (*Fassifern*) [3.53 p.m.]: I congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton and the hon. member for Nanango on their contributions to this debate. They certainly caused a bit of a stir in the Chamber and

*Mr. Muller.]*

awakened the interest of the hon. member for Ipswich in particular. Their remarks will not do any harm to the other hon. members opposite. The continued imposition of the relief tax raises a very grave question. Just where are we heading for, and what does it mean? So long as we continue to increase the relief tax each year we shall continue to create more unemployment. The relief tax means a reduction in wages. If you pay a wage-earner the basic wage and then take a portion away from him for relief tax it means that he has suffered a wage reduction.

The hon. member for Ipswich made a statement that the councils in his electorate were receiving large sums of money, which were expended on works in those shires. Perhaps that is so. Perhaps one would consider that they were getting a good deal of benefit, but only if one took a one-eyed view of the subject. The fact remains that the greater part of that money is being lost. I am not prepared to say whether Ipswich is handling it any more efficiently than most shires, but I know it is not being spent nearly as efficiently as if the men employed were engaged in ordinary work.

The hon. member for Enoggera asked if we wished to see men in country districts unemployed. The point I make is that this vicious relief tax is the means of throwing people into the unemployment ranks every day. I ask this Committee, "Why are the numbers of unemployed in the country creeping up each day?" As the hon. member for Hamilton says, "The policy of the Government is not allowing industry to survive." The reason why the numbers of the unemployed are increasing is that industry cannot absorb them. More and more people are joining the unemployed ranks every day, and that is not to any degree caused by the prevailing drought conditions, which, I admit, have some effect on the unemployment position. We endeavoured to solve the problem by instituting this form of taxation for the purpose of creating temporary employment; but that is getting us nowhere. I venture to say that if this policy is continued, before very long the number of people on relief will be greater than the number in permanent work. We may ask ourselves, "What is Communism? Who is responsible for the communistic element that is growing up in our State?"

Mr. POWER: Who is?

Mr. MULLER: I say hon. members opposite are or their organisation. Their policy is bringing it about.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Answer the first question—what is Communism?

Mr. MULLER: My idea of Communism is something like this: When you kill the enthusiasm and interest in your people you kill their enterprise and industry. They lose their interest in life, and seek to live on the other fellow.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a new definition.

Mr. MULLER: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman knows any more about it than I do. I tell the Committee that Communism was hatched in a Labour incubator.

Mr. COLLINS: What about the Bowen by-election?

[Mr. Muller.

Mr. MULLER: Labour was pandering for the communistic second preference vote there. After all, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Ninety-five per cent. of the Communist second preference votes went to the Labour candidate. I have the actual results here—

|              |     |     |      |
|--------------|-----|-----|------|
| Mr. Madden   | ... | ... | 451  |
| Mr. Graham   | ... | ... | 123  |
| Mr. Paterson | ... | ... | 1773 |
| Mr. Riordan  | ... | ... | 2569 |
| Mr. Smith    | ... | ... | 2377 |

The greater portion of the Communist preference votes, 991 of them, went to Mr. Riordan, and only 176 to Mr. Smith.

We have heard a great deal regarding direct action. I say if people or industrial workers lose their regard for the law, and resort to direct action we are on the road to Communism. What part did the Government play in the strike at the abattoirs and the railway strike that occurred some years ago?

Mr. TAYLOR: What about the maritime strike and the shearers' strike?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MULLER: Let us take them one at a time. The truth hurts and the hon. member does not wish to hear it. The railway workers were working under an award of the Industrial Court, but they downed tools and we in the country were told we had to stay there. Butter had to be sent by road, and quantities of produce were left to rot. The employees were under an award, but what happened? Direct action. Exactly the same thing occurred in the strike at the abattoirs. As an hon. member said this afternoon, the Government are controlled and run by the Queensland Central Executive of the Australian Labour Party and did not have the backbone to deal with the situation when it arose. It is the duty of the Government to endeavour to foster industry, and when action against development is springing up each and every day, it is the duty of the Government to squash it. If they do not do so it will get out of control.

The information contained in a pamphlet that I have in my hand should receive attention. It is directed at the smashing of our export trade by criticising the Ottawa Agreements. The pamphlet is issued by J. Hume-Cook, and for the information of hon. members I will read a few extracts from it.

Mr. TAYLOR: Is he a Labourite? Who is he?

Mr. MULLER: You know more about Mr. Hume-Cook than I. You subscribe the funds to keep this man going and disseminate this vicious type of propaganda aimed at smashing industry.

Mr. TAYLOR: Tell us who the man is.

Mr. MULLER: There is no need to. You know more about him than I, and your organisation is very largely responsible for putting out a certain amount of this vicious propaganda. An extract from the pamphlet reads—

"When made, the Ottawa Agreement was expected to confer many benefits on Australia. Practical experience over the last four years has shown that the anticipated results have not been realised. The primary producers, especially, have seen their hopes dissipated, more particularly with respect to better prices. In

the opinion of the Australian Industries Protection League, the fault is due entirely to the fact that the agreement has not proved to be truly reciprocal in its working. Therefore, before the Agreement comes up for reconsideration or renewal next year, the League sets out the following matter for impartial examination":—

It states that the Ottawa Agreements produced nothing, or in other words was framed in the interests of the importers on the other side of the world. No more damaging propaganda could be distributed throughout the length and breadth of Australia than that. Britain is buying almost the whole of our exportable primary products, and if we fail to recognise and foster Empire trade, this country will go "phut." The trouble in the past has been that Labour Governments do not appear to have the necessary appreciation of the need for greater trade between the various parts of the Empire. Had Great Britain not accepted the quantity of our produce that she has done in the last few years, conditions in Australia would be very much worse than they are. This is the type of propaganda that was put up at the time the Agreements were framed and our exportable primary products were increasing rapidly and the effect of the Ottawa Agreements was that Britain took a greater quantity of our goods. Such idle statements as are made in this pamphlet get the country nowhere.

Another paragraph reads—

"As was strongly stressed at the time, Australian manufacturers had nothing to gain from the adoption of the Agreement. On the contrary, if there were to be any falling away in trade, or any failure to extend business, it would be the manufacturers who must suffer the loss."

That statement is quite wrong, and hon. members know that the greater the amount of money returned to Australia, the greater the improvement in our secondary industries and our prosperity.

Another paragraph reads—

"As another illustration of the value to Britain of the preference Australia gives British goods, the purchases per head of population may be cited. For the year ended 30th June, 1932, Britain bought Australian products to the value of 16s. per head; but Australia purchased British goods to the value of £2 11s. per head; or more than three times as much."

When one considers that the population of Great Britain is in the vicinity of 46,000,000 and that that of Australia is about 5,000,000, one cannot help realising how unfair such a comparison really is.

A comparison is made also with India a little further on. The pamphlet says—

"Comparing purchases of British goods per head, by the three Great Dominions—India, Canada, and Australia—the lastnamed stands out in Himalayan proportions. For 1935 the figures are: India, 2s. 2d. per head; Canada, £1 19s. 5d.; Australia, £4 11s."

Fancy making such a comparison as that! They even mention India! One might as well ask why the trade balance with Australia is greater than that with China. Such a comparison is most unfair. Certainly this

is a damaging pamphlet to be circulating through the State.

I believe that our trouble lies in the fact that we have never made any real attempt to foster industry in the way that we should have done. The unemployment relief tax was imposed during the time of great difficulty, a time when something had to be done to relieve unemployment, even if it meant only temporary relief. To-day, we find that this unemployment relief tax is being quoted as the agency that enables the Government to carry out their policy, and in order to popularise that policy they are distributing the fund throughout the shires and city areas of our State. The result of that action has been that a number of our shires are of the opinion that this is "Money from home," just to help them to carry out their works. The fact remains, however, that such action by the Government is killing industry, and that if some thing is not done quickly industry will be extinguished before very long. As a result of the Government's policy in connection with unemployment relief, farmers are leaving their farms every day. Hon. members opposite may talk all they like about improved wages, but it must be realised that after they give this money to the people they take part of it away from them, so that really the Labour Government have reduced wages. Those men who have, of necessity, been doing the real work of the country are leaving that work and taking up intermittent relief work because there is more money in it. If the Government continue their present policy it is only reasonable to assume that industry will suffer. The hon. member for Nanango stated the case quite correctly this afternoon so far as the country districts are concerned. It is time that the members of this Government realised the position and perceived that if they continue in the way they are going, we shall have Communism. To my mind we are well on the road to it now; unless we are prepared to make an attempt to stabilise our industries Communism must creep over us.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*) [4.9 p.m.]: I had no intention of addressing myself to the question before the Committee this afternoon until I heard the statements that have been made by hon. members on the Government side, particularly by the hon. member for Kennedy and the hon. member for Bundaberg. I refer now to the statements they made in an attempt to lead this Committee to believe that the public servants were being incited by hon. members of the Opposition to take some extraordinary action. It is not necessary for us to attempt to incite the public servants, in view of the statements I propose to quote of what they have been saying themselves. Hon. members opposite are always boasting about their concern for the man on the lower rung of the ladder and declaring that the man on the top rung of the ladder can well take care of himself. We know that in many cases the man on the top rung has received the recognition of the Government, whereas the man on the lower rung has been pushed aside. After witnessing the action of the Government, one can quite appreciate the position in which they will find themselves when they attempt to justify what they have done. I do not propose to refer in any way to the attitude of the

*Mr. Maxwell.]*



Industrial Court, because, Mr. Hanson, you have ruled that we must not do so, but I do propose to give my opinion on the matter when the opportunity arises. I adopt an attitude somewhat similar to that adopted by the Treasurer some time ago when he said that Parliament must be supreme, because it is composed of the people's representatives, but on three occasions in this Chamber, when certain questions came up for discussion, Parliament was pushed on the back shelf and representatives of the people were completely ignored, because something outside was going on.

At 4.12 p.m.,

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

Mr. MAXWELL: The sooner some action is taken in this matter the better. Let me quote a statement made by Mr. Bolger. I do so to show that it is not necessary for hon. members of the Opposition to attempt to incite a body of intelligent men. I can quite understand their feelings, and hon. members on both sides of this Chamber must feel similarly when they realise that the men on the lower rungs have found that no recognition has been given to them while others on a higher scale have received benefits.

"For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

Mr. KING: Where did you get that from?

Mr. MAXWELL: From the Scriptures, a book the hon. member never reads. Mr. Bolger said—

"No man under £270 a year would receive any benefit from the judgment. Officers in receipt of £270 would benefit to the extent of £1 7s. 6d. a year, while an under secretary on £1,100 a year would benefit to the extent of £99 a year. He thought the way the percentages had worked out was inequitable.

"An officer in receipt of £225 continued to suffer a reduction of 12.89 per cent., one on £270 10.74 per cent., on £320 9.06 per cent., on £600 8 per cent., on £1,000 and £1,100 9 per cent., on £1,200 to £1,500 9½ per cent., and on more than £1,500 10 per cent.

"The reduction applicable to a salary of £225 was 3.89 per cent. greater than that on a salary of £900, it was 3.39 per cent. greater than that on a salary six times larger, and 2.89 per cent. greater than the reduction on an officer in receipt of a salary seven times higher. Other anomalies would arise.

"He considered that his argument in the court showed conclusively that there was no direct relation between the basic wage and the public service scales.

"The reductions on the percentage basis now brought about the position that a salary of £400 must be reached before the percentage reduction of 7½ per cent. (total £30) exceeded the basic wage reduction of £29. It followed therefore, that, for the future, any applications made to the court would benefit only those officers receiving more than £400, unless the basic wage were increased in the meantime."

[*Mr. Maxwell.*

I see the difficulty, and so do other hon. members. They based their calculations on the basic wage, and, as Mr. Bolger pointed out, a certain position arises. I am saying that it is not necessary for hon. members of the Opposition—

Mr. McLEAN: You are out of order.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Bundaberg may have been mayor of Bundaberg, but he is not Chairman of this Committee.

Mr. McLEAN: I rise to a point of order. By a ruling given by the Chairman in reference to the Treasurer's explanation that the case had not been finalised, matters could not be read in Parliament although they appear in the public Press. The Chairman ruled definitely that nothing relating to the judgment could be read in Parliament.

Mr. MAXWELL: He did not say "read." He never said that at all.

Mr. MAHER: On a point of order, I desire to say I have given a little more thought to the position that arose this afternoon. On my reading of the Industrial Court's decision, a judgment was given. There is no mistake about that, despite what the hon. the Treasurer said in this Committee. A judgment was given, and it has been broadcast all over Queensland, and those concerned have expressed their feelings in very strong terms concerning the nature of the judgment.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I should like to point out that the Chairman has given a ruling, and that being the case I will not allow any debate on the matter.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not in any way discussing the judgment of the Industrial Court, or criticising the amount of money that has been given. I am rebutting the statement that has been made by the hon. member for Bundaberg—one of the critics of the Opposition—and I am showing him and the Committee that his statement was wrong and that it is not necessary for the Opposition to attempt to incite the public servants, when, according to their own officials, there is ample room for criticism. Surely in a British community and particularly in a British Parliament, we are entitled to free speech! Surely we can get that! I have no desire to criticise the court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: On the present case?

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not going to do that. I am giving the opinions of certain officials of the union. I am quoting them from the Press. I am not apologising for doing that because I consider it to be my right.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: I have read some of it and I am satisfied that Mr. Bolger, the secretary of the State Service Union, gave that opinion.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member will not obey my call to order I shall have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. MAXWELL: All right, Mr. O'Keefe. We shall take another opportunity of continuing it. Do not worry! What we cannot do inside this Chamber we may be able to do outside.

The hon. member for Kennedy quoted from a leading article in to-day's "Telegraph" concerning the Leader of the Opposition. I presume that if he is prepared to accept the criticism of the "Telegraph" as being correct in one case he will accept it as being sound in another. I propose to quote the opinions of the "Telegraph" concerning the present Premier and Treasurer, and I submit that I am perfectly justified in doing that. It is absolutely essential that these things should be quoted not weekly or daily, but even hourly—all the time that we are in this Chamber.

Mr. WATERS: Every minute?

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes, so far as the hon. member is concerned. We should take every opportunity to correct the mis-statements concerning conditions that operated in this State some years ago and to correct the assertions that certain persons were to blame when they were not responsible for them. The hon. member for Kennedy was quite prepared to accept the criticism by the "Telegraph" of the Leader of the Opposition. I presume that he is also prepared to accept this criticism that the "Telegraph" published on 18th April, 1935, just prior to the last election—

"Mr. Smith overacted his part and was altogether unfair in inferring"—

Mr. WATERS interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. O'Keefe, would you be kind enough to keep the hon. member in order? If he is prepared to get up and make a speech I am content to listen to him, but I certainly object to his muttering. The "Telegraph" said—

"Mr. Smith overacted his part and was altogether unfair in inferring that Mr. Moore and his friends were responsible for all the ill effects of the world-wide economic crisis which raged during their term of office, and that depression was banished by magic as soon as Labour returned to office. Strong language and exaggeration should not impress thoughtful, intelligent people, such as an assertion that 'The reckless drive to ruin and bankruptcy during the years 1929-1930-1931 had been stopped and stagnation had been arrested.' Nor should the public be led astray by the parade of the Moore deficits or the charge that the Nationalists slashed wages and strove for the impoverishment of the people. Such methods of campaigning are unworthy of a Premier."

The hon. member for Baroona said, "Of course they did," but he has no knowledge of the matter. That is just his usual clap-trap, the usual talk that is heard from the soap box. He thinks that he can induce a body of intelligent hon. members on this side to believe his assertion.

Mr. POWER: You are not intelligent.

Mr. MAXWELL: That remark cuts no ice with me. It is only like pouring water on a duck's back. The "Telegraph" further said—

"But the economies effected by the Moore Government"—

Mr. WATERS: You are a Punch and Judy show.

Mr. MAXWELL: And the hon. member is a good Judy. The "Telegraph" further said—

"But the economies effected by the Moore Government were consistent with prudence, with safety, and with honourable trusteeship. They established a condition which facilitated recovery and very considerably smoothed the path of the incoming Labour Party. The Premier would have lost nothing in prestige had he admitted these facts instead of trying to put the onus of the world depression on Mr. Moore and taking to himself credit for recovery which is at least as real and patent throughout the Commonwealth as it is in Queensland."

If the "Telegraph" is reliable in the one case, I take it that the hon. member for Kennedy will admit that it is as reliable in the other. I have quoted it to show the opinion that it held of the hon. gentleman who was our worthy leader at that time.

There are other matters to which I should like to refer, but in view of your ruling, Mr. O'Keefe, I am precluded from dealing with them. However, we shall have an opportunity later on of doing so. I should like to draw attention to the interjections by hon. members opposite when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was referring to certain coincidences in connection with a recent industrial case. They complained that he was attributing dishonest motives to the Government, that he suggested that the Government must have interfered with the Industrial Court by virtually telling it what it had to do.

When Labour was in opposition hon. members opposite criticised the treatment that had been meted out to a number of men for the offence known as "jumping the rattler." They also stated what they would do if they had power and how they would treat these people. Prior to the elections Labour members, the present Secretary for Labour and Industry, Minister for Transport, and the Secretary for Public Works, waited on the then Premier regarding the provision of shelter sheds and free transport for the unemployed. The present Secretary for Public Lands complained of the iniquity of the unemployed being gaoled for jumping the rattler. What did the Labour Party do when they got in? They had the matter in their own hands, and they could have altered the law if they were dissatisfied with the penalty provided. The "Telegraph" of 31st January this year contains the following item:—

"Rockhampton, January 31.

"If I make it too lenient, the Railway Department write to my department and say I am too lenient and am encouraging this sort of thing, stated Mr. A. H. O'Kelly, police magistrate, in the police court this morning when Ray Cotterill, thirty, asked for leniency when he pleaded guilty to a charge of travelling by rail between Marlborough and Yaamba without paying the fare of 6s.

"The defendant was convicted and ordered to pay 6s. in default twelve hours' imprisonment."

If this is done by one department—and I presume it has been done—there is nothing to stop it from being done somewhere else. That is a particular case that should be brought under the notice of the department.

*Mr. Maxwell.]*

Let me deal with the alleged generosity of this Government in their treatment of these unfortunate men. The Government were in power when the following statement appeared in the "Courier" of 8th November, 1932:—

"At Maryborough, on 7th November, 1932, Archbishop Duhig said: 'Youths, in quest of work, got on a train without a ticket. They were arrested and put into gaol with the stigma of the gaol on them for ever. Faulty government, perhaps, was the cause of this trouble, and he could see no harm in attaching an extra coach to a train whereby those seeking work could travel from place to place without the danger of imprisonment.'

"The Minister for Labour and Industry (Mr. M. P. Hynes), in reply, declared that the proposal of Archbishop Duhig would be impracticable and was quite unnecessary."

It was not impossible when the Moore Government were in power to build shelter sheds for these people!

I draw the attention of the Committee to the "callous brutality"—to use words of hon. members opposite when they referred to the treatment of the unemployed by the Moore Government—of the Secretary for Public Lands when a deputation waited on him on the 12th January, 1935. Labour had full power to deal with this matter at the time, but in reply to a deputation representing the unemployed at Innisfail the Secretary for Public Lands made the following statement, as recorded in the "Cairns Post" of 13th January, 1935:—

"If we were to build shelter sheds, how long would it be before the rest of Australia was flocking here, I say that the position of unemployed is no worse to-day than it was years ago. People talk about hard times. When I was a kid living at Ross Island I wore no shoes and had dripping instead of butter. Conditions to-day in Queensland are immensely superior to when I was a boy. In those days we never talked about shelter sheds. Every Government tried to do its best, just as they do to-day. I can tell you the Government is definitely opposed to shelter sheds."

When in power hon. members opposite are opposed to the unemployed, but when in opposition they believe in them. There is such a thing as consistency, but it is a jewel not to be found on the other side of the Chamber. The article continues—

"... I cannot understand why, whenever people got into difficulties, they rush to the Government to get them out of their difficulties. . . . I again tell you single men, 'the Minister concluded,' that the best way to emancipate yourselves is to get married and thus become entitled to the privileges of the married men (i.e., £1 0s. 3d. per week for relief work)."

That is typical of the treatment meted out to these unfortunate men—and they are unfortunate—but hon. members opposite stand in this Chamber and make an accusation against the Opposition of not playing the game, and of inciting the public servants to strike. There is no doubt that the party opposite fooled them on the hustings and are attempting to fool them still further.

[Mr. Maxwell.

The party that I have the honour to be associated with—and it is an honour—has been charged—

Mr. KING: A party of three.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is immaterial. We may not have quantity but we have quality. We have been accused of being associated with the Communists, but some hon. members opposite know—and you know this, Mr. King—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hon. members opposite know that during election time the Labour Party is very busy running round getting votes. This is not hearsay, for I have seen them myself, and the hon. member for Barcoona is no exception. They run round getting votes, and it does not matter for whom so long as they get them. The Labour Press that was in existence at the Bowen by-elections and men interested in the elections on the Labour Party's side made statements from which the inference could be drawn that irrespective of how bad Labour government was—and God knows it is pretty bad at the present time—it will never be as bad as Tory government. They asked that the No. 2 vote be given to the Communist Party. Intelligent men know that the objectives of both parties are the same. To draw an analogy we might say that although they do not sleep in the same bed, they have two beds in the same room.

The Government must do everything possible to relieve the burden of taxation being borne by the people, and it is rather stupid for any hon. member opposite to suggest that because there are forty-five others in this Chamber with similar views to his, those views must be correct. If taxation is not reduced there will come a time, and the people are looking forward to it, when hon. members opposite will be given the order to "Right about turn."

Mr. NIMMO (*Oxley*) [4.34 p.m.]: The appropriation of a sum of £4,200,000 should have serious consideration. This morning the hon. member for Bundaberg made certain statements regarding the outlawing of the public servants from the Industrial Court by the Moore Government, but there is nothing very new about that. On three different occasions Labour Governments outlawed public servants from the Industrial Court. They took them away from the court when it was necessary to do so, and the Moore Government only did likewise; it was necessary that the public expenditure should be reduced by a certain amount. The Treasurer quite recently informed the public servants that the cuts in Queensland were the lowest of any of the Australian States. This shows that the Moore Government did the right thing, but we find that although the Labour Party on the hustings in 1932 accused the Moore Government of callously outlawing the public servants and reducing wages to a starvation level—the basic wage to-day is still £3 14s. a week.

Mr. JESSON: And a better purchasing power.

Mr. NIMMO: The purchasing power is 9s. a week less, and the unemployment relief tax is very materially higher than it

was under the Moore regime. I think that every member of this Committee recognises that the cost of living has risen to such a height that it is almost impossible even for the man on the basic wage to carry on in any comfort. According to the figures of Mr. Brigden we have on unemployment relief work a number of men equivalent to £10,000 on full-time; that is, 30,000 men are on intermittent relief work. From that it will be seen that the Government are not fulfilling their election promises. During the 1932 elections they led the people to believe that if the Labour Party were returned they would immediately right the wrongs committed by the Moore Government. Even the public servants were forced to wait for nearly three years before they were given access to the Industrial Court. Despite the fact that the Labour Party promised to give the public servants access to the court, they found immediately upon their return that there was a chock in the wheel—the Financial Emergency Act was still operating.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: That is not true.

Mr. NIMMO: That is true, and every hon. member of this Committee knows it. The public servants had no access to the court for twenty-seven months. Although it was necessary to impose those cuts on the salaries of public servants when the Moore Government were in power, the Labour Government continued to practise every one of those economies, and also increased the relief tax. From that it will be seen that the public servants have been treated much more harshly by the Labour Government than they were by the Moore Government.

In the Estimates this year the Government have provided for certain restorations of salary cuts. Last year a restoration of one-quarter was made to certain public servants. A perusal of any one of the Estimates for this year will disclose that provision is made for the restoration of a certain percentage of the salary cuts. Take, for example, the Estimate for the Sub-Department of Irrigation and Water Supply. There we find that last year—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Aubigny was quoting exactly the same figures on the occasion when the Chairman of Committees gave a ruling that these comparisons and quotations could not be made. Probably the hon. member for Oxley was not in the Chamber at the time that that ruling was given.

Mr. NIMMO: I am quoting from the Estimates. I am not referring in any way to the act of the Industrial Court. I am quoting from the Estimates now before this Committee, and if we are going to be hamstrung, and Ministers are going to try to restrict discussion in this Chamber—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order; I cannot allow the hon. member to make any reflections on the Chair. The hon. member heard the ruling that was given by the Chairman previously, and that ruling stands.

Mr. NIMMO: I will respect that ruling. The matter I am discussing is the Estimates that are before the Committee. At present we are discussing the appropriation of

£4,200,000, to which the Estimates are relevant.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may quote from those Estimates.

Mr. NIMMO: I will do that. In the Estimate for the Sub-Department of Irrigation and Water Supply we find a total of £22,813 for last year, from which was deducted salary reductions of £2,814. That reduction worked out at 12½ per cent. This year the amount provided is £21,397, and the salaries reduction of £2,163 works out at just on 10 per cent., showing that in these Estimates provision is made for a restoration over the whole public service of 2½ per cent.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: You know that these Estimates were framed before ever the case came before the court.

Mr. NIMMO: I am discussing these Estimates. I cannot discuss the court case.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: And the Estimates can only be framed with regard to what the position ultimately is, and that case has not been finally determined.

Mr. NIMMO: I am discussing the Estimates before this Committee. I do not intend to touch on the court case, as that matter has been ruled by the Chair to be sub judice. We had a ruling in this Chamber during the discussion of the Police Acts Amendment Act of 1928. You will remember that the Premier said that Parliament was supreme and beyond any court, and if it was the right thing to do for the people no one could stop the discussion. I hope that hon. members in this Chamber are not going to try to stop discussion in Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There are Standing Orders that must be observed.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: In that case, it was a Bill being introduced by the Government—

Mr. NIMMO: The hon. member is not Chairman of Committees. I appeal to the Chair.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Oxley continue his speech?

Mr. NIMMO: Taking out the Estimates as I have quoted them—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I have already told the hon. member that he may make a quotation from the Estimates.

Mr. NIMMO: I can prove by my figures the point I am getting at, without making any reference to the court. In tallying up the figures on the Estimates we find that 90 per cent. of the public servants are under £300 a year, and 10 per cent. of them are over £300 a year.

Mr. W. J. COPLEY: Not more than 85 per cent. of them.

Mr. NIMMO: Who is making the speech, the hon. member for Bulimba or I?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION interjected.

Mr. NIMMO: If the hon. gentleman thinks so, I had a higher opinion of his intelligence than I have now. The point I am making is that on these Estimates there is a general restoration throughout the public service of 2½ per cent. As 90 per

*Mr. Nimmo.]*

cent. are getting less than £300 a year, they will get very little, according to those Estimates, while the 10 per cent. over £300 a year will get a very material increase. I have worked out the actual increases provided by that restoration in the Estimates, and I find the increase is as follows:—

| Salary.<br>£ | Amount of restoration.<br>£ |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Under 270    | ... .. nil.                 |
| 270          | ... .. 1                    |
| 300          | ... .. 4                    |
| 400          | ... .. 15                   |
| 500          | ... .. 20                   |

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is getting on to dangerous ground.

Mr. NIMMO: I appeal to you, Mr. O'Keefe. If you rule me out of order I shall discontinue.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to keep within the limits of the debate now before the Committee. If he does not do so, I shall not give him another warning. I shall ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. NIMMO: That is what I expect if I am out of bounds. I have prepared a list here from the Estimates showing the amount of the increases that are likely to accrue to the public servants. Am I in order in quoting that?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to resume his seat, and to discontinue his speech.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Brcmer*) [4.45 p.m.]: There are just one or two matters I shall touch on in reply. So far as speeches of hon. members of the Opposition are concerned, I do not propose to go into the whole question of the £600,000 granted by way of subsidy. I refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to page 915 of the current issue of "Hansard," where he will find a full and explicit explanation by the hon. the Treasurer.

The hon. member for Aubigny made some reference to the cost of administering the Unemployment Relief Fund. It is true, as the hon. member has said, that these costs have increased slightly, but since 1931-32 the relief department has become a much bigger department. It handles a greater amount of money, and there is need for a higher efficiency and greater supervision. As a matter of fact, the percentage of administration expenses to the money handled by the department in 1931-32 was 1.83, whereas in 1935-36 it was 2.61 per cent. The increase is not very great when one considers the increased amount of work and the need there is for greater supervision in that department.

The hon. member for Aubigny also made reference to the matter of subsidy-loans. I remember many years ago that one of the delights of the populace was to go into the gallery and hiss the villain when he disowned his own child. I was reminded of that this afternoon when the hon. member for Aubigny disowned subsidy-loans—those wretched things that were the ruination of the country!

Mr. MOORE: I said from the unemployment relief tax. That is very different.

[*Mr. Nimmo.*]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. gentleman cannot disown his own child as quickly as all that, because if anybody was the father of that thing it was the hon. member for Aubigny. As a matter of fact he made a distinct statement to the Press, I think, in May, 1929, or 1932. I forget the year.

Mr. MOORE: It was in 1932.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He pointed out just how he was going to do this particular little job.

Mr. MOORE: Quite right, but not out of the Unemployment Relief Fund.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He mentioned that he was going to get so much out of one fund, so much out of another, so much out of another—he was going to raise so much by taxation—and out of that he was going to subscribe £1 for every £2 subscribed by the local authorities. One hon. member interjected that he did something in that direction and he knows that he did. He made that proposal in 1929, if I remember rightly. I am sorry that I cannot put my finger on that particular "Hansard."

Mr. MOORE: I will take your word for it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He did publish that statement. The unemployment relief tax is doing what it was supposed to do, and that is to put people into employment. If it is giving employment then it is doing what it was designed to do, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to have overlooked that fact entirely.

I do not desire to detain the Committee, but I asked the hon. member for Fassifern a question, and he having given a wrong answer, I should attempt to put him right. I asked him what Communism was, and he said that it was something brought into being by the Labour movement.

Mr. MAHER: Something hatched in the Labour incubator.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes, that is it. If I remember rightly, Marx and Engels drew up their Communist manifesto in 1848, and I think that was a little bit before the advent of the Labour movement in Australia. The hon. member also wanted an explanation of its relationship with the Labour movement. I think that Communism might fairly be described as the revolution of the empty stomach, whereas the Labour movement is the revolution of the full mind, and I think there is some distinction between those two things. I believe that the Communist doctrine might be described as "Each according to his need," and the Labour Party policy might be described as "Each according to his deed." I do not wish to pursue that subject any further, so I shall leave it at that. Probably at a later stage of the session we may have an opportunity of debating that matter more fully.

Mr. MOORE: Does the Labour Party's policy of "Each according to his deed" mean payment by results?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The socialistic policy means nothing less than payment by results—the

full result to the worker according to his service, nothing more and nothing less. That has always been the policy.

Mr. MAHER: All products of the one pod.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. gentleman professes to know, but I am afraid that he does not. I understand that the time of finishing is near at hand and I do not propose to prolong the debate.

Question—"That the resolution (*Mr. Cooper's motion*) be agreed to"—put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution and asked leave to sit again.

Resumption of Committee made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

Resolution received and agreed to.

#### WAYS AND MEANS.

COMMITTEE—VOTE ON ACCOUNT, £4,200,000.

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

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

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a further sum not exceeding £2,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland (exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account).

"(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a further sum not exceeding £1,500,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

"(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1936-1937, a further sum not exceeding £700,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account."

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to certain resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

Resumption of Committee made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

Resolutions received and agreed to.

Ordered, that a Bill be brought in founded on the resolutions.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL, No. 2.

##### FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) presented the Bill, and moved—

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

Question put and passed.

##### SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. A. Cooper, *Bremer*) [4.58 p.m.]: I move—

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

In the Committee stage we dealt with the matter thoroughly, and I do not wish to speak further on the Bill.

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

##### COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, and preamble agreed to.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

##### THIRD READING.

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

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

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 5.2 p.m.