In August-September 1885, Brisbane’s leading trade unionists founded a Trades and Labour Council (TLC). At that moment, the city of Brisbane was undergoing a rapid transformation from an underdeveloped provincial centre of some 30,000 inhabitants to a booming colonial capital of more than 90,000. The Council’s founders were men who embodied the values and habits of mind of the first half of the decade of the 1880s. They therefore created a peak labour body which could accommodate the features of a rapidly disappearing industrial relations system, a system based on exclusivist craft unions, on the benevolence of the city’s employers, on the assumption of the unity of purpose of capital and labour, on an unchanging social and industrial environment. However, a mid-decade tidal wave of immigration not only transformed the colony’s economic and industrial base, it brought into Brisbane, and into the city’s labour movement, a group of activists whose disposition was decidedly radical. Consequently, the TLC, even as it was created, was incapable of meeting the industrial, political and ideological needs of an invigorated labour movement. By 1888, the Brisbane TLC was committed to its own dissolution, a step which it took in June 1889, to make way for the Australian Labour Federation (ALF).

During its short life, the Council suffered from four problems, all traceable to its original constitution: a chronic shortage of funds; a lack of authority over its affiliates; an inability to assist its affiliates in controlling the supply of labour; and a failure to engender within the labour movement a sense of unity of purpose. The tension between the Council’s founding, conservative forces and its new, radical, immigrant-led personnel provided the dynamic which precipitated, first, the partial revision of the Council’s rules and, ultimately, its dissolution. This tension expressed itself in debates on a number of issues, including the admission of employers as delegates, proportional representation, Council’s policy on free trade and protection, and its ability to impose a compulsory levy on its affiliates. Beneath these structural and policy differences lurked a more profound division over the proper scope and purpose of the TLC. The Council’s founders were content to allow the Council to function as a local expression of the immediate material interests of its members, as an expression of the (perceived) benign relationship between capital and labour. The radical push, however, wanted something better — they wanted a peak labour body which could meet the needs of a more dynamic community, and which could ultimately be a vehicle for the transformation of the relationship between capital and labour. This contest gave rise to labourism, which first came to prominence under the stimulus of the Council’s efforts to return labour candidates in the general elections of May 1888.

Labour historians have written very little on the first Brisbane TLC, their attentions having been diverted by the Queensland labour movement’s more turbulent career under the ALF in the early-1890s. Australia’s peak labour bodies have fared little better, with only the Sydney TLC, the Adelaide United Trades and Labour Council, and the Australian Council of Trade Unions receiving comprehensive consideration. And it was only relatively recently that Ellem and Shields proposed ‘a model of peak union formation that combines internal and external processes, emphasising the connection between them.’ This paper not only provides much needed consideration of the origins of Queensland’s first peak labour body, it confirms Ellem and Shields’ hypothesis that ‘for any group of unions to form a peak body two conditions must apply: a state of internal equilibrium must exist between the unions concerned, and those unions must be presented with a clear external threat or opportunity’, while ‘it is the interaction between the two [conditions] that explains the origins and nature of peak bodies.’

In fulfilling these tasks, this paper examines the ways in which the Brisbane TLC, between 1885 and 1888, reflected the changes in its host community. It first identifies the most salient features of the community from which the Council arose. It then narrates the various efforts of the radical, immigrant-led element to reform the Council, and finds the origins of these proposed reforms in the changing ethos of the wider Brisbane community. The paper concludes that the conditions of the Council’s dissolution were intrinsically linked to the social conditions of its founding.

The community

In any consideration of Brisbane society in the 1880s, the impact of immigration cannot be over-estimated. From a modest 3,000 in 1880, immigration to Queensland peaked in 1883, when more than 28,000 people arrived in the colony. This prompted the government to limit the rate to one thousand per month, and for the next four years more than 10,000 immigrants arrived per year, before the rate returned to 3,000 at the end of the decade. Queensland during the 1880s was the boom colony, with almost one in three immigrants to Australia choosing Queensland as their destination. And Brisbane was a boom town, with its own population increasing spectacularly, from 31,109 in 1881, to 73,642 in 1886 to 93,657 in 1891. The high level of immigration in the mid-1880s fuelled economic growth, especially in the building industry, but it also had an adverse effect, for there was considerable unemployment and poverty in Brisbane during the mid-1880s, due to an oversupply of labour. By the second half of the 1880s Queensland’s economic development was a decidedly lopsided affair, with capitalists reaping the benefits of a buoyant economy while workers were left vulnerable to periods of unemployment.

Due to the impact of immigration, Brisbane was a restless place, a young city in flux. Its new immigrants were people who had been restless in Britain — the settled, rooted ones, and those lacking imagination, had stayed at Home. Some had been made restless by economic recession, by the continuing dislocations of the industrial revolution, but others were restless by temperament. Not satisfied with their lot or their prospects, with the range of choices available to them in Britain, they took their families and their dreams to a new land, a land of possibilities, a supposed ‘Colony for Working Men’.

These expectations, and their denial, played a major role in the early development of the TLC.

In 1885, Brisbane’s most influential trade union leader was William Galloway. Born in Perth, Scotland, in 1840, Galloway came to Queensland in 1872. Within three years he had established a seamen’s outfitting business in Brisbane, which became ‘a most extensive concern, and the principal manufacturing house of the kind in the colony.’ He consolidated his place in Brisbane society when he won a seat on the city council in 1884, and became Mayor in 1888-9. At the same time, Galloway took on the role of leader of the Brisbane labour movement. He played some part...
in the formation of the Brisbane branch of the Seamen’s Union in the aftermath of the seamen’s strike of 1879, and was president of that union until June 1888. He represented Brisbane unionists at Intercolonial Trade Union Congresses in 1885 and 1886, and was president of the Brisbane Eight Hours Committee in 1885-6. Galloway was also the initiator and first president of the Brisbane TLC. For Galloway, who himself stood astride the two elements of the productive process, his roles as businessman and employer, politician and labour leader could be reconciled by asserting that the function of organised labour was that of “bridging the gap which separated capital and labour in the old country, and which they did not want to exist here”.4

The main features of the labour movement during the period leading up to the formation of the TLC were the division between those workers who had attained the eight hour day and those who had not, the role of the ‘fair employer’ in agreeing to negotiate on unions’ claims, and the influence of liberalism on the labour movement’s industrial and political priorities. Until the advent of the TLC, the Eight Hours Day Committee served as the focal point for the Brisbane labour movement. As elsewhere, the reason for the formation of many of Brisbane’s early unions was the push for the eight hour day, an achievement intermittently celebrated in Brisbane from 1865, at the annual Eight Hours march and sports day. Until the mid-1880s, the building trades dominated these celebrations and the committee which organised them, while the right to participate in the marches remained restricted to those unions which had won the eight hours. In 1885, the Brisbane Eight Hours Movement represented some 2,500 workers in fourteen unions.5

The key element in the industrial relations process prior to 1885 was the goodwill of the employers. For example, the few short-term successes which fell to the Early Closing Association were due entirely to the support of the city’s retail employers, while the long-term failure of the Association to win a general early closing of shops was due, at least in part, to the intransigence of some employers in refusing to cooperate with the aims of the Association. Politically, the early Brisbane labour movement was reliant on liberalism for its leadership. Liberal Members of Parliament, large employers of labour and even the President of that most unsympathetic of bodies, the Legislative Council, presided over early Eight Hours celebrations. This state of affairs was not, of course, unique to Queensland, but it was more pronounced in the northern colony. Robin Gollan has argued that in Australia the urban middle-class become a de facto radical element because of the absence of a ‘substantial lower middle class or a pauperised proletariat’, this in turn being due to the fact that in Australia ‘industrialism was still a thing of the future’. In Queensland, with its decentralised, underdeveloped economy and the resultant weakness of secondary industry, this absence was even more evident than in New South Wales and Victoria. Hence the paucity of working class leaders was more pronounced and reliance on the colony’s liberals as de facto radicals, more necessary.6

In March 1885, William Galloway, speaking as president of the Eight Hours Movement, summed up the ethos of the labour movement when he compared the eight hours campaign to the Sudan campaign, then being conducted by British forces. The difference between the two, according to Galloway, was that in the eight hours campaign, ‘the advance guard was able to take possession without firing a single shot – the keys having been given up to them without a murmur’. This ‘advance guard’ was the city’s skilled workers who dominated the yearly processions. Those who handed over ‘the keys’, namely the eight hour day, were the prosperous and apparently benevolent employers. Indeed, on the day of the 1885 march, the city’s banks, legal offices, auction rooms, several wholesale warehouses and all government offices except the Post and Telegraph Department remained closed, so that their employees could attend the day’s festivities. Thus Galloway, and the movement on whose behalf he spoke, were understandably complacent, for, under the gaze of the colony’s ruling liberals, they could take comfort in the support of the city’s benevolent employers.7

The Council’s industrial role

Galloway chaired a planning meeting in August, and in September the inaugural meeting of the TLC elected him its first president. Nine unions attended these meetings – all were Eight Hours unions; all were craft unions, accept the Queensland United European Labourers’ Protection Society (QUELPS), a builders’ labourers’ union with close ties to the carpenters’ and masons’ unions. Galloway anticipated that while pursuing ‘the better working of trades unionism’, the Council ‘would always endeavour to act in accordance with the by-laws of each separate society...’ This deference to the autonomy of affiliates ensured that there would be no radical departure from the established and staid policies of Brisbane’s elite unions.8

In May 1886, just eight months after the TLC’s founding, Charles Seymour of the Seamen’s Union moved to rescind the Council’s Objects, which read in part: ‘to effect an abbreviation of the hours of labour’, ‘to obviate, as far as possible the necessity of “strikes”,’ and ‘to obtain an equitable share in the representation of the county’. Seymour proposed that, instead, Council concentrate all its energies on organisation. This was not only a recognition of the need to control the labour supply, it was an acknowledgment of the Council’s early failure to effectively engage in industrial activity. That only three (unspecified) delegates supported Seymour’s motion, indicates the dominance of ‘Eight Hour men’ in the Council; that Seymour saw the need for such a radical move indicates that the seeds of change were already sprouting within the Council. Two factors contributed to the latter situation: the impact of the wave of immigrants which was then flooding into Brisbane, and the arrival of a number of men who became central to the move to reform the council. This latter group included Gilbert Casey who arrived in 1883, Alf Walker sometime in the early 1880s, and Seymour himself, the odd man out on this score, who arrived sometime in the late-1870s. But the most important of these immigrants was William Lane, who disembarked in Brisbane in 1885.9

This is not the place for a detailed analysis of Lane’s utopian socialism. It must suffice to note that for Lane the purpose of all social action was to heighten the community’s awareness of the need for radical social change: ‘What we want is a co-operative system of industry, controlled by a community in which all would be workers, conducted not for profit but for use...’ On 20 March 1886, the Daily Observer published the first of Lane’s weekly ‘Labour Notes’, where he combined reportage, commentary and exhortation. He established close contacts with the city’s labour leaders and, as a reporter, attended TLC meetings from the earliest days, and published their proceedings in the Daily Observer. Like Seymour, Lane very early saw the need for a complete revision of the Council’s rules and objectives, and he used his position as a journalist to advocate such a change. But with the failure of their move to place the Council on a more substantial footing, Lane and Seymour and their colleagues were forced to work within the industrial parameters set by the Council’s Objects. During the ensuing two years, these parameters became increasingly narrow.10

Galloway and his co-founders had been remiss in not providing the means for the Council’s support. For with a contribution of just one farthing per member per week, it is clear that the Council would barely be able to cover its own running costs, much less form a fund from which to support its affiliates. Indeed, the state of the Council’s finances was, at best, parlous, with funds
peaking at £59 2s 6d in March 1887, for an average of less than £33 for the first two and a half years of its existence. This left the Council powerless to take action independently of its affiliates, and forced it to rely on voluntary subscriptions for any special projects which it undertook. 11

The Council’s rules did, however, allow for the imposition of a compulsory levy, but this rule was never invoked. Lane pointed out that the rules of the amalgamated societies, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (ASCI) and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (ASE), prohibited them from responding to a compulsory levy, and Seymour successfully proposed that the offending rule be struck out. What this meant, then, was that in future, any support which the TLC might be able to offer to its striking affiliates would necessarily be derived from the voluntary contributions of the other affiliated societies. 12

The failure of a proposal from Seymour to introduce compulsory arbitration further limited the TLC’s ability to sponsor effective industrial action. With the defeat of his motion to suspend the Council’s Objects, Seymour gave notice of a motion that, when a dispute arose, a board of arbitration be formed, comprising equal numbers from the disputing parties and a presiding member to be chosen by mutual consent, with the decisions of such a board ‘to be regarded as absolutely final’. However, this initiative was still-born, as the Painters’ Society which, with minimum reliance on arbitration, had recently won an increase in pay, announced that it would withdraw if the motion was carried. Seymour subsequently withdrew his motion. 13

With no substantial funds, no right to impose a levy on its affiliates, and no power to demand arbitration, the TLC was left hamstrung as a negotiator of industrial disputes. Consequently, during 1886-7, it was forced to abandon the QUELPS in a strike over weekly pay, the Operative Bakers’ Society in its campaign for a ten hour day, and the Bricklayer’s Society in its effort to resist a pay reduction. It is clear that the Objects were the impediment which prohibited the Council’s active involvement in these disputes: at the outbreak of the bakers’ strike Galloway used the existence of the Objects to allow him to rule that the TLC could not ‘merely go in for an exclusive support of the employees’ side of any question which might be brought before them’; and the QUELPS delegate to the Council demanded that ‘[i]f the council could help the labourers under the present system, let them say so and do it; if they could not, let them say so and the labourers’ delegates would retire from the council, and their society would fight its own battle alone.’ 14

The radical faction also moved to exclude employers from the Council. During May 1887, in order to conform to the requirements of a new Trade Union Act, delegates were obliged to revise a number of their rules. The most controversial of these was that no-one was to hold office on the Council unless they were ‘a bona fide working member of an affiliated society.’ Casey moved an amendment to the last rule: ‘That no foreman, overseer or employer should become a member of the council.’ Lane had pre-empted Casey’s amendment three months earlier when he argued that ‘between the employers and the employed [is] a gulf of divergent interests which, under ordinary circumstances, is never bridged... therefore it is unwise to have employers in a society, and folly to permit them to hold positions of trust in one.’ With only the ASCJ’s delegate objecting, on the basis that such a decision should be left to the individual societies, the meeting carried the amendment ‘by a large majority’. However, at the next fortnightly meeting, James Valentine, one of the mason’s delegates, protested that he was an employer, and that this new rule debarred men ‘who had risen a little up the ladder.’ The meeting ultimately rescinded the motion on the basis that it was unconstitutional, the requisite one month’s notice not having been given. Casey then gave a month’s notice that he would reintroduce it. A fortnight later Valentine’s co-delegate from the Masons said that his society would withdraw if the Council adopted Casey’s motion, adding that Valentine was a valued member of both his society and the TLC. Casey pointed out that this rule change was not designed to remove Valentine, and that delegates from the Boilermakers’ and from the Tanners and Carriers’, both of whom were employers, had already resigned in anticipation of this rule’s adoption. At the following meeting, in the face of strong opposition to the amendment from delegates of the Queensland Typographers’ Association (QTA), ASCJ, Cabinetmakers, Shipwrights and QUELPS, and with Valentine attempting to defuse the situation by resigning, delegates carried the amendment by thirteen votes to nine. Two of the affiliated societies responded passionately: the Masons withdrew, and the Carpenters threatened to do so. 15

There was a notable solidarity across the building trades on this issue, with the masons, carpenters, cabinetmakers and builders’ labourers all adamantly opposing the exclusion of employers. Not only did this solidarity prefigure the formation of a Building Trades Council in 1889, it also reflected the self-perceived opportunity for members of the building trades to ‘rise a little up the ladder’. The opposition of the QTA delegates is accounted for in the same way: in the 1880s, ‘many journeymen [printers] became masters’. Indeed, in November 1887, one of the Typographers’ delegates, Alf Walker, resigned from the Council, as he was soon to become an employer, albeit as co-manager with Lane of the decidedly radical Boomerang newspaper. 16

As with the other debates within the Council during this period, the controversy over the exclusion of employers illustrates a deeper ideological division. Many delegates from the building trades were prepared to accept employers amongst their ranks because they viewed the relationship between employers and employees, between capital and labour, as benign. The reformists, the radicals, were intent on excluding employers, even at the cost of alienating a number of affiliates, because for them there could be no reconciliation of the interests of capital and labour under the then current economic and industrial regime. In turn, this reflected the division within the larger Brisbane society between the staid, conservative interests which gave rise to the Council, and the recent immigrants who wanted something better. Indeed, these immigration-led changes within Brisbane society had a direct corollary in the Council, for even while the radicals pushed for a reworking of the rules, the composition of the Council was undergoing fundamental change. Whereas the Eight Hours Movement and the early Council were composed mainly of skilled, exclusivist unions, predominantly from the building trades, the ranks of the TLC were increasingly filled by unskilled, or less-skilled, workers. The Council’s executive reflected this: by March 1887 unskilled workers occupied the positions of President, Vice-president, Financial Secretary and two out of five committee men. The departure of the ASE, a conservative society, and the increasing activism of the QTA, a progressive one, moved the disposition of the Council further away from that of its founders.17 In summarising the work of the Council in its first two years, Lane declared that:

The Trades Council has done a grand work. It has made workmen familiar with the idea of a common interest regardless of occupation, and has thus paved the way for a solid union of unions... [But] its weakness... has been inseparable from the conditions of its establishment... 18

For Lane and his supporters, being so tightly bound to ‘the conditions of its establishment’ was precisely why the Council had now to be disbanded.
The TLC and politics

In April 1886, Galloway announced himself as a candidate for a by-election for one of the two seats of Fortitude Valley, and at an in camera meeting the TLC supported Galloway's candidature. At his first election rally Galloway declared himself, and by implication the TLC, in favour of 'protection generally', an assertion which provoked a storm of controversy, with TLC delegates repudiating both Galloway's advocacy of protection, and his candidature. In a written address and at a second rally, Galloway avoided the issue of protection and instead emphasised his credentials as a 'workingman'. But the damage was done, for on polling day Liberal Premier Samuel Griffith's candidate received 658 votes, a supporter of Nationalist (conservative) leader Thomas McIlwraith, 632, and Galloway just 111. This dismal result was at least partly attributable to dissatisfaction within the labour movement over both the method by which he secured the TLC's endorsement, and his subsequent unauthorised advocacy of protection. Galloway, however, seemed to learn nothing from the experience, as he continued to push the protection issue at the cost of further division within the Council. Indeed, Galloway's intransigence moved the focus of debate within the Council away from the limited issue of protection to the larger one of the role of politics in attaining the ends of the labour movement. 19

Several months after his electoral thrashing at Fortitude Valley, Galloway introduced into the Council a petition advocating protection. The delegates, having debated the issue over a period of several months, endorsed its adoption by seventeen votes to five, with five abstentions. The issue provoked significant division within several of the affiliated unions, culminating in the withdrawal of the Tailors' Society which decided 'almost unanimously' to leave the Council, stating that 'that body in its present state was useless, and had developed into a party political talking shop.' The tailors remained aloof from the TLC until May 1888. 20

Galloway's petition provoked a sophisticated response from the advocates of free trade, led by the radicals. First, they argued that protection could only create local monopolies, which would inevitably leave the workers open to greater exploitation. Second, they argued that protection could do nothing for the workers if immigration was left uncontrolled, that 'protection did not raise wages, for labour was not protected'. Thus Walker commented that to support the protection of industry without first assuring the cessation of immigration was 'like killing the fleas and leaving the dog.' Lane pre-empted the third phase of the free traders' response when he argued that fiscalism is 'a diversion' which the labour movement would be better off without. At a Council meeting just a few days later, Seymour reiterated Lane's view: he 'regarded the fiscal issue as an ignis fatuus, intended to mislead the working men. They should leave both free trade and protection alone and keep to the main questions of labour.' This third response is a complete abstraction from the terms of the debate, and reveals an important contradiction within the TLC's advocacy of protection. Griffith's candidates won 45 seats, and Griffith's twenty-four percent. Throughout the colony McIlwraith's candidates won 45 seats, and Griffith's twenty-three percent. These issues became the main planks of the platform of the Council's candidates. If we understand by the term, 'labourism', the doctrine that the interests of the wage-earner can best be served by the combination of a strong industrial trade union movement with a disciplined parliamentary labour party, then the TLC's 1888 general election platform was the first flourish of labourism in Brisbane. 21

In March 1888, the Council selected two candidates, William Colborne (QTA) for the two-member seat of Fortitude Valley, and James Johnston (Seamen) for Woolloongabba, while it invited James Valentine (Stonemasons) to attend a special meeting to consider his running for Toowong. The Council's Secretary, Albert Hinchcliffe (QTA), subsequently accepted the Council's nomination for Toombul. In order to fund the campaign, the TLC circulated subscription lists to its affiliated societies. The meetings of each of the candidates were well attended and orderly, and with many pledges of support being offered, there developed a distinct feeling that some, if not all, would be returned to parliament. This, however, was not to be. Valentine received roughly fourteen percent of the votes cast in his electorate, Colborne fifteen percent, Hinchcliffe twenty-three percent, and Johnston twenty-four percent. The campaign concluded with a set of policies, based on the issues on which it had been lobbying Griffith, including a Factories and Workshops Act, 'with an early closing clause'; the introduction of a Land Boilers Inspection Bill; a Wages and Lien Bill, the introduction of a Village Settlement scheme, and the severe limitation of assisted immigration. These issues became the main planks of the platform of the Council's candidates. If we understand by the term, 'labourism', the doctrine that the interests of the wage-earner can best be served by the combination of a strong industrial trade union movement with a disciplined parliamentary labour party, then the TLC's 1888 general election platform was the first flourish of labourism in Brisbane. 22

There are numerous and complex reasons for what the Brisbane Courier described as 'the remarkable defeat of the labour candidates'. As the Courier observed, 'the principal objects for which labour candidates were brought forward were amply secured by the pledges of the men occupying the ordinary political position.' This is particularly true of Griffith's candidates, and of Griffith himself. In a move that seemed designed to undermine the TLC's candidates' claim to independence, Griffith endorsed Johnston and, by implication, the other labour candidates, as Liberals. Johnston, Hinchcliffe and Colborne all repudiated such endorsement, but the damage was done. For the main reason for the defeat of the TLC's candidates was that they were associated with Griffith's party, while Griffith's popularity had steadily declined. In short, while the labourists had stepped into the breach created by the antagonism between the moderate and radical factions, the Council retained much of the ethos of its founders, and therefore lacked a distinctive character which could differentiate it from the Liberals. This, in turn, was the product of a community in transition, a community where continuing high rates of immigration ensured the retardation of the emergence of a dominant community ethos. 23

Conclusion

The Council's original Objects arose from a preconception of the unity of purpose of capital and labour, as manifest in the inherent benevolence of the city's employers, in an
unchanging social and industrial environment. Clearly, an organisation based on such a preconception was incapable of assimilating the ideas of William Lane and others who arrived in Brisbane in the mid-1880s. While there was nothing inherently radical in any of the reforms proposed by Lane, Seymour, Casey and their supporters, taken together these reforms were a direct challenge to the status quo within the Brisbane labour movement: they challenged the very preconceptions of the founders of the TLC. And herein lies the key to understanding the dynamics of the first Brisbane TLC: for Galloway and his colleagues these were misconceptions; for Lane and his, they were misconceptions.

In Ellem and Shields’ terms, ‘a state of internal equilibrium’ existed between the unions which founded the Brisbane TLC in 1885. However, in so far as this state reflected the labour movement’s industrial experiences of the previous twenty-odd years, it proved to be a hindrance to the ready accommodation of the Brisbane labour movement’s growing expectations. Above all, the Council’s founders failed to take account of the profound changes which were then occurring within the community of which they were but one expression, changes rung in by the influx of the thousands of men and women who, in their search for a better life, were then disembarking at the colony’s immigration depots. And while the chance to articulate the labour movement’s various interests accords opportunity.26
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