

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 27 AUGUST 1941

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

expenditure last year on account of income (State development) tax.

“2. Amounts paid during 1940-41—

	£	s.	d.
(a)	241,894	5	8
(b)	574,889	17	0
	£816,784	2	8

STRIKE OF BREAD BAKERS.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“1. Is it a fact, as reported in the Press, that the A.W.U. has donated £100 to assist the illegal strike of bread bakers and has promised further support?

“2. Does the Government propose to take any steps (a) to penalise persons taking part in an illegal strike, (b) to penalise unions illegally striking against awards of the Industrial Court, (c) to prevent union funds being used to assist another union to conduct an illegal strike, (d) to prevent the boycott weapon being used against employers who oppose an illegal strike and uphold the decisions of the Court?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. D. A. Gledson, Ipswich), for the SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. T. A. Foley, Normanby), replied—

“1. This question should be addressed to the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, who will be able to give the hon. member the information he seeks, if he so desires.

“2. The Industrial Court has cancelled the award governing the baking industry in the metropolitan area, and, therefore, the other matters raised in the question do not arise.”

COMPREHENSIVE MOTOR-VEHICLE INSURANCES.

Mr. WALKER (Cooroola) asked the Treasurer—

“What was the amount of (a) premiums, and (b) payments in 1940-41 under the Motor Vehicles Insurance Acts, 1936 to 1939, and on account of comprehensive motor vehicle policies, respectively?”

The TREASURER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer) replied—

“The Motor Vehicles Insurance Acts, 1936 to 1940—

Premiums.	Payment of Claims, Commission, and Expenses.
£ 153,163	£ 130,723

“Comprehensive Motor Vehicle Insurance—

Premiums.	Payment of Claims, Commission, and Expenses.
£ 379,047	£ 395,926

The above figures relate to the calendar year 1940, as disclosed by section 20 returns furnished by insurers under the Insurance Acts.”

WEDNESDAY, 27 AUGUST, 1941.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. E. J. Hanson, Buranda) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

BUNDABERG HOSPITAL BOARD.

Mr. YEATES (East Toowoomba) asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“What are the names of the members of the Bundaberg Hospital Board who were recently dismissed, and the names of the new appointees?”

The TREASURER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer), for The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca), replied—

“The information sought may be found in the ‘Queensland Government Gazette’ (published by authority), Volume 157, No. 39, page 379. Copies of the ‘Queensland Government Gazette’ may be obtained at the Government Printing Office.”

EXPENDITURE ON LOAN SUBSIDIES AND INTEREST FROM STATE DEVELOPMENT TAX.

Mr. NIMMO (Oxley) asked the Treasurer—

“1. What amounts were paid from income (State development) tax receipts in 1940-41 under the following headings:— (a) Subsidies under the loan-subsidy scheme, (b) interest on past loan expenditure, giving items?

“2. What was the total amount of (a) loans, (b) subsidies under the loan-subsidy scheme in 1940-41?”

The TREASURER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer) replied—

“1. (a) Nil; (b) Interest and sinking fund charges on development and employment expenditure amounted to £305,285. I would also inform the hon. member that a similar appropriation from the Unemployment Relief Fund in Victoria for last year amounted to £489,000, representing 39.6 per cent. of the Victorian Government's expenditure from the Unemployment Relief Fund. Queensland's appropriation for similar purposes represents only 15 per cent. of the

MAIN ROADS RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. WALKER (Cooroora) asked the Treasurer—

“1. What were the total receipts and expenditure of the Main Roads Fund in 1940-41?”

“2. What amount was received from the Commonwealth under the Federal Aid Roads Acts in 1939-40 and 1940-41, respectively?”

The TREASURER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer) replied—

“1. Receipts, £2,290,119 17s. 8d.; expenditure, £2,006,660 2s. 1d.

“2. 1939-40, £845,100 9s. 1d.; 1940-41, £662,426 15s.”

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulations under the Margarine Acts, 1910 to 1939.

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The TREASURER (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 of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Income Tax Assessment Act of 1936 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—SECOND ALLOTTED
DAY.

Debate resumed from 26 August (see p. 79) on Mr. Devries's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. YEATES (East Toowoomba) (10.42 a.m.): At the outset, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your unanimous election to the chair for another term. I have always found your decisions just, and I see no reason why I should think differently in the future.

I carefully examined the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor on behalf of the Government. It is proposed to place before this Assembly four new and 12 amending Bills. The programme for the session seems to be a short one, but there is a possibility that other Bills are in the offing. If that is so, I suggest that the Premier take the people into his confidence. He could bring along the whole programme each year, as the recess is long. I see no reason for holding anything back.

The Premier: Neither do I.

Mr. YEATES: I am under the impression that something is being held back. I may be wrong. Time will tell.

The Premier: You are generally wrong.

Mr. YEATES: As I mentioned the other day, when speaking to the Appropriation Bill, the war effort is of paramount importance—above all other things. I reaffirm my promise to support this Government on any Bill or regulation appertaining to the war effort. I see no reason, however, why constructive criticism should not be forthcoming in a State Parliament for the benefit of the State. In the Federal sphere domestic matters should be kept in the background; in a State Parliament it is necessary to deal with a large number of them.

In his speech on the Address in Reply the hon. member for Gregory—I shall not say parochially—dealt with industrial matters at considerable length.

The hon. member said that the Labour Party represented goodness and beauty, and he endeavoured to give the impression that nothing but good could come from that party. He would have us believe that they were Heaven-sent financiers and that no other political party knew anything about the art of government. I suppose that we must make some allowance for new hon. members, especially for those who have been brought up in a party-political atmosphere. He went on to say that Labour was offering its sons for the war effort. I grant him that, but I do not like the inference to be drawn from his remarks, that the fighting forces are coming only from the adherents of the Labour Party. The sons of people of other shades of political opinion are also doing their utmost for the war effort.

The hon. member for Kelvin Grove followed somewhat the same line of thought in dealing with industrial matters. I say with the utmost respect for those hon. members that Labour political candidates serve their apprenticeship as union organisers and that is clearly evident in the present Warrego by-election.

I have to admit that the industrial laws of Queensland are on a high plane, but I have no doubt that the industrial laws in the other States are just as good. But although our industrial laws are good, I say that we should go further and encourage the system of round-table conferences for the settlement of industrial troubles so as to eliminate much of the striking humbug that is now associated with them. That reminds me that recently there was a moulders' strike at Ipswich in connection with work that had to do very largely with the war effort. It would have been bad enough to hold up work on brake-shoes for Westinghouse brakes for ordinary railway services, but this work was associated with the war effort and should have transcended everything else. It was work that had to be done. I want to know why the Premier did not set an example in trying to settle the dispute. He is the leader of this State and it was his duty to make a public pronouncement concerning the trouble.

He should have advised the men to return to work. Indeed, he should have done more. He should have addressed the men from the rostrum at Ipswich during their lunch hour and advised them to go back to work. I believe they would have done so, that the Premier could have induced them to return to work at once if he had taken that course. It was his job to do it just as it would be the job of any other Premier in similar circumstances. Possibly my friend the hon. member for Murrumba, now Leader of the Opposition, may succeed him in the future, and I should then say the same about him. I want the hon. gentleman to carry out the job in the way I like to see it done.

The searchlight of criticism should be focused on the details of the Government's expenditure. Some people believe that governmental expenditure is one of the principal things in bringing about prosperity. We often hear that argument, especially from hon. members opposite. From 1932 to 30 June, 1941, the State's expenditure has increased by £5,000,000 a year. It is really more than that figure but I am omitting the few hundred thousand odd pounds and quoting round figures. The increased basic-wage rate caused the expenditure to be increased by £900,000, and the interest on the public debt accounted for another £247,000, or £1,147,000 in those two items alone. That is inevitable increased expenditure, although I use the term "inevitable" with reservations. The increased expenditure consequent on the increase in the basic wage was inevitable, but I have my mental reservations with regard to the increase in the interest on the public debt. My belief is that a certain amount of that increase should not have taken place. Expenditure on public works must be carefully watched. Expenditure on public works of a reproductive nature is quite sound, and we should encourage the Government to spend public money on works of that character as they might bring in an interest return.

Mr. JESSON: What are they?

Mr. YEATES: Water supply and water conservation are some, but I will not allow interruptions by interjections to divert me from my line of thought.

Mr. JESSON: What about schools?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. YEATES: Increased expenditure on public works should have been offset by increased earnings on loan works and services, but that is not always so. We find, too, that party government, particularly on the eve of an election—I hate to touch on these things—causes public moneys to be spent on public buildings just to please certain people. That is done merely to win an increased vote; the real need for such a building is not taken into account. Oftentimes public buildings, such as court houses and police stations, could have waited for 10 or 15 years longer. If we were carrying on a private business we should get all we could out of existing buildings so long as they were

comfortable for the employees who were working in them.

Since 1932 income tax has risen from £1,674,329 to £3,966,399. It may be said by hon. members opposite that that rise is the result of increased prosperity. I point out that the larger incomes being received are the result of better seasons, and the increased number of taxpayers is due to the increase in employment brought about by war service.

From July, 1932, to June, 1941, the unemployment relief tax—now called the State development tax, although it is only a white-washed unemployment relief tax—has increased from £1,089,645 to £2,369,883. The unemployment relief tax was introduced during the depression years and should have been eliminated before now; but it appears to have taken root and become a permanent tax on wages and salaries, notwithstanding the fact that unemployment in 1931-32 was 20.3 per cent. and now it is 3.9 per cent. The decrease in unemployment during the last 18 months has been largely due to war work, and in some degree to the spending of money by this Government on certain public works, some of which—such as roads and schools, particularly schools—are justified.

The total taxation in 1932 was £4,189,000, and it had increased to £8,140,000 up to June last, which is a tremendous annual rise for a State with an almost stationary population of only about 1,000,000.

I agree with the hon. member for Merthyr that the population of this State is very low compared with what it should be; but I am very hopeful the Federal child-endowment scheme will stimulate the birth rate, and that the money will not be frittered away in chocolates and picture shows.

There are really two sides to that question, and I hope that the thinking parents of this community will accept the money in the proper spirit.

Not much has been done by the Government about economy. I do not wish to see them give notice of dismissal to half the State employees or to cut wages by a special retrenchment Bill, but I expect them to go very carefully into the pros and cons in every corner of the service. It is a large service. For years it has been increasing and is apt to be built up at times to some extent by political influence, notwithstanding the fact that there is a Public Service Commissioner.

I ask the Government, in that splendid spirit of co-operation that the Premier invited us to display, to sit at a table on equal terms with us and discuss the problems of the country—I am prepared to do that at any time—to make a careful investigation into the cost of conducting the business of Queensland to-day, taking into consideration the need for assisting the war effort and the Commonwealth Government. Speaking of the Commonwealth Government in passing, I might mention that many hon. members on the Government benches are always insinuating that they are at fault irrespective of what they do. I must give the Premier credit

for giving credit where it is due, although he does not do that all through his speeches, but private members of the Government make irresponsible remarks about the Commonwealth Government to a certain extent. It must be remembered that the Commonwealth Government are in a very unfortunate predicament, but the people are to blame inasmuch as they have placed that Government in that position. The Prime Minister has to go cap in hand to some other person to ask him whether he can do this or that. That would not suit me for long, but I may be wrong.

Secondary industries in this State are lagging to a certain extent. I care not who on the Government side states that this charge is exaggerated. The fact is that greater encouragement must be given to companies, particularly small companies, such as were referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Hamilton, in whose speech I was very much interested. What has become of the commission that was appointed to inquire into taxation, company taxation in particular? Would it be advisable to advertise for it in the "Lost, stolen, or strayed" column of the Press? I have not seen or heard of any report by that commission, but it is possible it has sent in a report to the Premier. If that is so, it is the hon. gentleman's business to present it to Parliament, and the sooner we have some definite information about it the better.

Yesterday the hon. member for Hamilton, when dealing with the lag in companies and secondary industries, stated that technicians were going South. Probably the local firms could not compete because of the higher taxation that obtains in this State. We do not want our technicians to go South. I know that we are all one people under the one flag in Australia, but we have to realise that State Parliaments still exist—although the day may come when there will be no State Parliaments—and it is our job to look after the interests of the State without doing any harm to our sister States. I heartily agree with the hon. member for Hamilton's statement that Queensland should be the greatest State so far as secondary industries are concerned. To my mind, Queensland certainly is the star of the group of Australian States. In its babyhood it has been a producer of primary products, but the present war has been the means of bringing about a transition, and we must give some consideration to possible post-war problems. We should endeavour to evolve some means of carrying on the factories that may be established now. They should not be allowed to fall idle and go rusty. Adjustments should be made in our books, a certain amount should be charged to the State, and it might be advisable to sell them to enterprising companies who were willing to embark upon secondary industries, but care should be taken not to tax the very heart out of them. They should be given every encouragement to establish themselves here.

I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton, too, when he says that a young

secondary industry that is battling along and looking forward to employing more labour should have all taxation remitted so long as it continues to devote its profits to the expansion of the business up to, say, five years.

Mr. JESSON: You are a little copycat. Why do you not make your own speech?

Mr. YEATES: I shall please myself as to what I say here.

There are some hon. members on the Government side—possibly irresponsible members—who say that Federal contracts should be given to Queensland irrespective of price. I suggest that the Minister for Defence, or any other Minister in the Federal sphere, would not be carrying out his duty faithfully if he handed out contracts ad lib. just to please certain States, although he was paying a higher price for which he could get the work done in other States. The reason why we have not so many of these contracts is that secondary industries in Queensland have not been able to compete for them because of the heavier company taxation here.

Since this Government have come into power railway fares and freights have been increased by 10 per cent., a further 5½ per cent., and a still further 5 per cent. quite recently. The last increase is made ostensibly to cover the cost of child endowment and the increase in the basic wage. I realise that these are compulsory outgoings, but I also believe that the increased traffic that has been diverted compulsorily to the Railway Department because of petrol rationing should amply compensate the department for those increased costs.

I notice that the number of passengers using the railway service of the State is increasing, and I impress upon the department the necessity for holding this traffic. I sounded a similar note of warning during the last session of the last Parliament. I want the department to run faster trains and give a better service generally so that it may hold this increased traffic. When normal times come upon us again many a man may say, "I was comfortable and satisfied with train travelling; I shall stick to it." The department might expedite the livestock trains also, as to which I shall reserve further comment until we reach the Estimates.

I presume that claims were made upon the department in connection with the tragic railway accident—known as the Thallon mail smash—that occurred recently. I wonder what this statement from the Press means—

"In the absence of negligence on the part of the Railway Department or its employees, the legal position is that the Railway Department is not liable to make any payment in respect of such injuries, but, as an act of grace, and without admitting any liability to make any payment, the Commissioner has decided to assist those injured in the accident, so far as reasonably may be, and will consider any claims for medical and other expenses.

incurred by them, and will meet such of those claims as appear to him to be reasonable, on the distinct understanding that any payment made in that connection is not to be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the Commissioner."

I think that is a wrong policy to adopt towards any person who buys a ticket and travels on a train and is killed or injured in a rail accident. I think that such a person should be treated more sympathetically. Unfortunately, in this accident one passenger was killed. I regret the accident and so does the department; but I do not believe in the policy that has been adopted of saying that the department is not liable for compensation.

I was having a look at a bridge called the Story Bridge the other day and I noticed on a plaque these words: "This bridge was built by Queensland workmen under the authority of the Queensland Labour Government." What can we expect next? If the party on this side of the House comes into power—and I think it will before very long—shall we have the shocking audacity to put plaques on dental hospitals and bridges over the river to say that the Country-National Government built this hospital or that bridge?

I should like now to speak about income tax generally and the concessional deductions in particular. I throw out a reminder to the Government to allow dental costs as a deduction for income-tax purposes. During the last 25 years conditions have altered very much in the community. I suppose the diet of our people has changed, but whatever the cause I do know that dental fees constitute a very big item, particularly to parents bringing up a family. Dental treatment is a necessity. I am sure that the Department of Health and Home Affairs can confirm that. I, therefore, appeal to the Government to allow dental expenses as a concessional deduction for income-tax purposes.

I sincerely hope that the Government will give their earnest attention to the suggestion of the hon. member for Nanango that there should be co-ordination of labour in local-authority work.

It is pleasing to know that the Department of Agriculture and Stock, which is one of the live departments of State, is co-operating actively with the Federal Government in formulating a sound national fodder-conservation scheme.

I ask the Government to investigate a proposal to extend the 4-foot 8-inches railway track from the interstate railway station to the abattoirs. There are many sound reasons why this should be done, but lack of time does not permit of my elaborating them. Perhaps I shall return to the subject when the appropriate Estimates are under consideration.

To-day Queensland has 24,000,000 sheep, which is almost a record—we had a few more on one previous occasion. The post-war wool market calls for serious consideration by the Government. Just prior to the war the wool industry in Queensland was in jeopardy, but

it has been helped to some extent by the agreement with the British Government for the duration of the war and one year thereafter. We shall, however, have to be alert to see that this great industry is not impaired by the use of synthetic substitutes that may be pressed into use by war conditions.

The man on the land has too many forms to fill in and send to the Government, and I again appeal to the Government to devise a scheme whereby one or two returns will suffice. The Government have a great number of public servants at their command who should be able to achieve this very laudable reform.

I hope that the Department of Public Lands will retain some of the expiring leaseholds, especially brigalow and belah country, for the settlement of soldiers upon the termination of the war. Of course, I am not advocating that the land should be thrown open for selection now but it should be held until the men of the very fine type who are enlisting return from overseas. I believe the Government are already doing something about the repatriation of soldiers, and I give them credit for it. It must not be thought that I suggest that a man who is a quarryman should be given the position of chief bookkeeper. Let us deal with the problem of repatriating the returned men in a reasonable way, but above all give preference to the returned soldier.

Yesterday, I was pleased to hear the Premier give an outline of a new Bill to deal with the co-ordination of education from the kindergarten to the university, and I grasp the proposal with both hands. By the way, I noticed that the Premier read most of his speech, and I might be doing that yet myself. He referred to the brilliant achievements of Sir Charles Lilley in 1870, and the splendid work of Sir Samuel Walker Griffith in bringing up to date the Act of 1860, and I was pleased to hear him pay a tribute to those early statesmen who did so much to bring about a system of free education in Queensland. I hope that I shall have more to say on this subject when the Estimates are under consideration. What we require in this country is students skilled in the art of leadership and in giving service to the country. We should set out to train the children in leadership and service from the kindergarten through the primary and secondary schools to the university, for we sorely lack leadership in this country to-day.

I ask the Director of Education and the Secretary for Public Instruction not to think about closing a country school just because its attendance has fallen two or three below the required average. I appeal to them to give such a question serious consideration with a view to trying to keep country schools open.

The Government have not been doing enough in the matter of water-conservation schemes. This applies not only to the Condamine River, but to the Darling Downs as a whole.

(Time expired.)

Mr. TAYLOR (Enoggera) (11.21 a.m.): This is a time when one is compelled to consider very seriously the relationship between the Commonwealth and State. For that reason I am pleased to note that the Governor in his Speech drew attention to the wonderful co-ordinated effort that the people of Queensland and the Government were according to the Commonwealth Government in this the hour of crisis for all the Australian people. At this time I could do no better than repeat what I said in this House on 22 August last year, that before this war is finished, and before the peoples of the British Empire, together with their Allies, effectively deal with Hitler and his co-conspirators they will have to socialise the whole means of production and man-power for the war effort. It will have to be an all-in effort. To-day there is still a tendency in some quarters to think that it is the prerogative of the capitalistic companies, such as the Broken Hill Proprietary, to enjoy a monopoly of the control of the main factors of mechanised warfare, and that the people can be taxed to the utmost to provide them with the profits they are making to-day, and that we in Australia can nevertheless make a 100 per cent. war effort. I say most emphatically that we cannot. To-day, if the reports of those in control of recruiting are correct, we have evidence that there is a lag in recruiting. There is some cause for that lag other than the cause one hears occasionally to-day that there is no desire on the part of the Australian worker to fight for the cause of freedom. I say that is not so. The lag is caused by the difference in the conditions accorded to those who have charge of production of the necessities of war and those who have to take the things they produce and use them as soldiers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. That is one of the main factors that are causing a lag in recruiting to-day. We must realise that to-day the average man is better educated, has a better philosophy and a better psychology, and so can understand things better than 30 or 50 years ago. Consequently, he cannot be used by a capitalistic monopolistic company as an instrument for its benefit when he gets nothing out of it himself. Why, to-day we are still told that soldiers can fight for their five bob or six bob a day, as the case may be, plus the allowances to their wives and children, while we know that people in big jobs are being paid huge salaries, or are given commissions and a "cost-plus," the system operating in Britain. This state of things is operating to the detriment of the war effort generally.

I know perfectly well that many hon. members will not agree with what I am saying, nevertheless the people in Australia are showing evidence of agreement with my sentiments. I know perfectly well many are dubious of the ultimate result of this war under the conditions under which we are prosecuting it.

I have here a little booklet entitled, "The Traitor Class," published last November in England by Lawrence and Wishart. It contains some very illuminating information about the profiteering that is going on in England—I shall deal with the profiteering in Australia

later—and I point out to our friends that while this kind of thing goes on the people will not overtake the lag in recruiting. This booklet contains a list of many of the prominent firms in England showing their profits for 1939 and for 1940. I will not read all of them, but I will quote some that are more or less directly concerned with the manufacture of war implements for the mechanised troops. The information contained in this book will probably let hon. members know why certain people would not reduce their profits in order that the lag in recruiting might be overtaken. British Aluminium—and aluminium is one of the main factors in aeroplane construction—made a profit of £909,000 in 1939, and in 1940 its profits increased to £1,075,000.

An Opposition Member: Was there any increase in capital?

Mr. TAYLOR: There was an increase in the reserve funds. The British Sugar Corporation, which handles all the sugar that comes into England, made a profit of £383,312 in 1939, and £1,182,143 in 1940. Consett Iron made a profit of £669,717 in 1939 and £1,061,188 in 1940. Crosses and Winkworth Consolidated Mills, a cotton firm that provides the fabric used in aeroplane construction, made a profit of £61,605 in 1939 and £199,655 in 1940. Dunlop Rubber, the British branch of the Dunlop Rubber Company, made a profit of £2,025,000 in 1939, and in 1940 that profit had increased to £3,441,000. The British branch of the Ford motor firm in 1939 made a profit of £1,416,929 and in 1940 £2,753,417. J. P. Coats, another firm interested in the manufacture of war products, made a profit of £1,535,000 in 1939 and a profit of £2,187,000 in 1940. John Summers and Sons, a steel firm, made a profit of £221,207 in 1939 and £485,465 in 1940. Lever Brothers made a profit of £7,346,343 in 1939 and £9,740,567 in 1940.

The profits of other firms rose in a similar way, as the following table shows:—

	1939.	1940.
	£	£
Marks and Spencer (a steel firm) ..	2,380,610	3,047,030
Metal Traders ..	116,310	241,906
Niger Company ..	186,565	1,706,784
Richard Thomas and Company ..	792,203	1,717,677

The Niger Company is a subsidiary of the Lever Brothers and Unilever, and it is a scandal to find the profits of that company have increased to the extent shown. Richard Thomas and Company is also interested in the war. These are things that give rise to a definite upheaval in the minds of the working classes. Here, in Australia, we have in the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited the same kind of thing. That proprietary is one of the largest companies in Australia and can be quoted with the English companies mentioned. When one reads these facts in conjunction one with the other, one wonders what is occurring.

I now quote from the London "News Chronicle"—

"In April Lord Catto, then Director-General of Equipment and Stores, told the 'News Chronicle': 'The expeditionary force to Norway has gone over fully equipped to fight a campaign under conditions differing considerably from those in other spheres of war. . . . There is no doubt whatever that our army's equipment is much superior to that of the Germans.'"

That statement was made by the Director-General of Equipment and Stores in England in April, 1940. Hon. members must take particular heed of what I will read now—

"The review of the British Army in the first year of the war, issued in September by the Military Affairs Department of the Ministry of Information, describes the same expeditionary force as: 'untrained, unprepared, and ill-supplied and equipped for the conditions in which they had to fight.'"

And that is right.

Similar incidents have been occurring in Australia over a period in connection with the war effort. We have the spectacle of our Australian boys in Greece and Crete being in exactly the same position as the British expeditionary force in Norway. Hon. members must have read in our local Press that there were only two aeroplanes on an aerodrome in Crete that were capable of going into the air and then only in daylight. There was also the statement that our soldiers in Greece could see the German soldiers getting out of busses but had nothing to throw at them or hit them with except their fists. If such happenings are to continue I ask: how are we going to finish?

We must take careful stock of the whole organisation of the war effort if we are to win out. Believe me, those who do a little wishful thinking need not think that Hitler and the Fascist hordes are beaten. They have friends and Fifth Columnists in England and elsewhere in the British Empire, even in Australia.

Mr. Nimmo: Which side are you on?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am definitely on the side of the British Commonwealth of Nations—let the hon. gentleman make no mistake about that—but I believe in criticising when criticism is necessary. I do not think that the Federal Government, or the British Government in the past, have given us their best effort. For nine years the British Empire was governed by the greatest gang of political crooks, from Ramsay MacDonald to Chamberlain, that ever drew breath in any Parliament of the world.

As regards the effort in Australia, I would point out that the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited probably represents the nearest approach to the English companies I have mentioned. Let us see, therefore, what that concern has been doing in the war effort. It must be kept in mind that the director-

general of the Broken Hill company stated that his company could supply iron and steel only to the companies that were engaged in war production. They said that they were making only very low profits in the Broken Hill Proprietary steel works at Newcastle out of war production. That may be. They may be making only 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. out of it, but the fly in the ointment is that their subsidiary companies, which are manufacturing the mechanised units for the Australian Army, Navy, and Air Force, are controlled more or less by the same directorates as the Broken Hill Proprietary. After all, do hon. members not think that it is time we made a real effort to obtain control of these activities? When a Labour man makes a statement similar to the one made by the Hon. Frank Forde, he is howled down and criticised. When Mr. Forde stated in the Federal House that we have to take over the Broken Hill Proprietary and other companies in order to prosecute the war effort successfully there was a howl all over Australia from the Tory Press and their subsidiary organisations. All the Tories in Australia said, "Why, he is a damned Communist." Believe me, they will have to have the damned Communists before they will win this war.

Mr. Macdonald: Are you one of them?

Mr. TAYLOR: No. I draw the attention of hon. members to the following article from the "New Times":—

"A report recently published in Sydney stated that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited made net profits amounting to £963,279 for the year 1940-41. . . ." A wonderful contribution to the war effort! The article continues—

"But this figure represented a decrease on the previous year's profits of £15,859." That is all right if you just look at that small paragraph, but let us go on—

"Having in mind the various moves made by this concern towards complete centralisation and monopoly by buy-in, squeeze-out methods, I decided that I'd B.H.P. (Better Have a Peep) at the other relative figures. Investigation revealed that:

"Whereas in the year 1939-40 the sum set aside for 'depreciation' amounted to £903,354, in 1940-41 it had jumped to £1,453,211."

An additional sum of £549,000 was put aside for incidentals. We want to know, too, whether the 7½ per cent. dividend is not in keeping with the general application of the policy of big business to the war effort. Dividends and interest have to go by the board. If you are going to sacrifice the lives of Australia's manhood in the war, you have also to sacrifice something else with them so far as I am concerned. I believe that a Labour Government in the Federal sphere will govern more fairly and more equitably than the Menzies Government ever tried to do. A Labour Government there would have

the confidence of the people, and that would obviate all these questions of dividends derived from the war effort. Such a Government would have the confidence of the manpower of Australia, and you would get every soldier you wanted.

Mr. Massey: You would not need the Communists then.

Mr. TAYLOR: There is no doubt that our friends opposite are suffering, just as many other people are, from the anti-Communist obsession. Believe me, such people are going to get a very rude shock very shortly. It was because Hitler was scared to death of the Soviet armies in Russia that he deemed it best to attack them before they became any stronger. He got the assistance of Fifth Columnists in France, Spain, and other parts of Europe, and attacked the Soviet armies simply because he knew that sooner or later they would be able to oust him. We have to realise that for over nine solid weeks millions of the Communists whom our friends opposite are prepared to traduce have been standing up and taking the hammer blows of one of the most efficient and best-equipped mechanical fighting forces that the world has ever seen.

And what have we done? We have had a bit of a skirmish in Libya and a sort of a one in Syria. Look at the hundreds of thousands of soldiers belonging to the Red Army who have been slaughtered by the Nazis. Those soldiers of the Red Army are slaughtering hundreds and thousands of Germans in the process, let it be remembered. It is all very fine for us to sit here on padded cushions when men are being slaughtered on our behalf and say "More power to them!" It is all very well for our friends in the Opposition to say sneeringly, "Those damned Communists." We have reached a stage in the development of things when we shall come to Nazi-ism or Communism. There is no half-way house; you cannot sit on the fence much longer and get away with it. During the last week we had the spectacle of a British convoy losing six ships off the Spanish coast. We know perfectly well that German planes are operating from Spanish bases. We also know that there are 350,000 Spanish troops in Africa; they are not there for the good of their health. Money is not spent to send such a number of troops across to Africa just because the Spanish climate might not suit the health of the army. Those troops have gone there for a definite purpose. I prophesy that before another three or four weeks have elapsed we shall probably be fighting Spanish and French troops in Africa on the side of the Axis powers.

I quote from this publication again—

"Shipments of oil and oil products to Spain greatly in excess of last year's exports have led diplomatic circles to fear that Germany and Italy may be getting vital oil supplies through the blockade by this route. ('New York Times' Washington correspondent, quoted, 'Sunday Times,' 21 July.)"

Mr. Muller: Who is the author of that book?

Mr. TAYLOR: It was published in England and released by the censor. Evidently, the censorship in England is not so strict as that in Australia. It was not published by the "damned Communist Party" or any affiliated organisation. My friends opposite need not get scared.

I want to say something now about Franco, and particularly his statement about Gibraltar, because I think that he is one of the bloodiest butchers who ever led an army in any area of the war in Europe. With the assistance of German and Italian Fascists he has slaughtered his own people in the interests of finance capital in Spain and in the interests of the Germans. That is a positive fact. We have to try to fathom how we will behave in the increasing complexity of the war moves. Franco made a speech on 17 July last year in which he said—

"We have 2,000,000 soldiers prepared to stand up for Spain's rights" and "we have not finished our task. . . There remains Spain's duty and mission—the mandate of Gibraltar and colonial expansion."

Those are the words that Hitler has been using in Germany for many years.

The same book says—

"In the House of Commons, Mr. Attlee, interpellated on 31 July, explains. Franco, it seems, 'was actually making a historical reference to the political testament of Queen Isabella.'"

We could make historical references to King William and Mary in regard to the rights of citizens, if we cared to.

We do not want to do that because our action may be taken to mean that we desire to interfere with the war effort.

These are facts. To-day we are faced with the fact that Spain might throw herself wholeheartedly into the Axis camp. Indeed, she is three-parts of the way already. Only three months ago a statement appeared in the "Courier-Mail" to the effect that we had given Spain £6,000,000 worth of credit to enable her to purchase wool and wheat. Did that £6,000,000 of English finance have anything to do with matters that eventually might place the British Empire in jeopardy in Africa?

Something has to be said about similar happenings here in Australia. Our representatives have up to the present moment been examining a trade agreement with Japan under which we are to send Japan scrap iron, wool, and other items of commerce that may be useful to her in prosecuting a war against the British Empire and her allies. Then we wonder why there is a lag in recruiting. The working classes are not all dumb-bells. You can have conscription under Socialism, under the objective of the Labour Party, but only under the objective of the Labour Party. Bear that in mind.

I now come to a local paper, the Melbourne "Argus." Our friends opposite know that that is not published by the Communist Party. That paper contains a statement by the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Menzies, at a dinner given to 300 business men at the Hotel Australia on Tuesday, 19 August, 1941, so that it is a recent publication. The Australian Prime Minister said—

"No-one is more conscious of the magnificent defence which Russia is putting up than I am. For somewhat more than eight weeks Russia has been resisting the German onslaught, and the German High Command is at this moment no doubt anxiously studying weather reports to see if, for the second time in history, a would-be conqueror is going to find himself literally bogged in the Russian plains. So you and I say 'Thank God for what Russia has done, what she is doing, and what she is going to do.'"

Hon. members opposite will see that there is a wishful desire even on the part of the Australian Prime Minister that Russia may yet be able to do what we were not able to do in the early part of the war—that is, defeat Hitler and pull us out of the bog. Yet there are people in the Commonwealth who are prepared to sneer at that statement.

I have yet another paper, the "Catholic Worker," which in its issue of 2 August 1941 reprints an article from another paper published under the same authority in New Zealand called "Zealandia." The "Catholic Worker" deals with Russia as an ally, and says—

"To aid Soviet Russia even against our common foe is to invite the curse of God upon ourselves. To those who say that Germany's victory over Russia would mean our defeat, we would reply that it is better to go down in honour because of our allegiance to God than to stand victorious in the world after selling ourselves to the devil."

Mr. Macdonald: What is the name of the paper?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is the "Catholic Worker." I want to know whether the Prime Minister of Australia is correct, whether the British Prime Minister is correct, or whether these people are correct.

Mr. Massey: If you accept Mr. Menzies you will be all right.

Mr. TAYLOR: Let us assume that he has given us the correct policy of the British Commonwealth of Nations in our war effort. Then there are some Fifth Columnists in Australia who are getting away with a great deal of publicity and propaganda. Why? How are they able to do it?

If a Communist, or alleged Communist, is "picked up" with a pamphlet that might have been in his possession for two, three, or four years he is hauled before the court either in this State or another State in Australia and fined a "tenner." Fred Paterson was fined for making a statement at a council meeting, not in public.

An Opposition Member: Do you not think he should have been?

Mr. TAYLOR: Why not treat them all the same, not make fish of one and flesh of another?

Mr. Edwards: Point out one of these men that you are speaking of.

Mr. TAYLOR: Why not let us deal honestly and fairly with the whole position? If we are going to deal with Fifth Columnists, then let us deal with the whole damn lot of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Muller: What Fifth Columnist are you speaking of?

Mr. TAYLOR: Again, in the "New Times" the Prime Minister of Great Britain is discussed and it gets away with it.

Mr. Muller: What paper is that?

Mr. TAYLOR: The "New Times" is published under the aegis of the Douglas Credit people. Here is a statement—I will not read the whole of it but only one or two points—on the Prime Minister's eight points which were announced recently:—

"It was not the people of Britain who selected Mr. Churchill as Prime Minister. He obtained that eminence after a Press campaign, nearly all newspapers being controlled by Jewish interests speaking for international finance. The fact that other members of the British Cabinet were bosom friends of the Rothschilds also helped a little."

Such are the statements that are published. The British Commonwealth of Nations is desirous of getting every ounce of effort it possibly can out of the people of the British Empire in order to save ourselves and civilisation from being over-run by the Fascist and Nazi hordes. If we are going to allow the individual who believes in Socialism to be "pinched" every time he is caught with a pamphlet in his pocket, then we are not going to win this war or overcome the lag in recruiting.

Mr. Muller: You must read all the scurrilous rags.

Mr. TAYLOR: There is no possible chance of a member of Parliament's getting anywhere without reading everything he can lay his hands on. I make it my business to read everything I can get. I may not subscribe to the policy of a paper I read, but I read it because I believe if I want to get information I must get it at the source, particularly as that information is not contained in the Tory Press such as the "Courier-Mail" or "Telegraph," or the Sydney "Daily Telegraph," or the Melbourne "Argus" or "Herald." In the local Tory Press we only get skimmings of what is going on. After all, they cater for only a section of the people, whose policy is not in the best interests of the people of Australia or the British Empire.

I want to say, too, in connection with the lag in recruiting, that there is evidence that individuals who enlist are not being treated on an equal basis. That is another factor.

Mr. Edwards: You are doing a lot of damage to recruiting.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am trying to point out to the powers that be the folly of these things. Members in the Federal House have been stating these things for months—and I will quote their statements from "Hansard"—trying to point out to those in control of the war effort that they should look at their shortcomings in order to discover whether the present methods should not be altered. I believe that when the Labour Party takes hold of the reins of government in the Federal sphere this position will be righted. Then we shall not have aristocrats' sons getting pips on their shoulders and workers' sons getting five bob a day as footsloggers in the infantry.

Mr. Ward made statements concerning recruiting in the Federal House of Representatives, in which he said—

"Under this system we find that social darlings without any military experience join the forces and are whisked away to an officers' training school. They serve there for a few weeks and come out as full-blown officers, albeit without experience. As such they are placed in positions where they may lord it over other men with many years of military training and experience. Let me give a few specific instances—

Peter Playfair, 18 years of age, son of the Hon. T. Playfair, M.L.C., of the Fresh Food and Ice Company, joined the forces and in a few weeks obtained a commission.

Anthony Hordern, junior, was sent to an officers' training school.

Macfarlane V. Nathan, son of the very wealthy Mr. V. Nathan, enlisted in July, 1940, was made a corporal, and then sent to Duntroon Military College.

Phillip Lloyd Jones, son of one of the principals of David Jones Limited, took six weeks to become an officer."

Then you wonder why there is a lag in recruiting. Then we have the spectacle of the whole Press stating that something must be done to overcome this lag. The Director-General of recruiting says that something must be done to overcome the lag and that we must educate the people. Why not fill up the holes in their own burst boilers before they start to tell the other machine how to move? These are things we have to take notice of. These are things that will be rectified when the Labour Party becomes the Federal Government—make no mistake about that.

Mr. Nimmo: The Labour Party refused to become the Government.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Labour Party never refused to become the Government. The hon. member for Oxley knows well that the Labour Party refused to become the tools of a gang of political messers and misfits who have been making a bad job of the war effort in Australia over the past two years. That is why the Labour Party refused to join a national Government.

Mr. Barnes: Why did they not put Menzies out and do the job themselves?

Mr. TAYLOR: They will in their own good time. The time has almost arrived when the people of Australia will give them credit for doing the job and help them to do it. There is no doubt our friends who are opposed to the Labour movement wish to get a national Government in the Federal House in order that that Government could still keep covered up some of the defects in the organisation of work of the war effort—some of the graft and crookedness that has gone on under the war effort in those earlier years. But a national Government would not solve Australia's problem, nor the British problem; they would only bring about a little unity probably in the political field and allow some more crookedness to go on in connection with the war effort.

Mr. Edwards: You are trying to do all the harm you can.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am pointing out those things that need altering, and they are going to be altered. Here in Queensland we have a man who is associated with a recruiting committee as chairman whose company was pulled over the coals by the Commonwealth Supply Department for supplying refrigerators to the Commonwealth Government for the camps for the soldiers that were not in conformity with the specifications, and were practically second-hand machines sold to the Commonwealth Government at new-machine prices. That man is a director of two firms here in Queensland. Then you wonder why the people are beginning to wonder where it will finish. Go to the man in the street and see what he is wondering about. He is wondering where this is going to finish. It will continue unless there is a definite change in connection with the operations of the war effort.

As far as we are concerned in Queensland regarding the State's association with the war effort, we have been fairly lucky. That is due to the fact that we have appointed a Co-ordinator-General in control and he virtually supervises Queensland's contribution to the war effort.

It is only when there is an authority that can be held responsible for the job and on which can be fastened all the mistakes and misfits that you will get efficiency in administration. How can efficiency be obtained when there are hotch-potch departments, all mixed up like an Irish stew, all over-lapping, and responsibility on none?

The State of Queensland has done remarkably well in its war effort in the past 12

months. Bank clearances have increased and are now a record, which shows the prosperity of the State. Purchases of war-savings certificates are a few points above the 100 per cent. The contributions to patriotic funds in Queensland are the greatest in the Commonwealth in proportion to population. The Government have co-ordinated the work of the State to the Commonwealth's war effort, and we find ourselves in the best position of any Government in Australia. Mr. McKell, the recently-elected Labour Premier of the premier State of the Commonwealth, paints a terrible picture of the condition of things in that State. Of course, it will take him some time to clear up the mess there. Hon. members must believe me when I say that there is a mess in that State. I was in Sydney on voting day at the last State election, and all I could see as to the policy of the Mair United Australia Party Government was a large sign on the Sydney Town Hall, reading, "Beat Germany First," in other words, "For God's sake don't beat us or Germany will win the war." With such a state of things where shall we finish? If that is the only policy that the United Australia Party and the Country-National Organisation can put forward we shall not get anywhere. The people in Australia are looking for results and they will get them only if they put their faith in an organisation such as the Labour Party, which has a policy of progress. The people will get results only if they take no notice of smoke-screens of the type thrown out by the Tory Press and by members of the Country-National Party.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (12.3 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, I take this my first opportunity of offering my congratulations to you on your being re-elected to the chair unanimously. I have known you for a great number of years, and it gives me pleasure to be able to congratulate you, because I know you and your character so well and also know that you have conducted the business of the House so well in the past.

Much has been said of the outstanding need of planning for post-war reconstruction. We have been told, and we recognise, that the most important problem that will confront us when the war is successfully concluded will be the changing from war-time to peace-time industry. None can say how long this conflict will last. That would be pure speculation on our part, but this is the time for some speculation so that we can arrive at some conclusion as to a scheme to come into operation at a later date.

It has been suggested that we might even have to meet complete monetary changes. That may be so. There are others who think that there will be social reforms. Perhaps that also will take place. Still others think that we can never progress in the Commonwealth of Australia unless we embark upon a policy of uniform taxation and uniform wages. I believe that all these problems will arise, but I feel that whatever planning we do must not be done selfishly. We shall have to realise that while we are planning and considering the problems of our own State,

when it comes to war reconstruction we may have to give greater consideration to the planning that is taking place in other countries. I do not think the ultimate planning will rest entirely with us. Much will depend upon our own efforts, but a good deal will depend also upon the action taken by other nations of the world.

During the debate this morning it appeared to me that certain hon. members think that we shall shortly have to tackle the question of rehabilitation of our fighting men. I say that we have to consider that matter now, because we have men returning now. They deserve some consideration and the benefit of some plan, which really does not yet exist. What are we doing for these returned men to-day? Some of them who are returning wounded and unfit for service possibly will be also unfit to carry on the occupations for which they had been trained previously. We should tackle this problem immediately. We know that during the last war there was a great deal of talk, but what did we do for the men who fought in it? We embarked upon a rural-development scheme of sorts, but we had no idea whether the land selected was suitable. We picked the worst possible areas upon which to settle these men and put on them men who had not had experience or training to enable them to follow the pursuits of the land. Those men got a raw deal right through. At that time, when the spirit of patriotism was at its highest, we advocated preference for returned soldiers. To-day we have that same preference mentioned again. I appeal to hon. members to be earnest about this. If we are going to tackle this problem we should be doing it now. We should be establishing preference for our returned men now in at least certain occupations.

In considering suitable occupations in which to place these men I have come to the conclusion that one industry that is perhaps still untapped in this State has missed the attention of the authorities. In Queensland we have a coast line extending over many miles. We have the wealth of the sea waiting to be exploited, but all our efforts seem to be diverted to winning wealth from the land. We are depending a great deal on the Commonwealth Government, and we know that they are investigating the fishing industry. We know, too, that the other States, New South Wales in particular, have been giving that matter close attention for a number of years. We in Queensland should not wait for the Commonwealth Government to test our fields of possible wealth. We have to do a certain amount of that work ourselves. I say emphatically that we ought to be able to turn our attention to the fishing industry and establish something new, something that will create wealth and employment—new employment—for the people of this State.

In the past attempts have been made in a small way to foster the fishing industry of the State. Men with vision have tackled this problem, but they have not had sufficient support. Capital would be required for the pioneering work and the exploration of our

coastline. Money would be required to help private enterprise to buy trawlers and the necessary fishing plant; and to erect works for the processing of the fish. Then there is the marketing of the products and by-products of the industry. When we look at the matter broadly, we realise that we have enough knowledge of our coast to know that we have fish in sufficient quantities to warrant the establishment of a big industry if we had the courage to make the initial effort. The industry as we know it to-day is nothing more nor less than a local industry, one that is confined almost entirely to our southern coastline.

The Secretary for Public Works: They bring tons of fish down from the North.

Mr. DECKER: I repeat that it is virtually confined to the southern area. Let us look at what the Government have done to assist the fishing industry. They have placed on the statute books a Fish and Oyster Act, which is considered the basis of what the Government deem a fair deal for the industry. Much attention has been given in the regulations to the licensing of fishermen, the licensing of boats, the length of nets to be used, the mesh, the closed and open grounds, the use of traps, and the policing of the Act. Everything seems to have been provided for, up to a point, but where does it get us? Hon. members occupying the Government benches might be alarmed when I say that the fishermen to-day control the Government in the operation of the fishing laws of this State.

The Secretary for Mines: Do you not believe in the producer's having a say in his industry?

Mr. DECKER: If it is for the protection of the industry. I say that if the Government do not take a stand and make some further regulations to protect the fishing industry, particularly in the southern waters, the time is fast approaching when the industry will ruin itself. I made inquiries a little time ago about the procedure to be adopted to close a certain area against net fishing. I was told definitely that to do that I should first have to get the consent of the Fishermen's Association, because the Government had an understanding that no new grounds would be opened nor would any alteration be made to the Act unless by mutual consent.

The Treasurer: I can assure you that that is not true.

Mr. DECKER: It was the information I was given. I hope that it is not true. If it is not true then I say I was deliberately misled by officers of the Government. I was endeavouring to have certain waters at Sandgate closed to net fishing.

The Treasurer: We have consulted the Fishermen's Association and the Amateur Fishermen's Association, but we have no arrangement.

Along the South Coast of Queensland there are a few master fishermen, as I call them, who control the industry. They are so equipped that they can take their gear many

miles from certain centres. These master fishermen operate largely along the ocean beaches. This is a serious matter, and something that we shall have to look into very closely. For instance, during the winter season the mullet, which are then in prime condition and with full roes, are migrating north. The master fishermen have a very fine information bureau and that is not hard to establish. These fish move along the coast past given points almost to the day or week each year, and these periods are known with considerable certainty to the master fishermen. They have no trouble in employing scouts at different points to enable them to attack the approaching shoals without interference from the inspector of fisheries. When these shoals are attacked on the ocean beaches, they are prevented from gaining entrance to our rivers and bays, and thus we are deprived of a supply of seasonable fish in the estuaries. I believe that the mullet have a strong homing instinct, and that the young will eventually return to the place where the eggs or spawn are laid and hatched. I may be somewhat speculative in what I say as to mullet, but we have scientific proof that the eel, for instance, has strong homing instincts and so has the salmon and sea trout. I believe that applies with great force to the mullet and other fish that frequent the waters of our coast, and if so we should allow entrance for them to our bays and rivers to give them a chance of spawning and propagating in such numbers as to ensure continuity of supply. That is not done, because we allow the big fishermen to tackle the shoals and drive them away from the entrances to our bays and rivers, and so the local fishermen are virtually deprived of a livelihood. The local market is getting worse and worse, and eventually the industry will be entirely ruined just because the Government do not view it in proper perspective and do not give a little greater measure of protection to our migratory fish.

The question must be taken up seriously, and the Government should be big enough to lay down their own laws. I am certain that if they put the proposal to the fishermen themselves, and especially to the more influential fishermen, they would get nowhere. The fishermen would oppose the idea, but in the interests of the industry some action will have to be taken in that direction. Recently there was a fishermen's conference in New South Wales at which representatives of our local fishermen were present, but even the recommendations that were made there in pursuance of their combined experience were not acceptable to the fishermen here. I say that nothing will be acceptable to them, that they will ruin the industry unless we take a hand and make laws for the protection and propagation of the fish. Unless we do that the industry will continue to deteriorate instead of flourish. I know also that the Government made a big mistake when they turned down the suggestion of the hon. member for Stanley to install a fish ladder at the Somerset Dam. The Brisbane City Council, together with the assistance of

this Government and interested shire councils, has already erected a fish ladder at Mount Crosby. Now, it is necessary wherever there is a big drop in water occasioned by the construction of a dam in a river, that fish ladders be erected so that we do not interfere with the breeding habits of our fish.

The Secretary for Mines: You know that erecting a fish ladder at the Somerset Dam is a different matter to erecting one at Mount Crosby.

Mr. DECKER: I know that, nevertheless, it is on the same plane and deserves some consideration, as it is a matter of importance to the industry. To dismiss the suggestion is merely taking a narrow view, as it is one that is necessary in the interests of the fishing industry.

The Treasurer: You have an idea that fish breed up the rivers?

Mr. DECKER: I not only have an idea, but I am sure of it.

The Treasurer: I think you are wrong. They come from the sea to spawn, but not up the rivers.

Mr. DECKER: There is scientific opinion on that question, but it is opening up a very debatable question. I say definitely that mullet do not spawn in the sea; in the winter they come into our rivers to spawn and are only forced to spawn in the sea when they cannot reach the higher reaches of our rivers in time. They are forced to spawn at sea by attacks from fishermen who drive them off our ocean beaches and prohibit them from returning to their breeding grounds. That applies to mullet particularly, as has been proved over and over again. It will not help the Government one bit to take the word of fishermen. It is a subject for scientific study and research.

The Treasurer: I disagree with you, and scientific research disagrees with you.

Mr. DECKER: No.

The Treasurer: Experts tell me that the mullet goes up the river and matures until it is about three years of age, and then goes down the river and spawns for the first time.

Mr. DECKER: It is very interesting to hear the Minister make that statement, but I say without fear of contradiction that mullet that come north in full roe come here to spawn. They are not going from here after having spawned. We catch them during the winter months during their full migratory period. How then does the argument of the Minister hold? They come north and make up our rivers and bays to spawn. Certainly, after they have spawned they make back to the sea. That is apparent, otherwise we should not have the migration down the coast again in full roe. Until we make definite provision to stop all net fishing for all time on the ocean beaches and entrances to our bays we shall merely perpetuate the system as it is at present and not

give the protection to the fishermen that we should.

The Premier: What do you recommend?

Mr. DECKER: I recommend that all net fishing on ocean beaches be absolutely prohibited for all time, and that protection also be given to the entrances of our bays in order to allow fish to come in to spawn.

The Secretary for Mines: Do you go out with a rod and line to catch mullet?

Mr. DECKER: One does not go with a rod and line to catch mullet, but if we permit them to come into our bays and rivers we shall get a greater supply and more even distribution of fish.

In order to keep up the supply it is essential that the fish should be permitted to go to their natural spawning grounds. If we do not do that, we are losing sight of something that is vital to the interests of the fishing industry, particularly on the southern section of our coast. What I suggest is the sensible thing to do in the interests of the industry. Why allow the "key" fishermen to build up their interests in such a big way as to almost prevent the small man from operating? Why allow him to take the hordes of fish as they come in and thus deplete our bays and rivers, which should be teeming with fish?

I am not criticising the Government—I did not get up to do that to-day—I am merely putting forward a line of thought regarding the protection of our fish in the southern waters. By enforcing a regulation embracing my suggestion we may lay the foundation of a big fishing industry that would permit the operation of big preserving and processing works for the marketing of fish and their by-products. If we do not act now, later on perhaps New South Wales or one of the other States will take the matter up seriously and it will be too late for us to enter the field. When we know that before the war the imports of fish amounted to approximately £1,000,000 sterling, we realise the possibilities that exist for canning fish for markets overseas as well as home consumption.

I make those few suggestions for what they are worth, hoping they may be productive of something useful.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (12.33 p.m.): First, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. Those two gentlemen displayed a thorough understanding of the affairs of State and demonstrated that they had the ability to give expression to their ideas. I venture the opinion that both will render a useful service to this State.

I also wish to congratulate those other hon. members on both sides of the Chamber who have been sworn in for the first time. A man must have shown ability in order to win a seat in this House. Those new hon. members have the confidence of the majority of the people in their electorates, and I trust that

they will exert their undoubted ability with the object of making Queensland a better State for all to live in.

I was very pleased with the speech delivered by the hon. member for Hamilton, not that I agreed with all his suggestions, but because of the constructive criticism that he put forward. His suggestion regarding a flat rate of taxation does not appeal to me, but the hon. member showed he had honesty of purpose and the ability to place something constructive before the Government. Various proposals have been placed before the Government from time to time, and not very long ago people were suggesting that profits spent by companies or individuals on improving or extending their plants should be free from taxation.

Personally, I should be more inclined to give consideration to that suggestion than the one put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton. However, I am pleased that he did offer some constructive criticism, and I hope that the new hon. members sitting on the Opposition benches will take note and not be like the rank and file who, for the few years I have been a member of this House, have been criticising the Government. According to them nothing good comes from the Government, but they have made no concrete suggestion of what the Government should do.

I listened carefully and with interest to the Speech made by His Excellency, and from time to time I have heard remarks on the whole-hearted manner in which His Excellency carries out his many duties. There can be no doubt that he has gained widespread popularity, and that he has fitted himself for his eminent position.

The results of the recent election prove that the Government retain the confidence of the people of the State. Some may gain slight satisfaction in the knowledge that four electoral seats have been won from the Government, but the Government Party also can claim some satisfaction in the knowledge that it has won two seats held by independents in the last session. Moreover, it is safe to say that of the four seats taken by representatives now sitting on the Opposition benches two will be regained by the Government when the people are again asked for a mandate.

The political parties that form the Opposition in the main have been reshuffled and renamed, but, judging from the efforts made by the leader and deputy leader, what it requires is rejuvenation. As an hon. member on this side once remarked, "Not even the famous Dr. Voronoff could do that."

The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition criticised the Government, but were not willing to give credit to the Government for the splendid work done since 1932. The Leader of the Opposition became very sarcastic about a plaque placed on the Story Bridge when that structure was opened recently by the Premier.

Mr. Nimmo: And quite right, too.

Mr. MANN: Of course, the hon. gentleman would say that, because like other hon. members opposite, he can see no good in anything the Government do. Two years ago the Government sent the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock to South Africa, South America, the United States, and Canada on a visit of investigation. On his return he informed members of the Government Party that, as regards conditions for rural workers, there was no comparison between other parts of the world and Queensland. It is no idle boast to say that the conditions of our workers are as good as, if not better than, any in the other States. The workers' wages are higher and the cost of living lower, our people have greater purchasing power, and they work a lesser number of hours. That is proved by the figures of the Government Statistician. Those are facts that cannot be disputed.

We have been charged as a Government with not proceeding fast enough in putting into effect the policy of Labour. Obviously, State Governments are, by their Constitutions, subjected to definite limitations to their power to carry out reforms necessary to bring about ideal conditions.

We have been charged with not spending enough money, with not going far enough with our various projects, but we have to get the money first, and there are severe limitations upon the availability of money. It is because of those limitations that we can alleviate the position only to a certain degree, and amend existing legislation to only a limited extent.

We have been hampered to some degree in carrying out the full and comprehensive programme for which Labour stands. Many of our troubles are really the function of the national Government, and if we had a Labour Federal Government at Canberra the State Government could implement Labour's policy much more fully and effectively. There are many problems of an Australian nature that have been created for us by years and years of Tory administration in the Federal sphere. A little while ago the hon. member for Oxley interjected. I was keenly disappointed—although perhaps I should not have been, knowing him as I have during my five years in this Parliament—to hear him charge members of the Federal Labour Party at Canberra with being the cause of the disunity that exists there. He virtually lays the blame for the disunity in the Federal sphere at the feet of the Federal Labour Party. In my opinion, the Labour Party and the Labour members of the War Advisory Council have been most generous in their treatment of the Menzies Government. I believe that it is the unpopularity of Menzies himself as a leader that has caused this revolt within his own party. The two parties—the United Australia Party and the Country Party—which have coalesced to form a Government, have nothing in common. They have nothing but fear and hatred of the Labour movement to bind them together. They have no respect for one another. They have no faith in one another. They have no ideal to fight for, no goal to strive for, and they have no

sense of loyalty for one another. The United Australia Party distrusts the Country Party. The Country Party makes no secret of its distrust of the United Australia Party. Each distrusts the other, and each deserves to be distrusted.

We have been charged with not having the courage to form a Government. If Labour is given a mandate to take control of the national Parliament, I can assure hon. members that it will do so, that it will put into effect a programme that will do much more in the interests of the nation than the bungling that has gone on in the Menzies Government. Some of the severest critics of Menzies are within his own ranks. I am satisfied that those critics within his own ranks were prepared to make remissions or excuses for a Government of their own political faith up to a certain extent, but the manner in which the Menzies Government have carried on is so fraught with danger, and because of it the possibilities of disaster are so great, that a revolt has broken out in his own ranks. That is the sum total of the position. The Labour Party has shown an intense patriotic spirit in its endeavours at every turn to help Menzies and his Cabinet with their war and defence programme. The Labour members have put aside the usual party tactics and endeavoured to co-operate on the War Advisory Council in the best interests of this nation.

Mr. Nimmo: They refused to take any responsibility.

Mr. MANN: The Menzies Government have failed to rise to the patriotic height that the Labour Party have achieved. Even with the shadow of war hanging over our heads to-day the Menzies Government cannot refrain from showing hostility to the trade unions and the men working in the munitions factories in the Southern States. Like hon. members opposite the Menzies Government have shown their animosity to Labour and the workers even when it was obviously stupid to do so. We have only to look at the way in which the Minister for War Organisation of Industry in the Menzies Government has ranged himself on the side of the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited, when industrial disputes have arisen at those works, to realise how great is the hatred of the Menzies Government for Labour and all the things for which Labour stands.

He has gone so far as to charge workers of the Broken Hill Proprietary Limited with sabotage. Animosity has been shown by a Federal Minister against the working classes of Australia. In my opinion, such a state of affairs would stop the Labour Party at Canberra from endeavouring to govern with the aid of Mr. Menzies or any of his supporters.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Oxley has left the Chamber, because every time I see him rise in his place I see bias and hatred oozing from his hide, particularly when he attempts to speak of the Labour Party.

Mr. Edwards: Do you not do the same?

Mr. MANN: No wonder there is this chaos, ruin, and disunity in the Federal sphere at the present time. Mr. Holloway, M.P. for Port Melbourne in the House of Representatives, asked three questions about industrial conciliation in Australia. They were—

“What is wrong with Australia’s industrial machinery?”

“Has conciliation failed?”

“If so, who is to blame?—the organised workers or those who represent the employers in private and Government workshops?”

I want to tell every hon. member of this Assembly that more than any other section of society the trade-union movement is concerned in bringing this war to a successful issue. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Merthyr say that the trade-union movement had more to lose than anybody else in the community if Hitler was successful.

Mr. Edwards: How can you say that?

Mr. MANN: Look at all the things that we stand for—freedom and the opportunity to work—these will be swept overboard, and we shall be like slaves if democracy disappears. The hon. member and his friends try to make out that we are the only ones who are engineering sabotage or holding up the nation’s war effort.

Mr. Edwards: I did not say that.

Mr. MANN: The Minister for War Organisation of Industry at Canberra and others of Mr. Menzies’ Government charge the workers with sabotage. We do not hear about the sabotage that goes on among the friends of the hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Enoggera made a statement about a company in this town that was asked to supply refrigerators for the use of the airmen at Amberley. There was no comment from hon. members opposite about that, nor was there comment about the firm that made socks for the soldiers which, when washed, shrank from 11 inches to 7 inches. All those things are allowed to go by, but as soon as a worker asks for something in connection with his wages—wants something more for his labour—there is a hue and cry. Much is said about the man who is forced to strike for his rights. The friends of the Opposition immediately charge the workers with sabotaging the nation’s war effort.

Every member of the trade-union movement is determined to fight to the last ditch to bring this war to a successful issue. The Premier has often told hon. members opposite that they have no monopoly of patriotism. If there are strikes and stoppages of work, surely there should be some means of overcoming them. We all realise that every hour lost in the production of munitions adds to the great peril facing the thousands of our fellows overseas, who are throwing their very lives into this conflict.

They went there to save the situation and to uphold the democracy for which their forefathers fought. It ill becomes any hon. member of the Opposition to charge members of the trade-union movement with lack of patriotism or to say that the Labour Party is not doing all that it can for the war effort. Surely it is not too much for the leader of a Government to try to discover the causes of the industrial upheavals. We know that there are 100,000 workers in industry to-day whose hearts beat as one in an endeavour to give of their best in the output of munitions, only to find that their efforts are stifled by an industrial upheaval. It is the duty of the Government, the duty of Mr. Menzies and his Ministers, and Mr. Fadden as well, to ascertain the cause of the trouble, and if necessary introduce amendments of the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

I was exceedingly pleased to hear His Excellency the Governor refer in his Opening Speech to the industrial laws of Queensland.

An Opposition Member: That does not stop strikes.

Mr. MANN: For the benefit of the hon. member I want to say that if the Commonwealth industrial laws were administered as efficiently as the Queensland laws many of these industrial disputes in the Southern States would have been averted or satisfactorily adjusted. Let me give the hon. member an instance of how the Industrial Court operates in Queensland. The hon. member for Sandgate discussed the fish industry, but what I am saying is not a fish story. There was a threatened strike at the Somerset Dam and I got a friend of mine at the dam on a Sunday to find the union representative. I inquired from him as to the cause of the trouble and he told me. I got in touch with the Premier on Monday morning and told him that all the men wanted was that an industrial magistrate should go to Somerset Dam to hear their case, and they would abide by the decision of the court. The Premier sent an industrial magistrate to the dam, and the dispute was settled. Men go on strike not because they cannot get all that they want but because they cannot get anyone to hear their dispute. They have a grievance and they work day after day with the grievance, yet no-one cares and no-one is ready to hear their troubles. Then in disgust they say that the only thing to do is to down tools—go on strike and stop work. In 9 cases out of 10 industrial disputes occur in the Southern States because the men cannot get anyone to hear their case. The Commonwealth industrial laws should be brought into line with the up-to-date industrial laws in this State. If the Commonwealth Government had set that fine example I am confident that many of the industrial disputes in the South would not have occurred.

Mr. Edwards: How did you stop the moulders' strike at Ipswich?

Mr. MANN: If I had thought that we could have stopped the moulders' strike at Ipswich by sending the hon. member for Nanango I should have sent him. However, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without

making reference to something that concerns almost everyone in Australia. I refer now to the bungle brought about by the petrol rationing scheme. I say that the whole history of petrol rationing can be written down as a war-time bungle by the Menzies Government. The net result has been to throw many of our important industries—the transport industry and the motor industry included—into a state of chaos without in any way— I say that emphatically, without in any way—benefiting the nation's security. It is a repetition of a Big Business Ministry's giving control of an important industry and an important commodity to vested interests that were more concerned about making profits and dividends than they were about the interests of the nation. I say emphatically that if on the outbreak of war the Commonwealth Government had taken control of petrol supplies instead of allowing them to remain in the hands of a profit-making concern, the ruin and chaos in the motor, transport, and other industries, would not be nearly so acute as it is now.

Mr. Dart: It is easy to blame the other fellow.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is afraid to face up to the facts. No-one can argue that to-day the oil position in Australia is not a tragic example of the bungling war effort of the Menzies Government.

Mr. Muller: What would you do?

Mr. MANN: I have just told the hon. member what his Government should have done. I say that instead of giving the oil supplies into the hands of the oil cartel, or profit-making concerns, they should have controlled the matter themselves, or if it was right that they should not do so they should have first insisted that supplies be kept up to the then existing storage capacity. Instead, they allowed the quantity stored to sink to an alarmingly low level.

Mr. Edwards: You know there is a shortage of ships.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is making apology for his Federal political friends. We know that he is loth to give any credit to the Government on this side of the House for anything they do, but when his own political friends make mistakes he shuffles and tries to excuse them. I was endeavouring to point out that the whole cause of the blundering lay in the fact that the Federal Government did not insist upon the storage being kept up to the level existing when the oil cartel was created. From time to time the position was brought before the Prime Minister in Canberra by members of the Labour Party, but the Menzies Government said it was the duty of the oil companies constituting the oil cartel to look after the supply. The Menzies Government cannot get away from the fact that they delegated their duty to see that the oil companies maintained existing supplies to the oil cartel, which was constituted by the oil companies. The Menzies Government not only failed to take heed of the representations made to

them by the Federal Labour Party, but for months stubbornly refused to foresee that an acute shortage of oil was at hand. Now we are told that under a changed control supplies will be increased and we may return to the standards that existed before the formation of the cartel.

The Premier: The oil companies are still operating the cartel under a different name.

Mr. MANN: That is so. We could not induce the Federal Government to recognise the position, and the fact that supplies may shortly increase does not alter the fact that the Menzies Government and the oil cartel blundered badly. The rationing of supplies is not a matter for the State Government; it has been brought about by the policy of the Federal Government. We have co-operated with the Federal Government in endeavouring to right the position. The State Government made available the services of their officers to the Federal Fuel Control Board, but no-one can blame those men or any other officers of the board for being unable to get sufficient supplies of petrol. The whole thing has been a blunder! I want to give credit to the Government for endeavouring to rectify the position, but that will not exonerate the Menzies Government for having bungled in the first instance.

Mr. Edwards: Are you thinking of a Federal election?

Mr. MANN: The Opposition is very concerned about a Federal election, but I remind him that his friends at Canberra are afraid to face the electors and ask for a mandate because the electors are aware of the tragic blunders of the Menzies Government. In an effort to avoid an election and escape their responsibilities the Menzies Government have asked the Labour Party to co-operate with them. The Labour Party has never shirked its responsibilities when given a mandate by the people; it has always done its very best to carry it out to the best of its ability. That is what the Government in this State has done. They received a mandate in 1932 and it was renewed at each succeeding election, with the result that we find the State in an improved economic condition to-day.

Mr. Edwards: Remember what John Lang did in New South Wales.

Mr. MANN: If the hon. member knew something about John Lang and the work of his Government he would know that he placed legislation on the statute-book that the succeeding Tory Government were not game to repeal. Despite what hon. members opposite may say, it is a fact that Labour Governments always act in the best interests of the great majority of the people. Lang may have made mistakes, but he did excellent work in passing some legislation that was in the interests of the great toiling masses—after all, the people who count, the people who produce the wealth.

I was pleased to hear His Excellency refer to proposed amendments to the Workers'

Compensation Acts. I understand that the Act will be amended to cover workers who are not now covered. I was pleased to learn that miner's phthisis pensioners will receive increased payments. I have been in touch with old miners who have received the full benefit from the fund, and it was suggested to me that it might be made retrospective. I found on investigation that the amount needed to do that would be exceedingly great—too great for the fund, which has never been really solvent, to bear. It is not possible to extend any benefit to those who have received the full payment, but it is proposed to make larger payments to those who are now in receipt of pensions and the unfortunate ones who may become entitled to such pensions in the future.

In conclusion, I pay a tribute to the excellent effort of our people in working to gain the victory we all earnestly desire. As I said earlier, I wish to remind hon. members of the Opposition that they have not a monopoly of patriotism. I remind them that the members of the trade-union movement are more than ever determined to stand together in order to achieve victory for the British Empire. It is important that we should fight hypocrisy and cant in this country and do everything possible to establish a Government at Canberra that will endeavour to make Australia the greatest nation in the world, and to bring social security to our people so they may live their lives in freedom, happiness, and good health.

Mr. LUCKINS (Maree) (2.15 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, first of all I desire to congratulate you on your elevation to your very high office. From reports I know that you have been very successful during the last Parliament. By a peculiar set of circumstances, the district that I represent has in the past provided a Speaker in this Assembly, and I am pleased to know that the electorate adjoining the one I represent now has that great honour, and that another adjacent one has the honour to provide a Chairman of Committees.

I am very pleased to be associated with the Opposition. It may be fitting here to say that the gesture of good will amongst the Opposition parties—the amalgamation that was brought about recently—is something that should be of concern to the public of Queensland. We are endeavouring in our own way to share in the war effort of the Empire. We can at the conclusion of the conflict formulate our ideas of how best we can serve the interests of society.

I also wish to pay my respects to His Excellency the Governor for the excellent work he is doing in Queensland.

As a new member, I shall naturally need time to make myself conversant with the different departments. It is a very big job to represent an electoral district, and one in which a man has to make himself very conversant with their many ramifications. I have, however, some experience in public affairs, because for a term I have served in municipal government. Now, by the wish of the electors, I have been elevated to the

Assembly. I trust that the experience I have had will stand me in good stead.

I am not unmindful of some of the shortcomings of the Government during the past few years, and it is my duty as a public man to call attention to those shortcomings as I see them, and ask that the Ministers give some consideration to the proposals that I shall make as I proceed.

Queensland was established in September, 1859, and since that time there have been many different Parliaments, with different outlooks. The State has grown in population, although not as one would wish, but that shortcoming will be rectified in time, inasmuch as a new country such as Australia, and in particular Queensland, will have to find its feet in world affairs before it can be of full interest and value.

As a Queenslander, I am very much concerned for the welfare of the State. We must acknowledge that a vast amount of work has been accomplished in the State since 1859. I have had the privilege of seeing other parts of the world, of Australia in particular, and my experience may be of some use to the Government. I do not know yet if that will be so, but I am at the Government's disposal and if any advice that I can give in the interests of the good government of the State can be of use, I will, with very great pleasure, place myself at the disposal of the Premier and the Ministers.

Perhaps we are critical at times, but criticism is always helpful if it is taken in the right spirit. Being a new member of only a few days' experience, I do not know the spirit of this House, but I was a little disappointed that the Premier should have seen fit to apply the gag yesterday. I have always understood that the Labour Party contained some of the finest advocates for as much public and free speech as possible, especially in an Assembly such as this. I cannot see that any harm could have emerged from a debate on the Public Safety Act.

Mr. Mann: No harm could have come from it, only waste of time.

Mr. LUCKINS: I refer the hon. member to the long period for which this Assembly is in recess. There is ample time during those 9 or 10 months for the leader of the House to call us together. We should then have plenty of time to debate public laws and public affairs, and perhaps we might then accomplish something.

I am a little concerned, too, to think that during this period of strife and turmoil the Premier has not called Parliament together more regularly. In my opinion, it would be advisable to do so. Each day fresh problems are created, and I hope that Parliament will continue to be the institution from which public affairs are directed for the welfare of the community and the State.

Mr. Collins: We have more sitting days than the Federal Parliament.

Mr. LUCKINS: It does not matter to me what they do in other places. We want to be

leaders in affairs of State. Queensland has taken a very prominent place in development, and in the passing of laws, and I do not desire to deny the right of any party to bring forward proposals for the good of the community.

At times I am critical of the Labour Party. I voice my opinions, and give utterance to my politics, but sometimes I give a little attention to the rules governing the Labour Party, and I am sure that on many occasions its members ignore some of the rules that govern them. It gives me pleasure to refer at all times to that plank of their platform which provides that injury to one is the concern of all. That is a very admirable spirit, but until hon. members opposite can satisfy me that they practise it to the fullest extent, I am a little doubtful of their bona fides.

The Labour Party here are concerned with the conditions under which our workers toil and the wages they are paid, but that is not peculiar to Queensland; it is common to all British-speaking Parliaments and races. Other countries in the world have legislation that will compare very favourably with that of Queensland, and that legislation is not the result of any policy of the Labour Party or any other party; it is due to the natural development of the community in their own interests.

Mr. Macdonald: Evolution.

Mr. LUCKINS: It is evolution that will come to us as time goes on.

Mr. Mann: That is why your party cancelled all awards when they were a Government.

Mr. LUCKINS: Whatever my party did, it was what in their opinion was in the best interests of the State, and I have yet to learn of anything they did that was detrimental to the State. Society owes everything to Parliamentary procedure, law, and conviction. We might be proud of our Parliaments and our democratic rules, but it cannot be conceded to any section of the community that they are personally responsible for what we have and what we know of society to-day.

In passing, it might be as well if I referred to one or two things that probably have escaped the notice of the Premier or the responsible Minister, but concern a very fine section of our public service.

I refer to a most law-abiding section of the community and one that, in my opinion, has been very harshly dealt with, that noble band of servants in the Police Force. I am of the opinion that they have been very harshly and badly treated in the matter of conditions and work. I am very reliably informed that they are worked up to 56 hours a week, and the Government make the magnificent gesture towards them of allowing them one day a fortnight off. I mentioned earlier in my speech the plank of the Labour platform that an injury to one is the concern of all. I have yet to learn whether the Government's treatment of the Police Force is in keeping

the members of the Labour Party. They persuade one section of the civil service that is doing and will continue to do magnificent service to the State of Queensland.

Mr. Riordan: What other concessions are they granted?

Mr. LUCKINS: I have yet to learn that they enjoy concessions not extended to other unions. Perhaps I might make a comparison with the Australian Workers' Union, this wonderful organisation that is playing so prominent a part in the public life of Queensland to-day. I know of the deeds of early pioneers of the Labour movement and men associated with the Australian Workers' Union. I refer to one in particular—and to him I pay my respects this afternoon—in the person of an ex-Premier, Mr. William McCormack. Such men as he did the pioneering work of the Labour movement, and accomplished something. In the accomplishing of anything, however, I do not think it is desirable that any one union should arrogate to itself the right to dictate to a Government. I make that assertion advisedly. I have never been a member of a union, nor do I desire to be one, but I want to see the community well protected and well cared for, and the best consideration given to the workers in this State.

I propose to refer to a question that has been agitating the minds of members of the Australian Workers' Union. Members of that union, I believe, pay a sum of 25s. a year and receive nothing in return for their contribution. It may be advisable to suggest that the vast volume of money that has accumulated to date might be sent back to the members who have served in the union for 25 years and upwards in the form of sick pay, or some other consideration.

Mr. Riordan: You are not a member.

Mr. LUCKINS: I am not a member and do not desire to be one, but that fact does not stop me from having my interests associated with those members who perhaps have no control over the working of the Australian Workers' Union. There is a form of monopoly, an unfortunate form of monopoly—and I am not going to call those in authority parasites, nor am I going to indulge in personalities so long as I am a member of this Chamber. If I can make a case for those people who are desirous of bringing before Parliament the conditions under which they work and live I shall do so, but I do not desire to indulge in personalities. No hon. member opposite can truthfully accuse me of being personal in any matter of public importance with which I have been associated.

Mr. Dunstan: You are very sly about it.

Mr. LUCKINS: I do not know. I am here to be cross-examined; I am here to be tackled if the hon. member thinks it is possible to tackle me on that question, and I am here to defend myself in the best interests of those on whose behalf I speak. If any hon. member opposite has any suggestion to offer he can

get up in this Chamber and tell me why these things should not be done. My friend, the hon. member for Bowen, has a very fine appearance from an avoidpouis point of view; he may be able to tell me something about Queensland that I do not know, and I shall be interested to know something about it from his angle. Unfortunately, however, he looks to me like a typical member of the Australian Workers' Union or an ex-member of it.

Mr. Gair: Now you are personal.

Mr. LUCKINS: Because they have power to say who is going to be their representative in any position or to be a candidate in any plebiscite.

A Government Member: That is a lie.

Mr. LUCKINS: I know something about it and I know more perhaps, Mr. Speaker, than you would like me to tell you. However, it can never be expected that a union that controlled a political movement is going to succeed, because eventually it will devour itself in an attempt to gain control over direct representation in this Parliament.

Mr. Mann: That is what your party is hoping for.

Mr. LUCKINS: My party is quite able to look after itself and its interests. We should be able to lead or give a lead to the Government in the exercise of their authority in the best interests of all, and not in the interests of only a section of the community. I have referred to the Police Department, and I hope that my remarks will fall on sympathetic ears. I think it will. I have no desire to gain a few votes from the police, nor do I think I shall get any.

A Government Member: You are telling us.

Mr. LUCKINS: My hon. friend may know. I do not know. I am not in a position to know just how many votes are allocated to each district. I am under the impression that about 800 extra votes were put into Maree at the last elections, and that they have disappeared very methodically during the last few weeks. That has been known to me. To put our house in order politically we must have the best form of enrolment at the electoral office. I find no fault with the electoral office. If Mr. Smith comes down from the North and spends two or three months in the metropolitan area and gets on the State electoral roll for, say, Timbuctoo, or some other district—

Mr. Mann: Or Maree.

Mr. LUCKINS: Yes, Maree—I was going to say Maree. And if he is a man who works at a seasonal occupation in North Queensland and is known as someone else up there, as J. W. Smith, and thinks he has two votes—

Mr. Jesson: How do you know he has two votes?

Mr. LUCKINS: I know from experience that probably there are many men and women on the electoral roll for Brisbane who are not

properly qualified by residence to be permanently on that roll.

Mr. Mann: It is your duty to point that out to the electoral registrar.

Mr. LUCKINS: I am not proposing to take any work away from the electoral office because hon. members opposite might condemn me for holding two jobs. This is peculiar to any member of the Labour Party, and it is their duty to do whatever is right in the interests of the community so far as they can see it. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, by my hon. friends opposite that they perhaps know more about this than I do.

I commend the Premier for his action in cleaning up the plebiscite racket in the selection of Labour candidates, in connection with which there have been some unfortunate incidents in the past few years. (Government laughter.) These matters all have a peculiar reaction. They are, in my opinion, some of the blackest chapters in the history of Queensland.

The Secretary for Public Works and Public Instruction: You have been very successful, anyhow.

Mr. LUCKINS: I have had to fight for my success. I owe nothing to the Labour Party for my position in life, but I do owe something to the community. I came from the bush to the city and through certain processes in public life I have become a member of Parliament. I was not unmindful that the door of public life might be open to me, as it has been to others, and that I might become a successful member of Parliament. I do not know that yet. I have to be judged not by the Labour Party, but by the electors of the electoral district of Maree. I propose to give those electors the best service I possibly can.

I intend to deal with one or two other Government activities. I am sure that the Minister in charge will not take me to task for reminding him of the state of the Public Library in William street. I suggest to any member of Parliament that he visit that institution to-day and have a look at it himself. I do not know whether it is due to shortage of staff, but the library shelves are in a dirty, dilapidated state.

Mr. Jesson: There are not many votes in the Public Library.

Mr. LUCKINS: That is so; that is why the Government give it so little attention.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the sanitary pan system is still in vogue at the Public Library, notwithstanding that the Government and the Brisbane City Council by process of law are compelling householders to connect with the sewerage system. I saw it only yesterday. What can we expect from the development point of view in a city such as Brisbane—and a very noble city it is, a city that demands the best that our public men can give it—if that state of affairs exists in a Government institution?

There are many other departments whose work is not in the best interests of the State about which I want to remind the Government. I give the Minister for Transport credit for having completely changed the outlook at the Roma Street railway station. It is something we may all be proud of, but in striking contrast I want to take hon. members to Woolloongabba, a section of a district I have the honour to represent. I consider it a very great honour to represent that part of my electoral district as it was skilfully sliced off the Buranda electorate some years ago with the idea that it would swing the balance of the scales in Maree in favour of Labour. The beautification of the surroundings of Roma Street railway station is another instance of the staff's taking an interest in the surroundings of railway stations and adding to the appearance and development of the city, but I do not altogether agree with the department's outlook at Woolloongabba. The railway premises there are a very dirty and unsightly section of a great public utility.

Mr. Taylor: Do you suggest shifting Woolloongabba railway yards further out?

Mr. LUCKINS: I do not; I am suggesting that they be kept clean and decent so that citizens of this city can see by example what the Government expect from private property owners in the district. I regret the necessity to refer to this matter, but a very large area in that vicinity is controlled by the department and it should be cleaned and beautified.

I do not think it would be amiss if I asked the department, if it cannot control it, to hand it over to the Brisbane City Council.

A Government Member: For them to sell it?

Mr. LUCKINS: They would then be in a position to make it a thing of beauty. I give the Police Welfare Committee credit for the fact that they have converted a dump at Woolloongabba into one of the prettiest little parks it is possible to see, and have done it at their own expense. My friend asks me whether if the Woolloongabba railway yards went to the council, the council would sell them. Do hon. members opposite want to be reminded of what the Labour council did about the park at Hamilton—how they filched it away from the workers' families and sold it to private enterprise?

Mr. Mann interjected.

Mr. LUCKINS: I will tell the hon. member another about the lease of the Hamilton wharf, on which a Labour council lent over £86,000 of the ratepayers' money at the lowest rate of interest, repayable in 40 years. Will I tell hon. members something about the old Town Hall, where they came in and got a concession without publicly advertising the fact, and a magnificent offer was made to the council by which one man acquired a 30 years' lease at a nominal rent of £5,000 and was lent £15,000 of the ratepayers' money for 30 years without interest?

My desire is not to have a repetition of these things; whatever has happened in the

past, let us forget it; but as my friend prompted me, I thought I would give him a little jolt just to remind him that everything was not lovely in the garden of Labour politics. I am not blaming the Premier or members of Parliament, but I am particularly interested to know how that Labour council should have been in a position to give a 40 years' lease of the wharves at Newstead with the option of a further 40 years. If my memory serves me right, the lessees had no claim on the municipality to a grant of that site or a claim that the council should resume it for that purpose. They were paying £5,000 a year for the wharves in South Brisbane, which they let, and conveniently put themselves in a position to obtain one of the best sites possible at Newstead. It would have been a nice gesture if the Government stepped in and said, "We will acquire this site." Then we should have known that the profit accruing from it would be used in the interests of the workers of this State.

Mr. Jesson: You would have found something wrong with that.

Mr. LUCKINS: I find nothing wrong with anything that is right and honourable and just. I like a man who does make a mistake to admit it publicly and apologise for making it. If I have made any mistakes in my public life or have done something that was not in the interests of the public I am willing to admit it.

As to the State Transport Commission, I should like to see the Government consider transport questions from this angle: the municipality has a very competent staff to guide the destinies of transport in Greater Brisbane, and I should like the Government to hand over transport in Brisbane to the management of the council. They could then govern their own busses and the private busses operating within the Greater Brisbane area. It might be interesting for hon. members to know that the council busses pay the heavy vehicles tax on the Story Bridge. It would be a good gesture if a semi-governmental body such as the Brisbane City Council forewent that, inasmuch as we know that the rates of this city are to-day far too high.

Mr. Taylor: We should be better off in Queensland if they were all under one Transport Commission as in New South Wales.

Mr. LUCKINS: I am not interested in the suggestion of the hon. member for Enoggera at present.

There are other matters that might concern Government departments from the point of view of co-operation with the municipality. The first is the disposal of the beautiful alluvial soil that is being taken from the river bank in the very necessary work of widening the river. When I represented the district of Maree in the council the council approached the department with a view to getting the soil from the embankments that were cut away. We received a little, but something occurred in the meantime and it was found that it was not advisable for the department to allow the council to take the soil away. At New Farm

they are widening the river, and it would be a great thing if the council could get permission to take this beautiful alluvial soil. Instead, this soil is being emptied into the river. First of all it is dredged up from the river, and then carted down the river. I make the suggestion that the soil on the embankment be given to the council to help it beautify the parks of the city, and in turn the Government use soil taken from the river in dredging in the reclamation of the waste lands on the south bank, thus making them profitable to the department of Public Lands.

The suggestion I now make will not be very pleasing to the Ministers concerned, and it is that during the war period the Premier reduce the number of his Ministers by approximately half.

Mr. Taylor: Duplication.

Mr. LUCKINS: Never mind about that. There are as many Ministers in Australia as in the Imperial War Cabinet. It would be a nice gesture if the money the extra Ministers receive went towards the war effort. My suggestion is that there be amalgamation of departments and that the number of Ministers be reduced from 10 or 12 as the case may be, to six.

Mr. Taylor: By your mathematical analysis you will reduce yourself to nothing.

Mr. LUCKINS: I would reduce the hon. member to somewhere if I had the opportunity. I think he is the biggest nuisance we have had here for some time.

Mr. Taylor: You have been here for only a few minutes, virtually, and you are not competent to judge.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LUCKINS: I hope the hon. member will speak for himself. We have now to find ways and means of fortifying the Commonwealth.

Mr. Clayton: Why not members as well?

Mr. LUCKINS: I am coming to that, if hon. members will give me time. I suppose I shall not be popular. I am speaking in the interests of the community. I am not here in the interests of any party or any person, but whilst here I intend to advocate that which is wise and fair. It is only a matter of time till State Parliaments will have disappeared. As we are a federation, it would be in the interests of Australia to have one Parliament, one destiny, one people. It would be a very good gesture to reduce the number of Ministers from, say, 12 to 6, and give those remaining an opportunity of showing their worth by managing the amalgamated departments.

I think that must come, and in the interim we could find ways and means of conveniently reducing the number of members of Parliament.

Mr. Jesson: Is that to save money?

Mr. LUCKINS: Yes. Unfortunately, most Governments are mainly concerned with spending the people's money. I have never yet

seen them very concerned about saving the people's money. If they adopted my suggestion they would be doing a service that would be in the best interests of the State.

During the election I advocated the building of a public hospital in South Brisbane. The population of South Brisbane is about 42 per cent. of the total of the city of Brisbane, which is estimated at 330,000. Facilities should be provided in such an area as that for the care of the sick. A hospital should be erected either in or adjacent to South Brisbane. I suggest that the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs is spending too much money on hospitals and additional hospitals on their present sites.

Whilst dealing with these matters I should like to draw the attention of the House to a question that is requiring urgent consideration. We control the lazaret at Peel Island. The unfortunate men, women, and children who are sent there are supposed to be suffering from a disease that makes it desirable in the interests of society that they be not allowed to roam at large. Many of those unfortunate patients have been discharged and allowed to wander about the city to be called up for further examination by the department at any time. The point that I desire to stress is that when these unfortunate people who have been confined to the lazaret for the protection and benefit of society are discharged, they are in the unenviable position of being ostracised because they have been inmates of that institution. It would be a nice gesture for the department to make provision on the Estimates this year to give these discharged inmates some monetary consideration for what they have suffered at the hands of society. I recommend that the statute governing the lazaret be amended to provide for that. It is one of our old laws, introduced, I think, in 1895. It badly needs revising. I am pleased to hear that the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs proposes to provide better accommodation down there. That will certainly have my utmost support.

I judge, from the ringing of the bell, that my time is getting short. It handicaps me somewhat. At one time there was no limit on speeches in this Chamber, but I suppose the bell was a good innovation in that it prevented time from being wasted in Parliament by hon. members who desired to talk rubbish.

Mr. Taylor: It is all right talking about something worth while.

Mr. LUCKINS: It is, and there are many matters that are worth while debating in this Chamber. One is the allowance made to the unemployed. The department concerned might well be a little more liberal in its aid to those who are out of work. Many unemployed are receiving only the old-age pension. Others are deprived of a certain amount of help when the younger members of the family are taken away from school and put to work.

I think that this is a question which should concern the Minister. Nobody wants to deny a married man rearing a family the

right of enjoying the best conditions possible. As a member of Parliament, a citizen, and a taxpayer, I should not mind contributing my bit, particularly when I know it is going to be used for the welfare of the younger generation. I am pleased that the Premier said yesterday that he proposed to introduce a Bill in respect of the rights of juveniles and their employment. That should be commended. We should do all in our power in the interests of the younger generation, because it is the younger people of to-day who will be the guardians of society in the years to come.

(Time expired).

Mr. A. J. SMITH (Carpentaria) (2.56 p.m.): I congratulate the hon members for Gregory and Kelvin Grove on their contributions to the debate in moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency. Like the hon. member for Gregory, I represent an electorate in the back country of the State where the people are suffering the most trying conditions. They are taking a buffeting such as our Australian soldiers are getting to-day at Tobruk. They are suffering privations without murmur, but look to this Parliament and the Federal Government to ease their lot.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your return to office. As a new member to this Assembly I cannot speak of the past, but because of your unanimous re-election to the position I solidly place myself behind you.

My task in this Parliament will be an onerous one, because I am following in the footsteps of the Hon. John Mullan, a gentleman who was held in great esteem in this Assembly and who devoted the whole of his life not only to Queensland but to the Commonwealth and the Australian Labour movement.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. J. SMITH: A man who has had to retire after giving his life to the workers and the Australian Labour movement deserves the highest credit or reward that any man can receive.

I have heard Queensland's war effort discussed in this Chamber; I say that our war effort is 100 per cent. but I find that the Commonwealth Government have been only half-hearted in their efforts. To prove my statements I wish to turn to events happening in Queensland to-day. The electorate of Carpentaria abounds in mineral deposits and for its size has more than any country in Europe, particularly those in which men, women, and children are being slaughtered for the possession of mineral wealth. To-day in our papers and over the wireless we hear the call from the Federal Government for copper. Let me tell hon. members that the mineral belt in the Cloncurry area played a prominent part in the Great War of 1914-18. That area employed between 6,000 and 7,000 miners and contributed 1,500 tons of copper a month towards the 1914-18 war effort. The field is still in its infancy and has been worked for only a short period. Millions of

tons of copper are still lying beneath the surface of the earth, but the Federal Government, instead of passing legislation for the supply of money for the erection of smelters and concentration plants for the production of that copper and its use in the present war effort, would sooner import hundreds of thousands of tons into this country at fabulous prices. They refuse to divulge the price to the public or to anybody who seeks the information.

There is also an extensive lead field in the electorate, which was brought to life and fostered with the support of the Queensland Labour Government, and to-day the lead industry is playing a prominent part in the war effort. However, because of the sympathy between the Siamese twins, the Federal Government and the Broken Hill people, the Federal Government are ignoring the possibilities of the silver-lead and copper fields in the neighbourhood of Mount Isa. The general manager of the Mount Isa Company has gone to Sydney with the object of entering into an agreement to supply silver-lead to the Imperial Government for war purposes. Why should this man have to go on his bended knees to the Federal Government beseeching them to make the utmost use of the copper and lead lodes available in Australia for our own war effort, especially as if he is not successful hundreds of men will be thrown out of work?

We were told in the Press a few days ago that the Lysaght works at Newcastle were compelled to close through the want of zinc, whereas to-day we have between 60,000 tons and 70,000 tons of zinc stacked in the great mineral belt in the Carpentaria electorate. If the Commonwealth Government had been willing to make money available for the manufacture of zinc concentrates at Mount Isa, it would not have been necessary for the Lysaght works to close down and hinder our war effort to that extent.

I have made three suggestions that could be adopted with advantage in furthering our war effort. Hon. members opposite complain that there are not enough factories in this State, but what is the use of erecting factories for the manufacture of machinery for war purposes when the Federal Government refuse to exploit the industrial and mineral fields that are available in this State to-day? Recently, the Federal Government advanced a sum of £10,000 to the Mount Morgan Company.

An Opposition Member: That is a help.

Mr. A. J. SMITH: It is a help, but it is producing only 1,500 tons a year, whereas a field that is capable of producing thousands of tons a month is compelled to lie idle. This field holds fabulous resources. It is ridiculous to think that the Federal Government should sit idly by and import into this country the mineral that could be easily won in the Carpentaria electorate. I believe that if the Commonwealth Government advanced £350,000 for the establishment of a zinc refinery anywhere in Queensland we could produce all the explosives needed for war,

and by the expenditure of a few thousand pounds after the war this refinery could be converted to the manufacture of superphosphates and other materials urgently needed for agriculture.

Hon. members opposite have criticised the Queensland Labour Government for their alleged inactivity in connection with the war effort. Why, a few years ago the Mount Morgan works were idle. There was no foreign capital available and no help forthcoming from the Federal Government to permit of their being reopened. However, with the help of the State Labour Government, Mount Morgan was reopened and to-day it is playing a prominent part in our war effort. The modern method of warfare involving the mechanisation of the army calls for a tremendous expansion in the industrial and mineral field. If the Japanese Government sent an army of invasion to Queensland they would have no need to come further south than Bowen and west of Bowen to the border of South Australia until it suited them. They could settle down in our mineral, agricultural, and pastoral fields north of that line and in proximity to our fishing resources and meatworks, thus stabilise their position for 10 years and not bother to come any further south until it suited them. Yet the Federal Government at Canberra accuse every other Government and organisation of not playing their part in the war effort. They are prepared to spend huge sums of money in setting up a mining commission, while we have in Queensland one of the finest organisations associated with mining—that is, the State Mines Department. The Mines Department has assayed and surveyed every known mining field in Queensland. The Federal Mining Commission came to Brisbane, ignored the Mines Department, and, in effect, forgot that it ever existed. It would have needed only a letter from Mr. Menzies to our Premier to get all the information showing the size of the lodes, the assays, and the values in the different fields, and the Premier would have made that information available in a few hours.

The Federal Man Power Committee visited this State and travelled to Rockhampton and other centres. Its members took evidence from representatives of private enterprises—such as the management of Mount Morgan—but those representatives spoke for their own industries only. In a time of crisis we should not speak for our own businesses and industries but for the resources of the whole State. The Queensland Government have information as to all those resources in their different State departments, and these could have been placed at the disposal of the Federal Government had they asked for it.

We find, too, that the North is undefended in the war effort of the Commonwealth. The electoral district of Carpentaria is the buffer area of the Commonwealth in the event of an invasion of this nation from the north—no invasion will occur in the southern part of this continent—yet there is not one road, not one gun, or anything else in that district for its defence. Perhaps Brisbane, or the

capital and industrial centres in the South, can look with confidence for some protection in the case of invasion, but our inland areas, particularly this buffer area, have no defence against sea invasion. The Commonwealth have spent from a quarter to half a million pounds on the construction of a road eastwards to Perth in the west. This money could have been well spent in the defence of Northern Australia. A huge road is necessary to develop the mineral belt of North Queensland. There is a mineral belt in the Carpentaria electorate of 200 miles by 80 miles. That belt contains untold mineral wealth, which this country requires both for its war-time and peace-time efforts.

I heard an hon. member say that it might yet be necessary to tear down the Story Bridge to utilise its steel for armaments. That will be a sorry day not only for Brisbane but for Queensland and the British Empire. There are in my district huge deposits of iron ore sufficient for 20 Story bridges, the complete requirements of our army mechanisation, and the needs of our Navy and Air Forces. There is in Iron Mountain at Cloncurry no less than 55,000,000 tons of iron ore in sight without any exploration. Why have not the Federal Government made use of that huge deposit? It is ridiculous for hon. members to say that some day it might be necessary to tear down the Story Bridge for war purposes when such huge deposits of iron are lying idle.

Then we have our gold resources still undeveloped. In my own electorate there are gold resources requiring only a little capital for the purchase of modern equipment, such as sluicing and other machinery, to win that wealth that is vitally necessary for the nation to-day, and the production of a few thousand ounces of gold to-day would go far in the modernisation of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. The function of developing those fields in a war effort is not a State one but a Federal one.

The Federal Government can give assistance to enable the factories of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company to be developed, yet they can spend nothing in Queensland. They have even taken our artisans away to the detriment of our industries. Many of these men have been trained in this State. In the last three or four years the Mount Isa Company has trained 20 or 30 artisans who to-day have been transferred to the munitions factories in the Southern States. In the early stages of the war the Federal member for the Kennedy electorate, when the Federal Government were looking for annexes for munition-making, drew attention to the Mount Isa Company, but Mr. Casey, the ex-Federal Treasurer, replied, "Too far away." That is an instance of the attitude the Federal Government take up in regard to Queensland industries. Yet, anything written within a 5-mile radius of Canberra, or the Broken Hill Proprietary Works, is not too far away. It is time that not only State Governments decentralised their industries, as the Queensland Government have done; it is time that the Federal Government, also, decentralised industry.

Take the pastoral industry. We have in North Queensland in my electorate an important part of one of the best and most prosperous industries in the Commonwealth—the backbone of the Commonwealth, namely, the sheep industry—but vested interests have consistently opposed the establishment of a wool-appraisalment centre at Townsville. A few years ago Mr. Fadden, the Federal Treasurer, said that the North should be developed. Although he is Federal Treasurer, he is only in that position so long as he works for the vested interests that control him.

Mr. Fadden wholeheartedly supported the proposal at Mackay and Townsville, but when a deputation introduced by the hon. member for Townsville waited on him as Treasurer he said he could not do anything about it. It is time the Federal Government made arrangements for the decentralisation of industry. If we do not have decentralisation of industry, when the soldiers come back from the war, instead of going to the small country towns to work, they will be doing what they did after the last war—walking the streets of the cities without anything to do and with nowhere to go. It is the policy of the State Government to protect them to the best of their ability, but it should be the first plank in the platform of the Federal Government to see that these men are not roaming the streets begging for a feed or a suit of clothes or a pair of boots—which up to the present they are doing.

In addition to the decentralisation of industry, we must have the decentralisation of marketing. The Commonwealth Government get ships to come from Tasmania to Sydney with fruit, and if they cannot sell all the fruit there they feed them to the fish in Sydney Harbour. (Opposition laughter.) Why not have those ships refrigerated to carry the fruit to Rockhampton, Townsville, and Cairns in order that it may be distributed to the people of the central and far northern and western districts? Hon. members opposite may laugh, but I have seen young children in the West whose health was impaired owing to the lack of good fruit.

Mr. Muller: Do not blame the Federal Government for it.

Mr. A. J. SMITH: They control marketing in the Commonwealth. Why cannot the Federal Government arrange for coastal ships to carry the fruit from the Southern States to the central and northern cities so that it can be distributed to the central and north-western-areas of the State by the State Government's efficient railway system? It is too far to send the fruit from Sydney to Cloncurry and Mount Isa without refrigeration, but as hon. members opposite never had a journey, except on a tram, they do not know how the people in the back-country suffer.

Mr. Yeates: You mean the members of of the Labour Party have not been off the trams.

Mr. A. J. SMITH: I remember as a boy that many hon. members on this side of the Chamber walked with their swags—they were

on the track and not on the tram, and that is where hon. members opposite will never be. Hon. members opposite may laugh when I speak of fruit for the nutrition of the children in the West, but I maintain that we want a better fruit service for the North and the West. I contend that the Federal Government should inaugurate a fruit-distributing system. The hon. member for Sandgate says we want better fish; I say that we want better fruit for the children outback. What is wrong with the Federal Government's inaugurating a fruit-distributing system to carry the fruit from the South to Rockhampton, Townsville, and Cairns in order that it may be made available to the children in the out-back country who badly need it? Hon. members opposite may laugh and endeavour to put the blame on this Government. Why should not the Federal Government do what I suggest? They speak of a housing scheme. I am a member of the Cloncurry Shire Council, and I inaugurated a housing scheme for the workers of Mount Isa. The hon. the Premier granted the council £8,000 to provide houses for the workers of Mount Isa, but the Tory members of the council overruled me and said they would not do it. Hon. members opposite say there should be a housing scheme, and that we should have fresh milk for children. I find in Brisbane, under the rule of the Tory council, one cannot get accommodation for children. For three weeks I have been trying to get a flat, and every time my wife seeks a flat she is told, "No, you have got children." Why should hon. members opposite advocate free milk when they will not give the children accommodation in the city?

When children are taken to the outback country and the West the people there are only too pleased to make homes for them, but in the city we find we cannot get a house or even a room to sleep in. Evidently we are expected to take the family to a park or an unemployment camp. The children of to-day will be the men and women of to-morrow. It is they who will take control of government, and I sincerely hope they have the ideas of their fathers and keep a Labour Government in office in Queensland.

The Federal Government asked every member of Parliament to get behind them in their war effort, but what do we find in the Federal sphere to-day? Merely because the Prime Minister is not allowed to go to England, he wants to upset the Commonwealth Parliament and put the people to the expense of an election. There are capable men outside the Menzies Government who could go to London and there represent the people of Australia.

This, my first speech in this House, may be amusing to hon. members of the Opposition, but as time proceeds they will find that I shall be no more amusing to them than they will be ridiculous to me. I represent here people in the outback who know something of both the Queensland Labour Government and the Commonwealth Government. I have no experience of the Commonwealth House of Representatives but have now had experience of hon.

members opposite, and if the members of the Commonwealth Government are anything like those in Opposition here then the war effort of Australia is in very bad hands. I have always been 100 per cent. behind the war effort of Queensland, and in this House align myself with the Labour Government of Queensland, who are 100 per cent. behind the war effort of Queensland and of Australia.

In furtherance of the war effort the Federal Government should be making use of the vast mineral fields in the North. They should be constructing iron and steel works at Bowen, a copper-smelting and concentration plant in the Cloncurry area, and a zinc-refining plant somewhere in the North. These three minerals are the basis of war effort. If there are no factories to work the minerals to make tools, tanks, and aeroplanes, money and man power in the fighting forces will be of no use. If the Federal Government continue to neglect the vast mineral deposits of North Queensland, Australia will get nowhere in her war effort. It is idle for the Federal Government to sit back in the knowledge that America is making our industrial tools for us. We must make them ourselves. We have the tradesmen to do so. That has been proved.

But we must also make certain that our factories are not closed immediately at the conclusion of the war. The Australian soldier is sacrificing his life and his all for the ideal that the war factories will eventually be turned to the uses of peace-time industry. If it is found that they will be discontinued by reason of competition from slave-driven and slave-working countries, such countries must be wiped out. Australia must be protected better than she was after the last war. Because the huge copper ore deposits in South Africa were worked by black labour at a cost of about 1s. a week for each worker, the workers in the Cloncurry area on a wage of £4 to £5 a week had to go on the bread-line. We do not want that to happen again, and it is the duty of hon. members of the Opposition to see to it that it does not happen again. They may be representatives of organisations or chairmen of directors of large factories, and when they find that they can import into Australia articles from countries in which there is cheap labour, they must not take advantage of that fact. They must see to it that we trade only with countries that have the same standards of living as Australia.

Reference has been made to the allegedly high taxation in Queensland. The business people of the South are not concerned about the taxation in this State; they are only afraid of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which protects the workers here. Take Mount Isa Mines Limited as an example. That company was fostered by the Queensland Labour Government. It was not afraid of taxation. It is doing well. When they first came here the only concern of the directors was the conditions under which the workers were to be employed. The Queensland Labour Government are willing at any time to protect and foster any industry that cares to come here, and hon. members will find that

there are fewer wild-cat schemes in Queensland than in any other part of the Commonwealth. Industries that are started here are not set up at the expense of the workers. In Queensland the workers count. If the workers counted in the other States of the Commonwealth there would be no 50-50 Government, as we have now, but a 100-per-cent. Labour Government in Canberra and every capital city of every State.

In conclusion, I say that I only hope that hon. members opposite will impress upon their Government in Canberra that Queensland must receive her share of the money that is taken out of this State. We lead in all branches of war effort. Our enlistments are from 5 to 10 per cent. greater than those in any other State. That is due to the conditions under which our men live. Under our scheme of decentralisation of industry our men, after their 44 hours' work, can enjoy whatever sunshine there may be over the week-end. In such cities as Sydney and Melbourne, where centralisation of industry is the order of the day, the employees, after working in the dust and grime of the factories, go home to unclean suburbs and slums. If decentralisation of industry and marketing in Australia is carried out by the Commonwealth Government during the war period we shall be better fitted to carry out post-war reconstruction.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Dart, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 3.24 p.m.