

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1942**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER, 1942.**

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. E. J. Hanson, Buranda) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTION.

EFFECTS OF DAYLIGHT SAVING.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) asked the Premier—

“1. Will he give consideration to the decision of the Commonwealth Government to introduce daylight saving (so-called) again?”

“2. If he is satisfied that this alteration is detrimental to health, does not save fuel, and is against the wishes of the vast majority of the people of this State, will

he endeavour to persuade the Prime Minister to cancel this decision?

"3. If daylight saving is introduced, will he give favourable consideration to a later starting time for shop assistants, and also others, where practicable, many of whom will have to use artificial light and additional fuel in getting ready to proceed to their employment?"

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

"1. and 2. These matters are questions of policy entirely under the control of the Commonwealth Government.

"3. The Government has already announced its intention of reviewing the 'staggering of hours' plan in November next."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

**Mr. MAHER** (West Moreton) (11.2 a.m.), by leave: I wish to make a personal explanation. Yesterday, the hon. member for Windsor said that an hon. member of this House had advocated shooting miners. This is a slur on all hon. members of this House. The hon. member was no doubt referring to a statement of mine on the Address in Reply, but he did not have the courage to name me, as he knew his statement was not in accordance with fact.

On that occasion, I said that union leaders who defied the Industrial Court and urged the members of the unions to hold up supplies of food to our fighting services should be interned as enemies of Australia. I concluded by saying that in many other countries of the world union leaders acting in this way would be shot. No hon. member urged that miners should be shot, and the hon. member for Windsor, who uttered this libel on hon. members generally, deserves the censure of the House.

**The Attorney-General:** He distinctly said, the Tory members on the Opposition.

**Mr. MAHER:** As the real Tory members are on the Government side, it covers all.

#### FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT AID BILL.

##### INITIATION.

**The PREMIER** (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer) I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland, and for such purpose to suspend the imposition of State income tax and income (State development) tax during the present war and for a prescribed period thereafter; to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Brasington, Fortitude Valley, in the chair.)

**The PREMIER** (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer) (11.7 a.m.): I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced relating to financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland, and for such purpose to suspend the imposition of State income tax and income (State development) tax during the present war and for a prescribed period thereafter; to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes."

I think I need hardly remind hon. members of this Committee that quite recently the Commonwealth Parliament passed four Acts of Parliament having reference to what is known as the uniform taxation scheme. The object of those measures was to give the Commonwealth power to collect income tax over a specified period. The Bill that I wish to demonstrate to the Committee the desirability of introducing will be strictly in conformity with those four Acts as passed by the Commonwealth Legislature and in accordance with the interpretation put upon them by the High Court.

The legislation passed by the Commonwealth Government is to remain in force for the period of the war and for one full financial year thereafter.

**Mr. Decker:** If there is no referendum in the meantime.

**The PREMIER:** I do not want to pre-judge the future. All I am stating is what the Acts say. They say that the Acts shall remain in force for the period of the war and for one full financial year thereafter, or, to put it in the language of the Acts, till the last day of the financial year that commences after the termination of the war. If the war should end, say, on 31 October then the arrangement will remain in force for the balance of that financial year, from October to June, and for the whole of the following financial year. That is in accordance with the Commonwealth Acts, and that provision will be placed in the Bill that I hope to bring in. The Commonwealth legislation makes provision that it shall not be for a longer period; consequently, the Bill that I propose to introduce will contain the same provision, a provision that it shall be for that term and for no longer.

The question arises as to how we are to do this, and I think that when hon. members see the Bill they will find it is simplicity itself. The State has power under its Constitution to raise money by way of a tax on income. I am not sure of the section, but I think it is section 7 of the Income Tax Assessment Act that does that. The Bill, therefore, will suspend section 7 of the Income Tax Assessment Act.

Then we have a tax known as the income (State development) tax. It will be necessary to suspend the Income (State Development) Tax Act also because under it we have power to levy tax on income.

**Mr. Maher:** No tears will be shed over that.

**The PREMIER:** All I say is that the sections that give us the power to impose taxation will be suspended. We are compelled to do that—if it is a matter of compulsion—although in the strict sense it is not. We are doing it because one of the Commonwealth Acts says that if a State does not intend to collect revenue by way of taxation upon incomes then the Commonwealth Government will make that State—this or any other State—a payment equal to a certain sum that it considers to be the estimated income, or the average income of that State for the financial year ended 30 June, 1940, and the financial year ended 30 June, 1941.

**Mr. Maher:** A very liberal amount has been allocated to the States, too.

**The PREMIER:** The hon. member says it is a liberal amount, in his estimation. All I can say is that it is the due amount. It is the amount that we can consider due.

**Mr. Maher:** Based on record revenues.

**The Minister for Transport:** And record responsibility, too.

**The PREMIER:** That is the amount that the Commonwealth has said shall be the grant made to the States. To enable this State to obtain that grant from the Commonwealth, it is necessary for us to avow our intention not to collect income tax or tax on income, and it thus becomes necessary for us to suspend the section in the Income Tax Assessment Act, the sections in the Income (State Development) Act that give us power to collect those taxes. That is the simple method by which it is to be done.

However, there are other matters that must be considered. For instance, an arrangement has been entered into whereby arrears of taxation also will be collected. There are a number of cases in which people have not paid their income tax for various reasons, chiefly because they were not in a position to do so at the moment, and a generous Government have allowed them a little latitude. In order that the money owing to the State may be collected it is necessary that the rest of the Act should remain in force, and it will remain in force for that purpose. The Bill also provides that power shall be given to the Commonwealth to collect the arrears on behalf of the State.

**Mr. Pie:** They come back to the State?

**The PREMIER:** Later on. There is an arrangement whereby the arrears are collected.

**Mr. Taylor:** They do not go back to the taxpayer.

**The PREMIER:** A tremendous amount goes back to the taxpayer. Everything the State can possibly give to the taxpayer is given to him by the State. If there is one thing we seem to lack in this country it is a proper sense of our responsibility as citizens. This idea that we should get everything for nothing is very foreign to the Australian ideal. We should be willing to shoulder our responsibility as citizens and to do whatever the country asks us to do in furtherance of the benefit to the country. If we are not willing to do that we are not worthy of the name of Australians. The taxpayer gets everything the State can give him, for after all the country belongs to him, and in the last analysis he is the Government of it because he has the right to select the Government. And I presume that for the time being he is satisfied with the Government. If he is not, he can turn the Government adrift. Every three years he has it in his hands to do what he desires in that respect.

**Mr. Maher:** You made the State look shabby when you joined in the litigation against the Commonwealth.

**The PREMIER:** I ask the hon. member to listen to any argument on that point during my second-reading speech; it is not a matter to be dealt with now. The point does not arise at the moment, but the State's action was in no way shabby. I am sure that I shall be able to prove to hon. members opposite and to others who may have a similar idea that the State was right in its attitude.

It is necessary that the State of Queensland should carry on, that it should obtain this grant from the Commonwealth by allowing the Commonwealth to raise this taxation. The Bill does that. It will also allow the Commonwealth to collect the arrears of taxation for the State.

**Mr. Brand:** What amount is involved in unpaid taxation?

**The PREMIER:** Over the period, probably about £500,000. I want to make this explanation—that the arrears collected by the Commonwealth for the State will be returned to the State later on. To-day the arrears are coming in, and the Commonwealth is allowing the State to retain those amounts as part of the £5,821,000 to which the State is entitled under the Uniform Tax Scheme. I understand that the N.S.W. Government have asked for one-twelfth of these amounts to be paid to them month by month, but we have not asked for that. We have asked that all that money be made available to us in accordance with the amount we are to receive over the next two years.

**Mr. Pie:** Not in addition?

**The PREMIER:** No, not in addition. What is wrong with that? There is the additional provision that the arrears collected by the Commonwealth will be paid over to the State on the termination of this financial agreement so that money now owing to the State as arrears will be collected by the

Commonwealth on our behalf and held as amounts payable to the State at the termination of this financial agreement.

**Mr. Nimmo:** Is there any provision to grant relief in respect of over-payment of relief tax?

**The PREMIER:** I do not think there are any over-payments. There is an arrangement with the Commonwealth that over-payments shall be met.

**Mr. Nimmo:** I mean where State development tax has been assessed and paid in advance.

**The PREMIER:** There is a provision in the Act, which is not being repealed, that if a man dies or the Act is repealed certain adjustments shall be made. It is an adjustment of the amount that would have been paid in the last financial year with the amount that was paid in 1934-35. We are losing something in that respect because I am satisfied that if people had to pay State development tax for the financial year 1941-42 it would be in excess of the amount they paid for the year 1934-35. Rather than enter into these elaborate calculations and harry the people, who are being sufficiently harried in these matters at the moment, we have decided to suspend the Act rather than have these complications.

The Commonwealth Acts also provide that the officers of the Income Tax Department shall be passed over to the Commonwealth Income Tax Department for the specified period. That provision will be found in the Bill. It is necessary, however, that we should retain certain officers for certain purposes; consequently, the Bill makes provision that the present Commissioner of Taxes will be the Commissioner of Taxes for Queensland and the Deputy Commissioner will be the Deputy Commissioner of Taxes for Queensland. That will allow these gentlemen to act for the State. As the occasion requires the Commissioner will act as Commissioner for Stamp Duties and Commissioner of Taxes. That will allow him to do certain business in connection with the betting tax and totalisator taxation. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Commissioner of Taxes in Queensland has acted as Deputy Commissioner of Taxation for the Commonwealth. He will now be the Commonwealth officer and will do work for this State as a Commonwealth officer, just as he did work for the Commonwealth as an officer of this State. It is a mutual arrangement that we have entered into at the request of the Commonwealth Government. They are highly delighted at being able to enter into such an arrangement, and that arrangement has been provided for in the Bill.

Hon. members will also remember that we have been collecting in connection with the Golden Casket an amount of 3d. a ticket, which we have taken to be in lieu of income tax on the prizes won. In estimating the amount of income tax the State was entitled to, the Commonwealth Government disregarded the amount that came to us by way of the

Golden Casket. They eliminated in their calculation the amount received from the Golden Casket. Consequently, the State will not get that amount back from the Commonwealth Government. The State will not be in a position to collect income tax if we are to observe the Commonwealth Acts and the High Court's interpretation of those Acts, and we desire to do that to our utmost. Consequently, we cannot collect income tax on Golden Casket tickets. As a matter of fact, there are very many people who have expressed their antagonism to the tax, yet do not act according to their statements. I remember there was a Treasurer in this House who would not accept an amount from the Golden Casket on behalf of a charitable organisation with which he was connected, but when he became Treasurer he accepted the Golden Casket moneys, as good Treasurers always do.

**Mr. Walker:** He was quite an honourable man.

**The PREMIER:** That is so, and he was a good Treasurer. I am quoting this instance to point out that his conscience allowed him to differentiate between what he would do in a private capacity and what he would do in a public capacity. It is proposed in this Bill to make that impost on the Golden Casket a stamp tax. Therefore, the State will not lose the amount of revenue it was getting in the past from that source.

**Mr. Taylor:** Suppose the Federal Government want to collect income tax afterwards from the Golden Casket prizes?

**The PREMIER:** The Commonwealth Government have assured us they will not do so. To that extent the money that hon. members invest in the Casket and is returned to them by way of prizes can therefore be regarded by them as an offset to or remission of income tax.

Hon. members will notice that at certain times it has been necessary to amend the State Income Tax Assessment Act and the Income (State Development) Act with respect to exemptions. The exemption, roughly speaking, for those who paid this tax on money derived from employment has been the basic wage, and as the basic wage has risen, so the exemption has increased. The basic wage was raised in May, 1941; consequently there was need for this exemption to be raised. Provision will be made in the Bill to raise the exemption so that people will not pay a State development tax that they really should not be called upon to pay.

**Mr. Nicklin:** That will come into operation automatically?

**The PREMIER:** Yes. It is being observed now, and this amendment will make it perfectly legal.

We propose also to accede to another request of the Commonwealth Government, namely, to exempt from taxation the members of the United States and Allied fighting forces who are serving in Queensland. The Commonwealth put that proposal up to us

and we are very pleased to exempt these people from income tax in case there was any doubt that they might be liable. We have made provision in this Bill to cover that possibility.

Those are the main provisions of the first part of the Bill, which deals with the implementation of the Commonwealth Acts, and is drafted from a desire to act strictly in conformity with those Acts, and to be part and parcel of the scheme.

You will notice in this motion, Mr. Brasington, that there are these further words—

“to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes.”

When we suspend parts of the Income (State Development) Tax Act we, to a certain extent, place an obstruction in the way of doing much that this State is doing in the matter of development. We had a particular purpose when the Act was passed, and it is very necessary for the work to be continued. With the money that comes from the Commonwealth, we cannot do other than take it to the Treasury, because it is a payment made to the Treasury by the Commonwealth Government. They are paying it to us in lieu of income tax, therefore, we take the full amount of £5,821,000 into the Treasury for the purpose of the government of this State. The Government feel, however, that they should continue as best they may in these days, on the path of very fine development the State has pursued over the years. I do not want to enter into an elaborate discussion on that point. Hon. members are familiar with the position. I am sure the whole of the Committee will be in accord with me when I say that the great objective in front of us to-day is victory.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**The PREMIER:** That is ahead of us. I can see nothing else ahead of us but victory. We have to bend all our energies in that direction. I am not unmindful of the fact that we are, to a certain extent—I was going to say a peculiar people—but I will say that we are a trusting and confiding people. I speak of “us” as “members of the British Empire,” and history points to the fact that we are very much inclined, particularly in good works, to measure other people by our own bushel. The war of 1914-18 lasted for four years. It lasted for those four years because we would not believe that there were other nations who were preparing to tear us to pieces. I remember that Robert Blatchford went to Germany in 1913 and came back and told the people of Britain to prepare for war. Blatchford was disowned by virtually the whole of the people of Britain, he was scourged, and he was expelled from organisations to which he belonged because they dubbed him a war-monger. But Blatchford was right. The war lasted for four years because we were not prepared. When Kitchener was asked when the war would end he said, “After the war begins it will take

us at least three years to prepare to win the war,” and he was right.

**Mr. Taylor:** The same thing this time.

**The PREMIER:** The same thing this time, except that it is going to be a much longer period, and for the same reason—that we are inclined to measure other people by our own bushel and did not make the preparation we should have made.

**Mr. Maher:** Do you think over your own culpability in the matter of compulsory service?

**The PREMIER:** I talk about us all as a nation; I talk about us all as an Empire—the whole of the British Empire. We are all in this boat, and I do not propose to sit down and pick out anybody to throw stones at, because, I say, we are all in it. I do want to say this, however, that it ought to be a lesson to us to prepare, not necessarily to prepare for the next war but to get ourselves ready to do something after the war is over. All our energy we must use for victory. I believe that is all-essential. How can we build a future if we have no land to build on? The first job is to win the war, but in our spare moments we should give some consideration to the tremendous jobs that will face us when the war is over. They will be much more difficult than in the period that began in 1918. Then we had not many people coming back from overseas, but at the termination of this war we shall not only have people coming back to us but we shall have the people who are driving the enemy back to his own home to tie him there, and we shall have the whole nation that has been put into war channels to get back to peace channels; and for us to sit idly and make no provision for that time would stamp us as people who believed that such a responsibility would not come to us. Not only must we have faith that we are going to win; we must show by our works that we are going to win. Everything we can do for victory and everything we can do to get ready for that peace and order that will come after the war is over we should do. For that purpose—

**Mr. Edwards:** Muddle through?

**The PREMIER:** It is said that the Englishman muddles through. I am not so sure that that is correct. I think the Englishman or the Britisher gets through generally by trial and error, and if he is manly enough to own up to his blunders and correct the mistakes of the past, he will continue to be a real good Britisher and, I hope, a real good Australian.

**Mr. Taylor:** You cannot go on making mistakes for ever, and continue to get out of the trouble.

**The PREMIER:** The world has been making mistakes ever since the world began and we have been correcting those mistakes. The things that are mistakes to-day were not mistakes 35 or 40 years ago. The world changes. It is a world of progress. We have a wider vision and a greater knowledge, and by reason of that fact we are able to improve on things that in the past were thought to be

the absolute ideal. For that reason, when the Estimates are presented to the appropriate Committee there will be found an amount of something like £1,400,000 for this developmental work that will help towards getting our people back into peace-time work in an orderly way and with as little disruption as possible. Hon. members will be astounded when the information is given to them as to the amount of work that is being done and has been done by State instrumentalities in preparation for the defence of this country and for the offensive that will start from this country, and it is a very fine testimonial to the State of Queensland that its foresight led it to establish the organisation that has been of such tremendous help to the Commonwealth Government in their hour of need. Had this State been unprepared we should not have been anywhere near where we are to-day. The magnificent work being done by the Allied Works Council had its very foundation in the Main Roads Commission established by this Government and carried on so well by this Government. The organisation was ready and it has worked magnificently. It has earned the high praise of all people who have come in contact with the work it has done, not only Australians but people from overseas, not only Americans but Englishmen, and all others who have observed its work. They believe it to be a magnificent effort and did not think this effort could possibly have been made in such a State as Queensland. We are proud of that praise, but it is necessary for us in this Bill which amends the Income Tax Acts and the Income (State Development) Tax Act to make provision to allow us to carry on as opportunity offers—not to carry on in a way that will injure the war effort one iota—so that we shall be able to meet that day when peace comes to us. Orderly planning will allow us to settle people back into industry so that this State may continue to be the great State it gave promise of being in the past, and that we shall be ready to meet that day. Consequently, we are making provision in this Bill to carry on this good work, and I have for that reason much pleasure in moving the motion.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Does the £5,821,000 include the land tax?

**The PREMIER:** No, it does not. The Commissioner will also collect the land tax.

**Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) (11.34 a.m.):** Having listened to the Premier this morning, I think it would have been better had he divided the motion into two parts and introduced two separate Bills, one to deal solely with the financial arrangements with the Commonwealth Government and the other to deal with the all-important problem of post-war development. Mixing the two in this one motion confuses things.

**The Premier:** Not at all. One is the natural complement of the other.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** That may be so, but after all post-war development and planning for post-war development are not complementary to confirming a financial agreement with the

Commonwealth. That is an obligation this State has to fulfil under the financial agreement that was arrived at and brought about uniform taxation. I repeat that it would have been preferable had a separate Bill dealing with the latter part of this motion been introduced, and this measure had been confined to the more or less simple procedure of confirming the financial agreement entered into with the Commonwealth Government.

The first part of the Bill will be more or less a machinery measure designed to implement the financial arrangement between the State and the Commonwealth. Notwithstanding anything we may have heard about this financial agreement, it must be admitted that the States are getting a remarkably good deal.

They are not going to lose anything by way of revenue because the amounts to be paid to them by the Commonwealth are based on what were virtually peak revenues from the State's point of view. Then, when we take into consideration the fact that at the present time the States have neither the need nor the opportunity to expend money on development that they had in normal times, we see that the revenues they will obtain as a result of this financial agreement with the Commonwealth Government will be more than ample for their present requirements. I do not think there can be any argument on that point. No matter how much a Government may wish to enter into developmental work just now—and from what the Premier told us the Government do not intend to do any developmental work at the present time except that which will tend to help the general war effort of the Commonwealth—

**The Premier:** And to provide for the future, as I said.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** But at the present time I cannot see any opportunity for making much provision for the future by way of developmental works.

**The Secretary for Public Works:** Much of the war work is doing that automatically.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** Admittedly the construction of roads that have a defence value will also help in the development of the State after the war. Perhaps other war works that are being carried out at the present time will help the State's economic development later, but I make the point—and nobody knows this better than the Premier and his Cabinet—that at the moment, no matter how much he or his Cabinet desires to enter into works of a developmental nature, his Government are confronted with considerable handicaps in the way of shortage of man-power and lack of necessary materials and plant for carrying out those works. As the Premier has intimated in his speech this morning, the object of his Government first of all is to gain victory, and that is a point on which we are all behind him 100 per cent. I was very glad, indeed, to hear him make that definite statement.

**The Premier:** We have never made any other statement.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I know that. I do not say what I have said in any derogatory manner, but I think that the point cannot be emphasised too often at the moment because, unfortunately, there is a large section of our community who do not yet realise the difficult and dangerous position in which we are placed. They spend far too much time thinking of the times that will come after the war and of our development after the war. We have to realise that perhaps we may not have the guiding of our destinies after the war, and we have to make every effort now to ensure that nothing we can do at the moment will hamper our effort towards that desirable objective of victory, which we all hope to see in the very near future.

As the Premier says, we must give thought in our spare moments—if we have any spare moments from the work we have to do to ensure victory—to what should be done after the war and to what preparations we can make now to meet the big problems that will confront us as a State and a people after the war.

By ratifying the financial agreement through the passage of this proposed measure we are ratifying a war-time arrangement that, I think, will be very satisfactory to all parties. It is necessary that the Commonwealth Government shall get all the finance they need to conduct this war. Undoubtedly the old arrangement, under which six State Governments as well as the Commonwealth Government dipped into the taxpayers' pockets for income tax, did not permit of our making a 100-per-cent. war effort by making the necessary money available to the Commonwealth, and for that reason this financial arrangement is a satisfactory one to the people. As I mentioned earlier, it will not be a hardship in any way on any of the States because the amounts they will receive are based on record revenues, and so their finances are secure.

Most of the machinery clauses that the Premier enumerated are necessary to ratify the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State. The collection of income tax and State development tax is suspended until the end of the financial year following the conclusion of war. The Bill makes provision for the collection of arrears of taxation and for the taking over of the State Taxation Department officers by the Commonwealth. The Bill deals with small anomalies that have occurred in connection with the tax the Government have collected in connection with the Golden Casket, and it also grants an exemption from taxation to certain members of the Allied fighting forces who are in the State. I think those principles will meet with the approval of everyone concerned.

I have said that the agreement was a very necessary and a very satisfactory one, but I should also like to take the opportunity of condemning the action of the State Government in opposing the uniform taxation scheme by their application to the High Court. They attempted to destroy what was a very necessary financial arrangement

by appealing to the High Court, and their action undoubtedly is worthy of nothing but the most severe condemnation. It is to be hoped that when the Premier makes his second-reading speech he will be able to make good the claim made in his initiatory speech that he could justify the action of the State Government in appealing to the High Court against the Commonwealth legislation. It will be interesting to know exactly how he will endeavour to do so.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** It would be interesting to hear the Country Party leader in Victoria, too.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I condemn the Country Party leader in Victoria equally with the former Premier of the State of Queensland and the Premier of New South Wales. Even the Secretary for Public Lands, if he expressed his true thoughts on the matter, would admit that the Commonwealth legislation was justified under war-time conditions. Therefore, I am sure hon. members will look forward with considerable interest to the defence of the Queensland Cabinet and their justification of their action in contesting the Commonwealth legislation.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** The Constitution has to be protected, irrespective of party.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** The constitutional aspect was not involved in the appeal to the High Court by the various States; the States were well protected otherwise. The Commonwealth legislation was purely war-time legislation, and as the Premier has already said contained a provision to the effect that it was to terminate at the end of the financial year following the conclusion of the war. That explodes the argument of the Secretary for Public Lands that the constitutional aspect was involved.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** The High Court had not said that. We are satisfied that that is the case now.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** It was clearly pointed out by the Commonwealth Government that it was to be purely a war-time measure.

**The Premier:** And Commonwealth Ministers said that they hoped it would continue for all time. The High Court has established the fact that it is to operate for a limited time.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** We cannot speculate on the hopes and wishes of Commonwealth Ministers; we must look at the facts. As this is a war-time measure, it should have had the support of all concerned.

**The Premier:** That was the offer the Queensland Government made to the Commonwealth Government, but they would not accept it.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I cannot follow the hon. gentleman.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** The Queensland Government said

that if it was to be only a war-time measure we would agree to it.

**The Premier:** The Queensland Government were anxious to establish the point that it was purely a war-time measure.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I do not think there was any need to appeal to the High Court to establish that point. Did not the Commonwealth Acts definitely limit their operation? In fact, the Premier said so in moving this motion. Consequently, no question was involved whether this scheme would be continued after the war.

**The Premier:** An Act of Parliament may be varied. We wanted to know what the constitution said.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** An Act of Parliament may be varied, but that is only an endeavour to draw a red herring across the trail. The fact of the matter is that the legislation laid down definitely that it was purely a war-time measure, and as a war-time measure there was no argument against its validity or its necessity. The Commonwealth Government must have the money, and this was the obvious way in which they would get it.

Let us look at the second part of the motion to which the Committee is asked to give consideration. It says that the Bill is a Bill—

“to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes.”

Those words sound rather familiar. I think we have heard something like that in this Chamber before. In fact, during last session we had a Bill that had a title sounding something like that in regard to economic development after the war, and a planned direction of labour facilities and other matters in this State. That legislation received a great deal of comment in the Governor's Speech last year and also in the debates during its passage through this Chamber. It was only recently that this Act was put into effect, and then only some sections of it were proclaimed. The last part of the motion seems to me to indicate a desire for a little bit of political propaganda, something of the same sort as that indulged in by the hon. gentlemen opposite when we were considering the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill last session. Evidently we are not finished with that measure yet. The Secretary for Labour and Industry distributed 12,000 copies of his second-reading speech in booklet form. Fancy 12,000 booklets being distributed at the present time when there is supposed to be a shortage of paper in this State, and when it is necessary to conserve man-power! That measure has only now been implemented by being proclaimed.

Let us look more closely at the second part of the motion. It is wrong, I think, to include it in the resolution; if there is a need for such legislation we should have a second Bill brought down to deal with the subject, so that we could widen it still further. I

propose, Mr. Brassington, now that I have heard what the Premier has had to say about this matter and now that he persists in proceeding with this motion in its present form, instead of dividing the subject into two separate Bills, to move the following amendment:—

“After the word, ‘State’ where it lastly occurs, insert the words—

‘to make provision for an adequate measure of preference in employment to returned members of the Commonwealth Naval, Military, and Air Forces and for their training in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings.’”

The second part of the motion would then read—

“to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, to make provision for an adequate measure of preference in employment to returned members of the Commonwealth Naval, Military, and Air Forces and for their training in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes.”

The biggest problem we shall have to consider in post-war development and planning is how we are going to deal with the men who are now in our fighting forces. That is going to be about 75 per cent. of the problem of post-war planning and post-war development. To ensure that the returned members of our fighting forces are not forgotten in this post-war planning and development, I have moved the amendment to extend the scope of the motion.

That is particularly necessary at the present time, more necessary than it was after the last war, when, as the Premier mentioned, it was some months before we had a repatriation problem on our hands, because our soldiers were thousands of miles away overseas, whereas this time a large section of them will be right on our doorstep and the repatriation problem will be a particularly big and important one immediately the war ends. That is the reason why I move this amendment this morning, to ensure that if we are to give consideration to the economic security and development of the State after the war we should make certain that we give every consideration to those most entitled to that economic security—the members of the forces who are fighting for their country.

**Mr. BRAND (Isis) (11.56 a.m.):** I think the Committee must be very appreciative of the act of the Leader of the Opposition in recognising that in any set-up in the financial arrangements of this country during the period of the war and for reconstruction after the war some thought should be given to those who are making the biggest sacrifice of all, so that they will have some knowledge that when they return they will find a place

in the planned economy to be set up by the various Governments of Australia. I, therefore, support the amendment to the full and feel that the Committee as a whole will accept it.

The nature of the legislation indicates clearly that there is in the minds of the people and the Governments of Australia a recognition of the need to mobilise the whole of our resources, whether in finance, manpower, or industry, to prosecute this war to a successful issue. The Premier has indicated quite clearly that the main objective that must concern us is victory, and we all agree with him that that is the main consideration in any activity of any Government to-day. I believe that the move by the Commonwealth authorities to bring about a better distribution of the taxation in the States had no other objective than a greater war effort and a better means of planning for the future of this country. For that reason I have supported, and still support, the Commonwealth Government in their action to bring about uniform taxation in Australia. It would appear that Queensland may have been fortunate in that we have been a very highly taxed State. After all, some good comes out of high taxation. I believe with the Premier, however, that we have received only what we are fully entitled to. This States requires the £5,821,000 that has been allocated to it under the uniform taxation scheme.

This is a State capable of great development and great rural production. It has also been developing fast in manufacturing industries. It will require from the Commonwealth authorities greater aid than it has been receiving in order to retain prosperity for our people. We cannot rest content with the mere decision of the Commonwealth Government to make a certain amount of money available. Greater responsibility for what will happen to the people of this State rests with that authority. A great obligation and a heavy responsibility rest on the State Government to see that the Commonwealth Government provide for the people of this State and their industries the reasonable protection to which they are entitled. After all, we must realise that whatever amount may be collected from the people of Australia, which includes Queensland, and although possibly this State is not involved so actively in the collection of taxes, the people of Queensland will be contributors to the uniform income tax and consequently have the right to expect from the Commonwealth Government greater consideration than they are to-day receiving. I am appalled to find that in this State particularly the basic industries are not receiving from the Commonwealth authorities due consideration in the things that stimulate such industries to greater production. Nor do I think that this Government are making the appeal they should make to that end. All these things are necessary if we are to provide the wherewithal from which the Commonwealth Government can repay to us the amount of money provided under the financial arrangement.

This morning I make an appeal to the Government not to lose sight of the source from which all our income is derived, and I ask them to strike hard and protest to the Commonwealth Government on the necessity for providing a fair reward to the people of Queensland who are carrying on the principal primary industries. It is remarkable that we are finding throughout Australia that only one section of people have not as yet received any benefit from the continual increases in costs that have occurred, one section who are not participating in the benefits of rising costs, but who have nevertheless to incur all the disabilities thereof—the primary producers. Within the past few days the primary producers have had submitted to them by the Minister controlling the Department of Agriculture and Stock a demand to produce an amount that he regards as a target production for the 12 months ahead. I am sorry to find that in this Parliament we have a Government who have not as yet recognised their responsibilities in making a proper appeal to the Commonwealth Government that these producers should receive some reasonable consideration in regard to prices, something similar to that given to the more favoured manufacturing sections of the people.

**Mr. Dunstan:** Many such appeals have been made.

**Mr. BRAND:** I am pleased to hear from the hon. member for Gympie that many such appeals have been made. If they have, it is remarkable that we have not received greater consideration.

**Mr. Mann:** You should know that Melbourne runs the Commonwealth Government.

**Mr. BRAND:** I should not like to say that the present Commonwealth Government are controlled from Melbourne.

**Mr. Mann:** I make no apology for saying that.

**Mr. BRAND:** On the contrary, I believe that they are controlled by circumstances they are not prepared to fight against. As a political party, they should protest against the forces to which it is evident they are succumbing. I ask this Labour Government to make their influence felt in the Federal sphere and to demand aid for the people who are doing their utmost, who are working day and night to produce the basic foodstuffs required by this country, and who are doing all this because they want to win the war. If we are to meet the demands made upon us by the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—if we are to achieve the target production that he suggests, then these people must have full recognition. It is my belief that the quantities of foodstuffs that we in this State are called upon to produce are not target quantities, but are the minimum amounts required by the nation to-day and, just as it has been found through the ages that the hope of reward sweetens labour, so is it essential that price levels shall be fixed that will ensure a reasonable profit over cost of production, because that is the only way by which we can

hope to stimulate production and achieve the target quotas. It is high time we set out to give our primary producers some reasonable hope of making a livelihood in their own industry. If we are to help in the collection of greater amounts of income tax for the Commonwealth Government, then we must remove from all industry the things that are hampering its progress. I believe that it is possible for the Queensland people to produce all that is required of them if the Government cease to adopt a totalitarian attitude in their endeavour to obtain this production. If they allow our primary producers to follow their ordinary recognised practice, they will show them what can be done. The Queensland people abhor totalitarian methods, and I appeal to the Government, through their Ministers, to drop the dictatorial attitude that they are adopting in an endeavour to wrench from the producers certain considerations that are not in the interests of industry in general.

I am sorry the Commonwealth Government are not giving us adequate consideration, and I urge this Government to do all they can for us in this direction. I agree with the Premier that each and every one of us should be doing his utmost in some war activity, but the Commonwealth Government have failed to place our people in active work. Technicians and machines lie idle in Queensland to-day because those smart boys who are controlling the munitions programme have not enough vision to plan a system by which the whole of our people will be placed in work.

**Mr. Pie:** They were meant for the labour corps.

**Mr. BRAND:** That is so, and even when they framed a method of employing labour their plan was a poor one. In my opinion, conditions to-day warrant the appointment to the committees controlling activities of men like Mr. J. D. Story, who are capable of advising as to the best methods to adopt. We must bring to our aid all the best brains in the State. So far, very few State public servants have been called upon to help in the great work of planning and directing the war effort of the State. It is true that a few have been called to do the work, and that these are doing a very important job, but there are many others who could contribute to a greater extent than they are.

**Mr. Power:** There are hon. members in this Chamber who could help as well.

**Mr. BRAND:** I quite agree with the hon. member. There are hon. members in this Chamber who are willing to give their services, but they are not acceptable to the Commonwealth authorities. We know that one hon. member put up a fight for weeks in order to have a showdown about the bad deal handed out to the Queensland manufacturers. The Commonwealth Government will have to see that there is a better set-up of the various activities in their war programme.

The Bill provides for a plan of post-war reconstruction, and the amendment simply says that some consideration shall be given to those who may pass through the holocaust

and return to their homes. It means that whatever scheme of planning or reconstruction is adopted, it shall preserve the rights and liberties of the people.

**Mr. Power:** What consideration do you propose to give to a man who volunteers for active service, is rejected, and is later called up in the militia forces?

**Mr. BRAND:** He is still a member of the Australian military forces.

**Mr. Power:** What consideration would you give to a man in a reserved occupation who wants to enlist and is not allowed to do so?

**Mr. BRAND:** He will remain in his reserved occupation, and he is getting his reward to-day. He enjoys a security that is not available for the men who leave for the fighting fronts, and it is these men who are entitled to the utmost consideration. The amendment does not conflict with party-political views at all and should be accepted by all hon. members. I hope that the discussion will lead to unanimity on the subject, for the reason that we wish to see that those Queenslanders who are making great sacrifices to-day shall find a place in society when they return after victory has been won.

**Mr. MAHER** (West Moreton) (12.15 p.m.): We have been asked to affirm the principle that it is desirable to introduce a Bill to implement the agreement between the Commonwealth and the States concerning the uniform-tax proposal. The Bill is eminently desirable, but one regrettable feature in the recent political life of the State is that Parliament was not called together at the time the suggestion was made in order that it might discuss a matter of such far-reaching importance as the passing over of the income-taxation powers of the State to the Commonwealth for the duration of the war and a period thereafter. When the matter first came up for discussion the former Premier, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, made use of these words—

“I take the view that if this power passes from the States to the Commonwealth it will pass permanently.”

In other words, he meant that the State would be struck in such a way that it could not recover, and that once the people of Australia became used to uniform tax there would be no prospects of inducing them to return to the State system of government. If the former Premier's view is correct, then surely it is a matter that justified the calling of the State Parliament together to discuss it so that the views of hon. members on both sides could have been ascertained!

The former Premier later on made this remarkable statement, which I have extracted from the newspaper called the “Australian Worker” under date 28 April, 1942—

“Mr. Forgan Smith said: ‘I am not prepared to transfer these powers to the Commonwealth. I have been elected by the people of Queensland to preserve, not

dissipate, the Constitution. I have no right to barter away the powers contained in the Queensland Constitution.' ”

“I”!

**Mr. Nimmo:** Dictator!

**Mr. MAHER:** Yes, is this matter to be the sole domain of the ex-Premier? He claims the right to speak for the Parliament of Queensland. When it comes to any interference with the Constitution of this State it is for this Parliament to decide, not the ex-Premier.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** While the Premier holds the majority of the support of this Parliament he is the only man who can speak for Queensland.

**Mr. MAHER:** Who can say that this Parliament is going to support his point of view? There is no certainty of that. Very divergent views are held in this Parliament concerning the passing of those powers to the Commonwealth Government. It was the ex-Premier's duty to the electors to summon Parliament together to ascertain the views of their elected representatives to gain support for his point of view from them. No, the hon. gentleman said—

“I have been elected by the people of Queensland to preserve, not dissipate, the Constitution. I have no right to barter away the powers contained in the Queensland Constitution. I am not prepared to transfer these powers to the Commonwealth.”

Well, Mr. Brassington, if that is not a touch of supreme egotism, then I do not know what is—that the ex-Premier should take unto himself the role of the sole upholder of the Queensland Constitution.

**Mr. Mann:** As Premier of the State he is entitled to do so.

**Mr. MAHER:**

“I am Sir Oracle,

And when I ope my lips, let no dog bark!”

I protest as an individual, a unit of the State and as a citizen, I protest as an elected member of this Parliament that on a matter of such tremendous importance as one on which our ex-Premier should endeavour to lead the people to believe that the passing to the Commonwealth of those powers of taxation means not only that they will pass permanently, but that this will destroy State Parliaments altogether—the ex-Premier visualised that prospect—I protest that if this passing of powers could possibly destroy the State's system of government utterly and render useless the Constitution of the State, someone else should have been asked to speak besides the ex-Premier alone, or besides the hon. members of the Cabinet. The House should have been summoned. This, in the opinion of the ex-Premier, was a blow that would undermine the whole foundation of the Queensland Constitution, and each hon. member of this Assembly has an equal right

with the ex-Premier to uphold the Constitution of this State.

**Mr. Dunstan:** Do you believe in that?

**Mr. MAHER:** That is what I am saying—that the House should have been called together to decide this important matter.

Let us see how far the ex-Premier's illogical and foolish attitude took him. He joined with other States in litigation attacking the Commonwealth. That, too, I say in passing, is a subject Parliament should have been invited to discuss before the State was committed to the cost of that litigation. The State of Queensland was advantaged by the uniform-tax proposals, and the passing of those powers over to the Commonwealth for the period of the war and one year thereafter. I think that 90 per cent. of the people of Australia are in complete accord with them. So far as the people are concerned, the advantages rest with them. For example, a taxpayer on an income of £250 and having a wife and one dependent child will pay £7 10s. per annum less under the uniform-taxation proposals than under the Queensland tax laws; a taxpayer with a dependent wife and one child in receipt of £500 per annum will pay £12 4s. per annum less, and a taxpayer with a wife and one dependent child, in receipt of £1,000 per annum will pay £37 10s. less.

**Mr. Riordan:** That is not right.

**Mr. MAHER:** It is true. Those are the facts. I took the figures from the statement made by the Commonwealth Treasurer, Mr. Chifley, when he visited Brisbane about the time the Premier was criticising the Commonwealth proposals. The ex-Premier and those who supported him in his foolish attack on the Commonwealth for seeking to assume those powers for the period of the war really acted contrary to the best interests of the taxpayers of Queensland. That is why I interjected when the Premier was speaking this morning that no tears would be shed because of the abolition of the State development tax.

A Government Member interjected.

**Mr. MAHER:** It depends on the income of an individual. All those in receipt of £1,000 and less in the State will pay less to the Commonwealth than they would have paid to the State if this change had not been made. You find the evidence on every hand to-day. I believe one of the factors that contributed to the retirement of Mr. Forgan Smith from the Premiership lay in the fact—if I might use the vernacular—that he hopped off on the wrong leg in his opposition to the Commonwealth's proposals. I believe they have found the widest possible favour amongst the unionists and members of the Australian Labour Parties throughout Queensland, and that considerable pressure is being exerted on individual members of the State Labour Party to reverse their attitude of opposition to them, and thus present a united front at the next Federal election which is in the offing. Obviously, the rank-and-file member of the Labour Party in Parliament can turn

a somersault—he can reverse his attitude—but the leader, the ex-Premier in this case, because he was the spearhead of the attack against the Federal Government, having joined in the litigation with other States, cannot possibly do so. As the Federal elections came closer and closer, the leadership of the ex-Premier in those circumstances would have become increasingly embarrassing to hon. gentlemen who sit opposite; therefore, rather than have a public showdown in three or four months' time, the Premier thought it was more graceful and tactful to retire from the leadership. I submit that is one of the factors contributing to the hon. gentleman's decision that he led the members of his party into an ambush—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is indulging in too much repetition.

**Mr. MAHER:** The ex-Premier led his followers in this Parliament into an ambush prepared by the Federal Labour leaders, and now he finds he is losing ground amongst his own followers and so he has retired from the political scene.

**Mr. Riordan:** You take the opportunity while he is away to attack him.

**Mr. MAHER:** The hon. member can reply to what I have said. One does not have to wait for an hon. member to be present; if he is not here, it is just too bad.

The Premiers who objected to the uniform-tax proposals cut a very sorry figure. I can make some allowance for the Premier of Victoria, because that State is being penalised by these proposals for its thrift and economy, and because the low taxation scale operating there brought grist to the mill and made it a great industrial State. I can understand the feeling of the Premier of Victoria, but I have no sympathy with the Premier of Queensland, and I cannot understand why this State, which was gaining a distinct advantage by these proposals, should have been committed to the cost of litigation without consulting Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member has referred to that point fully six times. I ask him to refrain from repetition.

**Mr. MAHER:** I wanted to show that the ex-Premier, in his opposition to this litigation in the Federal Parliament, took a stand that was un-Australian and to an extent unpatriotic in all the circumstances, because Australia was threatened by the enemy, was imperilled, and it was essential that the Commonwealth Government should have control over the finances of Australia in order that they might prosecute the war with the utmost vigour. The four Premiers were prepared to hold up the war effort and distract the War Minister in the Federal Government by argument on constitutional differences. The Prime Minister very truly expressed the position when he said that the men who argued about rights under the Constitution in Australia might find that if the enemy succeeds there would not be any Constitution to wrangle about. Mr. W. M. Hughes, the Leader of the United Australia Party in the Federal Par-

liament at the time, made use of this expression and it, too, covers the ground fairly well—

“Australia to-day is an armed camp, but the Premiers stand aloof, pinchbeck Caesars babbling about State rights when not only the rights but the very lives of the people who compose those States are in deadly peril. It is time to ring down the curtain on this outmoded drama.”

That is a very effective reply to the little Australians who put every sprag possible into the wheels to prevent the Commonwealth Government from getting control over Australian finance in order to prosecute this war with the utmost vigour. (Government interjections.)

This morning the Leader of the Opposition submitted an amendment to this motion. It provides for an adequate measure of preference in employment to returned members of the Commonwealth naval, military, and air forces, and for their training in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings. No hon. member could quibble at an amendment of this kind. It goes without saying that we owe a debt that cannot be repaid to the men who volunteered to serve their country in the air, on the land, and on the sea in the various warlike operations in which Australian service men are to-day engaged. These men offered their lives for the security that we in Australia enjoy. It is not enough to utter words of praise of them when they enlist; there is the solemn obligation on us to help them into their peaceful way of life once again after the war ends. (Government interjections.) There is far too much levity on this matter this morning and it ill becomes this Assembly. It ill becomes hon. members when it may be a matter of life and death. We know not the minute when the Japanese may make an invasion landing on our soil, nor do we know the minute when the city of Brisbane may be bombed, but hon. members sit here and make light of a question that involves the future wellbeing of the men who are being shot down in the jungles of New Guinea, the Australian far North, and the battlefields of the Middle East. The Assembly should have some dignity and understanding of the seriousness of the position, instead of making flippant observations on a matter of such importance.

**Mr. Riordan:** It is a pity you did not observe that a moment ago when you were speaking.

**Mr. MAHER:** I have done it. It is the duty of this Parliament to record their support for an amendment that seeks to provide for the men in the fighting services when they return to Australia. I have given evidence of the need for that provision. The other day I quoted in the House a letter from a lieutenant who served two and a-half years in the Middle East and was discharged as medically unfit. When he applied to the Repatriation Commission for help to rehabilitate himself on a small farm he was told no provision was made for the men discharged as medically unfit. It is clear that no time

or thought is given to this important problem to-day. So far the Federal Government have failed to meet that situation. It is all right to take a referendum at the next Federal election to give power to the Commonwealth Government to provide funds to settle returned soldiers after the war, but there is no necessity for a referendum for such a purpose. It could be done now under the power that they already possess, and it is only pulling the wool over the eyes of the voting public to say that a referendum is necessary to gain those powers.

The Premier stated this morning that a sum a little in excess of £1,000,000 would be contained in the Estimates for this year for the purpose of development.

I want to know from the Premier whether that £1,250,000 is to be spent during the current year or whether it is an amount that he is putting aside as a trust fund to be spent after the war in giving employment to the men who will be thrown out of the forces and who will be in search of work. Does he propose to spend the £1,250,000 in the current year on top of the vast sums that are being spent by the Commonwealth Government on every side to-day? Does he intend to add to the inflationary effect of all that spending? Where is the man-power available for what the Premier calls development to an extent that will absorb this sum of £1,250,000?

**The Premier:** If there is no man-power there is no absorption.

**Mr. MAHER:** Then, let us be frank. What is the use of telling the Committee that the hon. gentleman is going to spend over £1,000,000 for development, and that it is provided for in the Estimates, if there is no man-power available?

**The Premier:** Plus defensive measures. We have been spending more on that than the Commonwealth has spent. In the past the State has spent more than the Commonwealth on the defence of Australia in Queensland.

**Mr. MAHER:** That is an absurd assertion.

**The Premier:** It is not absurd; it is the truth.

**Mr. MAHER:** I invite the Premier to submit to this House facts and figures so that hon. members will be able to assess the position.

**The Premier:** I will submit what we have spent on works and what the Commonwealth Government have spent on works.

**Mr. MAHER:** If the hon. gentleman will do that it will give some information to the Committee, but I am entitled to suggest this morning to the Premier that if there is £1,250,000 on the Estimates for developmental purposes, when unemployment is not a factor in our economy to-day, that if he is going to compete with the Commonwealth war effort by taking men away—

**The Premier:** We aid the war effort, and well you know it.

**Mr. MAHER:** It all depends on what this money is being spent for. If it is just election propaganda or something of that sort, that is not good business.

**The Premier:** As yours is. All that the Opposition have said this morning has been pure propaganda.

**Mr. MAHER:** Money is being frittered away to-day like water in every direction. I am urging prudence upon the Premier. I am urging, if he has £1,250,000, that instead of throwing it into the inflationary pool he should retain it and keep it in a trust fund to help the members of the fighting forces when this struggle is ended.

As an example of how money is being wasted to-day, let me quote the fact that we have in Queensland an Allied Works Council which I think everyone will agree is not giving the greatest amount of value. Then we have the Main Roads Commission. Then we have the Department of Public Works. Why all this duplication of effort?

**The Premier:** 95 per cent. of the work of the Department of Public Works is war work. You do not know your book.

**Mr. MAHER:** The Department of Public Works is capable of handling all the jobs that are essential to-day.

**The Secretary for Public Works:** It cannot do the Main Roads jobs.

**Mr. MAHER:** The Main Roads Commission is capable of handling all the road work of the State.

**The Premier:** It is doing it, and doing work for the Allied Works Council.

**Mr. MAHER:** The Allied Works Council is also doing work that encroaches upon the job entrusted to the Main Roads Commission by this Parliament.

(Time expired.)

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS** (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (12.41 p.m.): I am very sorry indeed to hear the Leader of the Opposition introduce this amendment this morning, and I was especially sorry to hear the last speech, that delivered by the hon. member for West Moreton as his contribution to the task of getting together to win the war. It was just a tirade of abuse against our former Premier.

**Mr. MAHER:** Not abuse, just criticism of his actions.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** I think the hon. member is still suffering from the inferiority complex that he developed when he wanted to be Premier in place of the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, and when the people of Queensland told him "No" in no uncertain terms. There is no doubt that the inferiority complex is a great urge for many vicious things,

and I think that that is what has been troubling the hon. member for West Moreton.

I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition took this attitude, because it leads one to believe that there is still a feeling abroad that if you can knock an honest bob out of a returned soldier then do 'it by all means, if you can knock a bob out of the bag do it by all means.

One of the things that disgusted the men who fought in the last war on their return was the carefully-planned post-war scheme for exploiting them when they had a few hundred pounds in their pockets. While they were left out of work tramping the country looking for jobs, after having been away in the fighting services to preserve the country, they could see round them people who upon every possible occasion bounced to their feet to sing the National Anthem and were afterwards prosecuted for putting in false income-tax returns to rob His Majesty's Treasury. Those are the things that make rebels of people, those are the things that destroy democracy and shatter civilisation—the inequality and ill-treatment that are extended to people who do the real work and the real fighting for the protection and maintenance of our social order. I cannot believe that any other motive prompted hon. members opposite to move the amendment than the one of making a little political capital out of it. (Opposition dissent.) We are entitled to look for the reason.

**Mr. Nimmo:** What is your yardstick of measurement?

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** My experience since the last war. Since the last war I have watched very carefully the treatment meted out by people in business, in commerce, and trade in this country to the men who went away to fight and made the country safe for business, commerce, and trade. I am justified in the light of my experience of examining carefully the treatment being meted out to the fighting men, in deciding the reasons why the amendment was moved. After exhausting all possible reasons that could have urged the Leader of the Opposition to move it, I am forced back on the only one that remains. Is it a desire to provide preference of work for all returned soldiers after the war? Is it a desire to provide for the training of men in skilled trades and for their training for land occupations after their discharge from the fighting services? After asking myself these questions, I say "No" unless hon. members opposite admit that they do not know what legislation they are helping to put through this Parliament. During the few short weeks Parliament has been in session we have heard a great deal about the Act passed last session by the Secretary for Labour and Industry and recently proclaimed. I refer to the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act. Hon. members opposite either have no sincerity in this matter, or they do not know what they have already done in the way of legislation, because the amendment is pirated from the Act introduced by my colleague, the

Secretary for Labour and Industry, last year. Section 11 (3) of the Act says—

"In addition to the powers and authorities hereinbefore set forth, the Council shall be entrusted with the following powers, functions, duties, and inquiries, namely:—

(a) Make recommendations to the Governor in Council as to the measure of preference in employment which should be given to returned members of the Commonwealth Naval, Military, and Air Forces and as to the training facilities in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings which should be provided for them."

The amendment is pirated from that Act, and hon. members opposite have forgotten all about the Act.

**Mr. Nicklin:** Who moved that amendment to the Bill?

**The Premier:** You did.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** The Leader of the Opposition moved it and has forgotten all about it.

**Mr. Brand:** It only makes recommendations, whereas the amendment is definite.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** Now, now, now! I listened to the hon. member having his little say a while ago, and he did not seem to know anything about it either. When the Act was being considered last year the Leader of the Opposition suggested that very amendment to the Secretary for Labour and Industry, who was in charge of the Bill, and he agreed, as we have always done, to do everything possible for members of the fighting services. He accepted the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and included the amendment in the Act. Hon. members opposite were so concerned about the principle that they had forgotten all about it in that short space of time from last session until now. What hypocrisy! It makes me frightened—to hear people, little people, talking about post-war problems, just as I was frightened for many years when I heard people cackling about how they were going to put Hitler and his order under proper control. Those ideas came from half-baked Tories and half-sane Communists who put forth what they were going to do with the dictators of the world. It frightened me because I realised the terrific task that was ahead of democracy if they tried to do it. The same silly, meaningless, and tactless statements come from some people to-day about post-war problems. They have not the faintest idea of what the post-war problems will be. There is an old saying that when in the forest you cannot see the forest for the trees. That is the position in connection with the talk we hear about post-war problems.

What are going to be the post-war problems? Hon. members speaking to this motion seem to regard the post-war problems as

being the same as those we experienced after the last war. Many men are called heroes until the war ends, when they are thrown on the labour market and invited to hang round labour exchanges and employers' places of business in the hope of getting a job, singing "Hallelujah, I'm a Bum," until someone gives them the opportunity of working in the country they fought to preserve. Is that the view hon. members take of post-war problems?

**Mr. Brand:** Definitely, no.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** I think that if the people talking about post-war problems think that our returned men will go through what the diggers did in the post-war period of the last war they have another think coming. Day after day and week after week, during the years following the last war, you would pick up the newspapers and read of happenings as a result of the treatment of these returned Diggers. A man I knew on the other side, an excellent soldier, whose body was found in the tunnel between Central Station and Brunswick Street Station, had as his sole possessions to solve his post-war problems a little bit of soap wrapped in a towel, a tooth brush, and an army-issued razor. Do hon. members think that the men who are involved in this war are going to be satisfied with the same method of solving their problems?

**Mr. Brand:** Definitely, no.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** I do not think they are, and it is nearly time those people who talk about post-war problems thought about what they are going to be. Then they will have reason to be as frightened as I am when I hear all this cackling about those problems.

There are three possibilities ahead of us, the same as there are in every fight no matter whether it is between two men, or two dogs, or two nations. There is the possibility of a win, the possibility of a loss, and the possibility of a draw. If we lose, Mr. Brassington, there are no post-war problems so far as we are concerned. If we have a draw the post-war problems just become a matter of speeding up armament works and training for the next round. That is all a draw means—merely a breathing space, an intermission until all parties get their wind and assemble their equipment to start over again the process of another long, fierce, and destructive war. If we talk about post-war problems, then, we mean the problems that will face us when the war is won. But we have no certainty that we shall win this war until a lot more common sense and energy is displayed in facing up to the war problem itself. It may be a waste of time talking about post-war problems. The other day a person made a remark to me that of the three years' duration of the present war, two and a-half years have been spent wrangling about the peace. There is a good deal of truth in that.

Let us visualise what is going to happen when the war is won. According to the June

issue of the "Economic News" we have in Queensland alone 130,000 men in the armed forces or employed in war production. Since that issue was published there has been a continual and even more rapid call-up for the fighting services, for the Allied Works Council, and for all other activities associated with the war. If hon. members look at the "Economic News" carefully they will see that according to the figures published in it the number of those engaged in the fighting services and war industries is rising, and that the section of population engaged in civil production is falling rapidly. Therefore, it can be safely said that to-day 160,000 of the 440,000 employable persons in Queensland are directly engaged in war activities. Queensland represents 1-7th of the total population of Australia. You will see that if the proportion of people engaged in the fighting services and in activities directly associated with war production is the same in other States as it is in Queensland we have 1,100,000 men whose jobs end the day the war ends. That is not taking into consideration the big section of the population who are indirectly employed in the war effort.

This war is going to go on for many years yet, and we are going to have this problem through years and years of war ahead of us, and month by month and year by year the problem will be getting bigger. As time passes and more people go into the war effort casualties have to be replaced—casualties from the army and other services have to be replaced—and industry as well as the army will have to be maintained. More and more kinds of munitions and newer and faster planes have to be built, more types of stronger and faster ships have to be built, and bigger and more powerful guns have to be built before we win this war. As this growth goes up, the number of people engaged in the war effort increases and the number engaged in civilian effort decreases. The other day the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, who senses the Australian food problem as clearly as any man in the Commonwealth, pointed out that it would be necessary to train the people in this country to change their method of eating and living, because as the war went on they would have to do without many foods they are used to to-day. That is true; more and more will go into the war effort.

Hon. members opposite think they will solve the problem by saying to the people who come round the door looking for the one job. "We will give the fellow on active service preference over the fellow on munition works." They visualise up to 1,500,000 men scrambling round employers' doorways looking for perhaps 100,000 jobs. They want it done that way, but the men will not stand for it. If it was going to be done that way they would not lay down their arms when the war was over, but they would fight it out—fight it out here. I tell hon. members in this Chamber that this cheap skite about giving preference to a returned soldier over somebody else is not the problem. The problem is an economic one, and we have to face up

to it and see that not one of these men have to wait for a job—to see that no man comes off the army payroll until he is on the production payroll.

**An Opposition Member:** There were a few waiting for a job when they came back before.

**THE SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** I know that, but it is wrong.

**An Opposition Member:** It is being done to-day.

**THE SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** That is where the tragedy is. I had a man to see me the other morning who had an arm badly smashed and was shot through the stomach. He has made an application for a pension and it is being considered—and he can consider his breakfast in the meantime while it is being considered. Fortunately, we were able to give that man a job. At the moment it is easy to give him a job, but the time will come when the 1,100,000 men coming marching home. Are we going to discharge them and let them go looking for jobs? That is the end of this country if we do. It would be better to lose the war. If we cannot handle this country better than that, let somebody else handle it. If we cannot do a better job for the men who are fighting and struggling for the freedom of this country, for our right to live a decent life and the right to rear our children under decent conditions—if we can see nothing better for them than hanging round the Labour Exchange looking for a job—well, we don't deserve to win the war.

It is a big problem and it has to be looked at properly. We have to consider how these people are going to be re-employed. As my colleague the Secretary for Labour and Industry said, when introducing the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill, a survey of this country has to be made to lay out in advance the work that is most urgent from the point of view of development, and men must go direct from the army and the munition jobs to work directly concerned with the development of this country. That is why that Act was passed. This party is trying to keep its feet on solid ground in regard to post-war problems. We are not solving them by making speeches, attending patriotic dinners, or singing anthems. We regard it as the greatest job that ever faced a Government of any kind. If you read history, you will see in all European countries that after any war there were two problems, one on the doorstep of the winner and one on the doorstep of the loser, and there was not a great deal of difference. The loser had his country racked and torn to pieces, and the winner had his armies thrown out in want and hunger and had industrial troubles and civil disruption. That is not going to last in a democratic country. I advise hon. members opposite to keep their attention fixed on the real and vast problem—a problem that is worthy of the greatest minds in this Commonwealth—the problem of dealing

with the bulk of our population when it is displaced from war activities, and seeing that no returned soldier is hanging round somebody else's door looking for somebody to patronise him and give him a job.

**Mr. PIE (Hamilton) (2.15 p.m.):** We all realise that the measure the Premier brought forward to-day was necessary to implement the measures brought down by the Commonwealth Government on uniform income tax. We all also know that there have been many differences of opinion on uniform taxation, but I hold the view, whether it is right or wrong, that as it is now the law we have to abide by it. Uniform taxation is absolutely necessary in this period of stress of war, if only for the reason that I shall give. Those who have travelled in the Southern States in the past six or nine months have been forced to the realisation that the people who have been making money in the South have not been putting it into the war effort. They have been recklessly spending money. No matter what hotel one visited nor in fact where one went, one saw money in this period of war wasted and not going into the war effort. That had to be stopped. On the other hand the people of Queensland who were making money were finding, under our system of taxation, that it was very difficult to meet their commitments. In Victoria people were making no more money than we in Queensland, but there they were throwing their money around like water. For that reason alone I contend uniform taxation is right. Certainly, I agree that the powers of the State have been taken away. That too is wrong in peace. The war has proved that Queensland has done a wonderful job in the interests of the Commonwealth—nobody can deny that—and therefore as a State we must protect our rights. At the same time, in war the State should become the agency of the Commonwealth, and I think that is what we are to-day.

I was very much surprised at the Deputy Premier's bringing up the question of the treatment of men after the war, but he made out an excellent case as to why we should make provision for these men after the war. I have a recollection of the way in which returned men were treated after the last Great War, and in moving his amendment the Leader of the Opposition put forward his reasons why we should treat them better than on the last occasion—he did not, for instance, want to see them throwing themselves under the train in a tunnel as the solution to their post-war problem. Nobody wants that, and consequently the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman is necessary.

**The Premier:** It is already the law.

**Mr. PIE:** I do not know that it is, but we shall come to that later. During the luncheon adjournment I studied the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act. The Deputy Leader of the Government pointed out that what the amendment provides for is already

in that Act. I agree, up to a point, but there is this difference, that the Act makes recommendations, whereas the amendment makes provision. There is a tremendous difference between the two.

**The Premier:** Just so many words. It makes no provision.

**Mr. PIE:** There can be no room for argument as to the difference. The Act reads—

“to make recommendations to the Governor in Council as to the measure of preference in employment.”

The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is entirely different—“to make provision.”

**The Premier:** What provision?

**Mr. PIE:** That is something we have to work out.

**The Premier:** Is not that exactly the same thing?

**Mr. PIE:** No. The dictionary states—

**The Premier:** How can you have provisions without recommendations?

**Mr. PIE:** I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there was no need to make further provision in this Bill for the planned economic development of the State because it is in the Act to which I have referred. I have read in the Act that every possible provision is made for a planned economic development, and if that Act is put into operation there will be no need for this Bill.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** You must provide the money.

**Mr. PIE:** Of course you must provide the money. In any case, money must be provided for the implementation of the Act. This is a Bill, amongst other things, to make further provision for the planned economic development of this State, which is already provided for.

**The Premier:** Have you noticed the word “further”?

**Mr. PIE:** Yes. If the Act was put into operation no further provision would be required. The Act referred to is an ideal measure.

**The Premier:** I am glad you think it so perfect.

**Mr. PIE:** It is perfect if it is properly implemented.

**The Premier:** That is the end of it.

**Mr. PIE:** Irrespective of what anybody may say, we must consider that our service men have given up their jobs to fight. Nobody will deny that. It has been stated that we should also consider men in munition factories and others, but those in munition factories are earning up to £10 or £15 a week, whereas the lad who is doing the fighting for us is getting his six bob a day.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** Some of them joined up.

**Mr. PIE:** Those who want to join up but can't are still making that money, and can save money and put it into war bonds if they wish to.

**Mr. Collins:** Are you visualising a peace in which some will get jobs and others will get starvation.

**Mr. PIE:** No, I visualise a peace in which everyone has work, and the only way of providing for that is by giving purchasing power to the people.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** To every one of them.

**Mr. PIE:** To every one of them, and giving to every person the right to work. I will not pay the man who is not willing to work, nor will the Minister.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** And placing on him an obligation to work.

**Mr. PIE:** And placing on him an obligation to work.

I was very interested to hear the Premier mention arrears of taxation. We all realise that there are arrears of taxation, and I was pleased to hear that as far as this State is concerned that money is going to the Commonwealth to be held in trust, I take it, until after the war. That is a very laudable arrangement, and we can highly commend the Premier of the State for taking up that attitude. But I ask, under present-day conditions, how is this State going to spend that tremendous amount of £5,800,000? It has been suggested by the Premier that £1,500,000 is to be spent on development. What development? I know there are Allied Works jobs going on, and aerodromes and roads are being made, but this State is not paying for them.

**The Premier:** It is paying a fair amount.

**Mr. PIE:** That is the point I want to make. Can the Premier tell us what we are paying?

**The Premier:** I will tell you that later.

**Mr. PIE:** I shall be glad to hear it. I wanted to make those things clear because the money the Commonwealth is spending here to-day will mean a wonderful asset to the State after the war. No matter what anyone says, the roads and aerodromes that are being built to-day because of the war will be a wonderful asset in the development of the country after the war. I know, too, that a dock may be built. I do not know whether it will be in Queensland, but if it is, this State may contribute a good deal towards its construction, and that is a very laudable object. It would be in the interests of the war effort, and no-one would question it. If this State intends to do things that will help the war effort, things that will also be good for the peace, with this £1,500,000 that the Premier says is to be used for

development, then I say the Government are on the right lines.

**The Premier:** Then we are on the right lines.

**Mr. PIE:** That is what I wanted to know. I have not much to say on post-war problems, because I believe no-one to-day can visualise our post-war position—post-war problems of the last war cannot be a guide to post-war problems of this war—but I do say that out of this conflict will come an entirely different social order.

**Mr. Collins:** Some of the pitfalls of the last war should be avoided.

**Mr. PIE:** I agree, but at the same time we have to consider the men who are fighting this war. If you go into any unit of the army to-day you will find a certain amount of unrest among the men as to what is going to happen to them after the war. It is all very well to compare them with munition workers—

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** They are entitled to see some evidence of the new order.

**Mr. PIE:** We are all entitled to see some evidence of it, but none of us knows what next year will bring, nor do we know what the new order will be. Certainly, there will be a common ground for all people. There is no doubt that the old system cannot go on. Out of that will come the new order, and we must try to visualise the possibilities there may be for spending money after the war, but I urge the Government not to put money into something that might happen. Certainly they would be wise to prepare for the future if they can, but I suggest that they put the £1,500,000 into a trust fund to be used after the war, because we shall certainly need it then for the development of the State and the putting into employment of these returned men.

I do not want to say anything more, or to delay the Committee further, but I do feel that the Deputy Premier made out a wonderful case as to why the amendment should be included in the motion.

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS** (Hon. H. A. Bruce, The Tableland) (2.26 p.m.): Hon. members have enlarged on the question of the single tax, whereas the actual question under discussion is the implementing of the decision of the High Court. A decision has been given by the High Court on the question of the single tax, and we, as a State, are prepared to implement it. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition reads—

“to make provision for an adequate measure of preference in employment to returned members of the Commonwealth naval, military, and air forces and for their training in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings,”

That is what was tried in principle after the last war with very little success. The principle obtains in my department and I think

it obtained in other departments, too, with the condition that preference was to be granted “all other things being equal.” Quite a large number of returned men were placed in employment by the Government after the last world war and since.

It appears to me that the amendment before the Committee has not been carefully considered because it does not cover everything that is involved. It says that preference shall be given to soldiers, sailors, and airmen, but time passes quickly and so what of the future? Many soldiers, sailors, and airmen have sons who will be looking for employment in the future. There are other classes of people who are risking their lives in the war effort—in ferrying people from enemy-invaded country to places of safety such as Australia for instance, although they are not using the fighting aeroplanes. Does anyone imagine that when an air raid takes place the worker engaged in the manufacture of the raw material is going to run away and leave the material? This war is entirely different from the wars of the past. I suppose it can be truthfully said that more civilians have been killed in Great Britain through enemy action than there have been casualties in the armed forces.

Nor does the amendment nearly meet all that may be involved. It says that provision shall be made. What does that mean? I take it that monetary provision is to be made for the purpose of enabling men to be trained for the land and skilled occupations. But money is required first of all for war purposes. The war will not end in 24 hours and every £1 we can raise in Australia is wanted for war needs. So it is out of the question to suggest that money should be made available for the purposes outlined in the amendment.

In addition, hon. members opposite have told us that it is difficult to make a living on the land. Day in and day out they have told us, and particularly the members of the Country Party have told us, that only long-established farmers with reasonably good land can make a living and that many others are leaving their properties. That is true to some extent, and why is it taking place? We can remedy the difficulty only by having an adequate and sound scheme to cope with it and not simply by approving of a pious amendment.

The soldier, sailor, and airman are at a disadvantage while they are fighting compared with others who are fully engaged in skilled trades and callings. There is the other important factor to be considered, that is, the introduction of womenfolk into skilled trades and callings. In the solution of these problems we need a very broad vision indeed, a bigger vision, a broader vision, and a deeper thought than have been used before. In the past Australia has been only in her swaddling clothes. In the future the outlook of Australia will have to be the outlook of a nation, caring not only for the returned soldiers, sailors, and airmen of this country, but providing also for hundreds of thousands of allied soldiers, sailors, and airmen from

other parts of the world. We cannot solve these problems unless we adopt a very broad and statesmanlike outlook. The system of tying up money and tying up industry in the interests of private enterprise will have to cease. We cannot hope to solve our difficulties by the old means whereby pioneers and others were satisfied with an occupation that gave them a competence for themselves and their families. The trouble with the world is lack of security. If the people of Queensland or of Australia and of the world were given social security there would not be to-day those things that are tending to destroy our civilisation.

I may be criticised for what I am about to say, but the present war was brought about in part by the fact that 80,000,000 Japanese were compelled to fend for themselves on a small island not very much bigger or not very much smaller than Great Britain.

Those 80,000,000 people want to live and try to get security. That is the whole difficulty to-day. Given security by having adequate and ample supplies of food, clothing, shelter, medical attention, the right to educate our children, and an insurance policy for the time when we cease to be able to work, much of our world's difficulties to-day will disappear. Those who are unable to work must have exactly the same rights as those who are fit to do so. Of course, we shall have to go through travail to attain this new order and doubtless shall have to fight vested interests to bring it about, but it is sufficiently all-embracing to include our sailors, airmen, and soldiers, together with those fighting in the industrial arena, who labour year in and year out with little notice taken of them.

**Mr. Pie:** It is a world problem.

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

Of course it is a world problem, and I am trying to point out that the amendment constitutes so much waste paper because it seeks to attain a position we have already established. The principle of the amendment has operated since the end of the last war. For instance, take the Department of Public Works, which I administer. One section alone, that of watchmen and others, are returned soldiers of the last war as well as some returned men of the present war. The liftmen employed by my department are limbless soldiers of the last war. Every department follows the same principle of administration. Does that meet the situation? It does not. It only employs a trivial number of men who returned from the last war.

The hon. member for Isis spoke at length about food supply, which, of course, is a vital necessity. Amongst other things, it affects the morale of the civil population. If the morale of our civilian is affected to any degree there will be an injurious reaction on our fighting forces. I have said on previous occasions that an army marches on its stomach, but to-day armies are affected considerably by any loss of morale in the civilian population they represent. Then if armies

do not get food in sufficient quantity they, too, will lose their morale. I cannot visualise any rational person suggesting that we can throw further sections of our manpower into the fighting forces until we have made provision for a sufficient supply of food, munitions, and protection both in the air and on the ground.

**Mr. Pie:** The Prime Minister said that he would prefer to go without food than have the fighting forces defeated.

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

If the Prime Minister is correctly reported then the statement is utterly ridiculous. It is probably true that we shall not get the classes of food we have enjoyed in the past—we have been living in a paradise compared with other peoples in the world—but there is an ample supply of food in Australia for all of us, even though it may be plain, as it was in the pioneering days, but from a health point of view probably better than we are getting to-day.

The Premier referred to the splendid work that is being undertaken by the Main Roads Commission, or it might be fairer to say the Allied Works Council. The Allied Works Council to-day in the main is the Main Roads Commission, but it has been buttressed by the Commonwealth Government with additional men and money. It is new in name only. The only difference is that its administrators are employing thousands more men and expending a vast amount of public money.

**Mr. Nimmo:** Is the Main Roads Commission being white-anted by the Allied Works Council?

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

The Allied Works Council is really the Main Roads Commission on a large scale. I can assure the interjector that the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. Kemp, who is also Commonwealth Deputy Co-ordinator-General for Works in Queensland, will not allow the Commission to be white-anted; all he is concerned about is to obtain a 100-per-cent. efficiency.

**Mr. Nimmo:** I hope it will not be white-anted.

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

Naturally, in the change-over from peacetime to war-time conditions mistakes have been made, and there has been wastage in both man-power and money. Sometimes our Allies ask us to embark on a big job, then change their minds and suggest that some other job be undertaken. That may be a good thing because one characteristic of the British race is its lack of aptitude in adapting itself to new conditions.

While there is a good deal of waste in that direction, nevertheless the Commissioner of Main Roads has his finger on all these things. Recently I took a trip to the North, and as Secretary for Public Works controlling the Main Roads Commission—which, as I said, is really the Allied Works Council—I had the opportunity of seeing things that I cannot mention. The point is this: there can

be no question of wasting money or time or telling the people about post-war activities until we win this war. If everybody had the faintest idea of the position we are in to-day they would realise that we cannot waste one minute talking about it or one shilling that we should be spending on it.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

The Premier said that in this war we are not meeting men coming back from overseas; but if we are successful—if we have the success we wish for—we shall have returning men, because when we follow the Japanese back to Tokio we shall have to repatriate those men afterwards. On the other hand, if a part of Australia should be invaded—and that would be Queensland—we should not be repatriating men, we should be rebuilding the destruction caused by the war in this State. So it will be seen that nobody can tell what is the right way to make provision or spend money for post-war activities.

To-day you have prominent politicians in Great Britain talking about post-war problems and what they will do to solve them. These people do greater damage to the morale of the people than is done by more direct methods, because when they talk to the people of post-war activities they instill into the minds of the people the idea that we shall win the war easily, and the tendency is for the people to say, "If it is going to be won, why should we worry?"

I am not going to say that I do not believe in a new order—if we are to use that term. On the contrary, I am wholeheartedly for it. But this war is different from any other war, and no intelligent steps can be taken until we know the situation we have to face.

**Mr. Macdonald:** All preconceived policies go by the board.

**The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:**

I believe hon. members in this Assembly are of average if not of superior intelligence to any cross-section of men in Queensland, but none of us has any conception of the new social order that will exist after this war is finished. We are 20 years better educated than we were after the last war. We have some of the most brilliant scholars in Australia trained in the air force, and we have some of the finest men from the land and from various other occupations in Australia taking part in this war. They have seen other countries, they have suffered tremendous hardships, and they have seen their comrades killed. Do hon. members think we can say to this young generation, "You are going to go back into such-and-such conditions"? The young generation will think for itself. After the last war the Australians were all overseas and they sent the troops back to Australia and Billy Hughes gave them a bonus of £90 and then threw them out on the world. On this occasion they will come back and they will be right here with all the arms they carried through the war, and if anybody tries to give them a worse world than they knew before they will take steps to see that if the country was worth fighting

for it is worth remoulding on their lines and not ours.

I repeat that I think that the extreme emphasis being put on post-war spending is doing a great deal of damage, because the people may get the impression that the war is going to be won easily. When we visualise the fact that the Japanese people are not only fighting the war with America and Australia but they are inter-marrying with the people in the islands, and if the war lasts very long we shall find amongst the Filipinos and other races between here and Japan a Japanese population apart from the armies she sent there. There are those who regard Tokio as the base of their lines of communication, but that base is Singapore and not Tokio. The Japanese are much nearer to our lines of communication than we are to theirs. A consideration of these matters alone will give some idea of the difficulties confronting us in winning this war. To-day we are—certainly our Allies have backed us up very considerably—we are with a few mistakes making a 100-per-cent. war effort, but we are only 7,000,000 people, and the number that America is able to send us is limited. Every hon member should, and I think does, know—if he gives consideration to this question—of the enormous job ahead of us in Australia, altogether apart from European affairs, and of the need for making every effort, spending every penny, giving everything we have to back those boys who are fighting for us in the various forces to win this war, and those of us who remain at home must do our best to bring about conditions that will repay those men for saving this country for us and future generations. But that world will be an entirely new world, and we, to-day, have no possibility whatever of laying down any basis on which we can handle post-war problems or the way in which they should be handled.

**Mr. MOORHOUSE** (Windsor) (2.47 p.m.): The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is not quite wide enough. It should include all those men of Australia who to-day have been sent into the service of the Allied Works Council. Men have been conscripted for that organisation, and when the war ends they will be looking round for jobs, in the same way as the soldiers who return from the fighting fronts. Included also should be the volunteers who have gone into industries producing war materials. The mover of the amendment, therefore, should consider widening the scope to include these people. Had the country a policy of production for use and not for profit, neither the amendment nor the Bill would be necessary.

We heard the Secretary for Public Works tell us something of the new order. Standing in my place to-day, I would tell hon. members that unless the country adopts a policy of production for use and not for profit, the boys will adopt it when they return, and everybody else will have to fall into line.

I feel that the Leader of the Opposition must know something, because if a new order

was going to emerge from this war there would be no need for him to move this amendment. Does he know something? To-day we find that members of the forces have been discharged and are looking for work. It is all very well to contend that post-war planning must await the end of the war, but even during its progress fighting men are being discharged. Therefore, some provision must be made for placing them in employment instead of having them sent from door to door or, as an hon. member said this morning, endeavouring to sell something or jumping under a train in a tunnel. Our duty is to provide something in the way of employment for these men to-day, not to wait until the war finishes.

**Mr. Devries:** Men were told that when they came back they could have their jobs back.

**Mr. MOORHOUSE:** That is perfectly true. I am afraid that when this war is over the people of Australia will be so war-weary that they will take anything thrust upon them, but the soldiers when they return will not be content with the old conditions, and will fight for what they believe to be their rights. As the Secretary for Public Works has said, they think that if a country is worth fighting for it is worth developing. An illustration of this has appeared in the Press; some soldiers in the Northern Territory are submitting a proposal that it be handed over to soldiers to be developed. If soldiers are thinking that way now, it is obvious that they are thinking constructively.

I feel that there will be no new order, and in support of that statement we have only to look at what happened when the Federal Government attempted to introduce a Bill to limit profits, something that was a new departure, something that would have brought a change in the system. We found that the million-dollar Press immediately took the matter up, and was supported in its opposition by Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden who were, and who still are, very far removed from the thoughts of the masses of the people. When we find that Big Business has such control in Australia that the Commonwealth Government are forced to drop a measure like the Bill to limit profits to 4 per cent., it is apparent that any new order is going to be difficult because of the opposition that Big Business will see is made to it in the right place.

**Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) (2.53 p.m.):** I notice that it has been the practice of the Opposition to endeavour to impute some ulterior motive to any action by the Government to deal with matters concerning the treatment of returned soldiers after this war. The same thing happened after the last war when returned soldiers were promised all sorts of things, when they were promised the world, so to speak. They were settled on the land, and except in a very few instances, were left to their own resources, and the Opposition, to whom the blame rightly belongs, now endeavour to blame the Labour Government.

The question what to do in the best interests of the returned soldiers after the war exercises the minds of this and other Labour Governments, just as it does the minds of any other section of the community. Only last session, when the question of post-war problems was being discussed, the Government readily accepted their responsibility to do what they could to see that the returned soldiers got a fair deal.

Hon. members opposite who contend that this and that should be done for the returned soldiers will be among the first to resent action along the lines that I suggest should be taken in the first instance—the making available of land that is not now being used for its proper purpose for the settlement of not only returned soldiers but others who are suitable and willing to go on the land.

**Mr. Macdonald:** What right have you to say that? On what grounds do you make that statement?

**Mr. THEODORE:** The Opposition have always opposed anything of that kind. One of the greatest ramps after the last war was the action taken by landowners, some of whom made fortunes out of their willingness to see returned soldiers settled on the land so long as a high enough price was paid for that land, and these landowners were well paid for it; but they will not get away with that type of business after this war.

Provision must be made and action should be taken as early as possible to see that all land available for the purpose should be used for the settlement of returned soldiers and others who are able, suitable, and anxious to go on the land, and that land should be made available at the lowest possible price.

**Mr. Massey:** The first thing is to win the war.

**Mr. Barnes:** You are supporting the amendment, are you not?

**Mr. THEODORE:** I am not. There is no occasion for it, and there is no sincerity in the action of the Leader of the Opposition in moving it.

**Mr. NICKLIN:** I rise to a point of order. I object to the statement by the hon. member for Herbert that there is no sincerity in my action in moving the amendment, and I ask that he withdraw that remark.

**Mr. CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member for Herbert to withdraw that remark.

**Mr. THEODORE:** In deference to your ruling, I withdraw the remark.

By imputation the Opposition say that the Government do not pay proper regard to the care of returned soldiers, but as the Secretary for Public Works pointed out the problem must be viewed in a broad way so that proper attention may be given to all the people and not to a section alone. We wish to see the returned soldiers given the treatment to which they are entitled. We have our own sons fighting at the fronts and no-one is more anxiously concerned about their welfare than

the Government. The soldiers are willing to make sacrifices in defence of their country, and we in turn should repay them after the war is over.

I realise that the all-important matter to-day is to prepare for the defence of our country. We are not fully aware of the strength the enemy may be marshalling at Java or at any other point in the East Indies for the purpose of pouncing unexpectedly on this country at any moment. Therefore, it is our immediate duty to marshal all our resources and fighting strength to enable us to fight our way to victory.

Hon. members opposite have asked why Parliament has not been called together more frequently, and why we do not sit longer hours. I suggest that we should extend the sittings and sit at night if necessary so that we may have the services of some of the husky young hon. members on the other side of the Chamber to help us in our food production. We should consider sitting longer, of sitting on more days of the week and for longer hours so that we may conclude our business and go back to our electorates to cope with the important problems confronting us there.

The Government have been condemned for contesting Commonwealth legislation relating to the uniform tax, but they have no apologies to make; they were defending the Constitution of this country. That brings to my mind the way in which North Queensland has been neglected by past Federal Governments. North Queensland is the best part of the State, but it has been badly neglected financially by the Federal Government. They have failed to develop it as it should be developed. If it had been properly developed as was suggested by the State in the years that have gone, it would now be an even better bulwark of defence than it is. Not only would it have been more fully developed, but it would have had a bigger population. However, it is to the credit of the State Government that they developed the North to the utmost of their restricted financial resources.

**Mr. Nimmo:** What about the aliens up there?

**Mr. THEODORE:** No-one took exception to their presence until the war began. If they were thought to be not suitable or desirable citizens, why did not hon. members opposite object to their presence years ago? They tolerated them, they exploited them, and some of their friends in the Federal Parliament made good money out of them.

**Mr. Nimmo:** Who brought them here?

**Mr. THEODORE:** The hon. gentleman's own Federal Government. The Labour Government are not responsible for their being there. North Queensland, which is a vulnerable part of Australia, should be heavily populated with a strong, virile race that would be ready and willing to defend the country in time of danger. Any unfortunate circumstances that may have arisen in connection with North Queensland cannot be laid at the door of the State Government.

I agree with the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs and the Secretary for Public Works that our future developmental policy—in other words, our post-war programme—will depend on whether we retain control of this country. As most hon. members are aware, the Commonwealth Government are seriously concerning themselves with post-war planning. There is no need for us to come into this Chamber or anywhere else and have any acrimonious debates about this subject; nevertheless, preparation should be made along the lines that the Commonwealth Government have indicated. This State Government have at all times shown a general readiness to co-operate with a national Government. Therefore, all our argument will get us nowhere. We must be prepared, however, to do something to ginger up existing organisations so that they can be readily switched over from war-time to peace-time conditions, to provide for continuity of employment. Our thoughts can be trained along such a channel that we have men at the head of our various organisations who are competent to undertake that reorganisation. It is neither desirable nor reasonable for us to endeavour to formulate a plan that might be altogether incapable of accomplishing the big jobs that will have to be done. Like every hon. member, I realise, in regard to the employment of returned soldiers and the people generally, that we are in no doubt as to our responsibilities and our duty to all those people who are engaged in the great task that confronts this State.

**Mr. BARNES (Bundaberg) (3.5 p.m.):** All my financial speeches have had to do with post-war planning. I therefore continue those speeches from where I left off the other day.

What is the matter with the Empire's war effort? Why have disastrous events happened that we were told could not possibly happen? Why were we so terribly unprepared for the present world conflict, and why has the Empire lost battle after battle—Norway, Libya, Greece, Crete, Hong Kong, North Borneo, Malaya, Singapore, Rangoon, and Burma? Why is the enthusiasm lacking to make this something in the nature of a holy war for Democracy? There is one short answer to all these questions. It is this:—because of a traitorous financial system.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I should like to inquire from the hon. member what document he is quoting from.

**Mr. BARNES:** These are extracts.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I desire to lay down the principle here and now that under the Standing Orders it is not permissible for any hon. member to read his speech.

**Mr. BARNES:** I crave your indulgence, Mr. Brassington, to read this speech, because 80 per cent. of it is composed of quotations from world-famous authorities and politicians. This is the first time that I have attempted to read a speech in this Chamber.

**Government Members:** Oh!

**Mr. BARNES:** Other hon. members have often been given the privilege.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have ruled that the hon. member cannot do so.

**Mr. BARNES:** Apparently I am not a Pie.

**Mr. PIE:** Mr. Chairman, I take strong objection to that remark. (Laughter.) You won't say that somewhere else.

**Mr. BARNES:** I will say it somewhere else.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have already ruled that the hon. member for Bundaberg cannot continue to read his speech. The Standing Orders are definite on the point. I have given my ruling and the hon. member must obey it.

**Mr. PIE:** I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that he was not a Pie, implying that I was given privileges in this Chamber that he did not have. I strongly object to that remark.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member for Bundaberg is not in order in making that remark, and I accordingly ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. BARNES:** In deference to you, Sir, I withdraw it.

I came into this Parliament pledged to monetary reform. That is the platform of the supposed Labour Government sitting opposite, and it has been their platform since 1908, although it is forgotten. I campaigned the Bundaberg election on that platform and won it. I am going to campaign the Cairns by-election on that platform, and I will win the Cairns by-election despite the fact that hon. members opposite, as well as hon. members on this side of the Chamber, have said that is an impossibility. I will show not only this Government but the people of Australia that the people themselves realise that big changes are going to happen and happen quickly. Only last night I listened to one hon. member speak of the bank smash of 1893. I mentioned the fact that in 1923 there was a world's bank smash. In the United States of America 1,400 banks went broke, and not one bank in Australia closed its doors. That was because the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, the late Sir Denison Miller, made it physically impossible for that to occur. He averted the bank smash in 1923. We have no Sir Denison Miller now, and I venture to prophesy unless something is done with the Commonwealth Bank, and done quickly, we shall have a bank smash after this war and all the disasters that go with it.

I wrote to the Federal Labour Party demanding that they implement Labour's financial policy. I got an answer from the Prime Minister and from the Minister for the Army, saying they would not take over the government until they got a majority in both Houses. Within three months the party took over the government. I sent a copy of a letter that I had written to Curtin and Forde,

to every trades and labour council throughout Australia, and I sent it to 127 newspapers, and 22 published it. I spoke of it in my campaign throughout Queensland, and I arranged to send them thousands of letters to that effect. In three months sufficient pressure was brought on the party to make it take over the government. The Newcastle Labour executive wrote to John Curtin and asked him to implement the Australian Labour Party's financial policy, which was amended before the Federal crisis in a way that only makes it plain. He refused for similar reasons. If 20 judges read the policy they would read it the same way as everyone reads it—that is, "The nationalisation of credit in Australia." To-day the banks are utilising the national credit and charging us 3 per cent. to 6 per cent. interest on it.

After sending those letters out, I received the following reply from the Cairns Trades and Labour Council, dated 24 July, 1941:—

"I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter and have to state that consideration of matter contained therein has been held over owing to pressure of previous business of the council, until a later date.

"When the decision of council has been made, I will advise you as to what effect.

"Yours faithfully,

"J. S. H. Moore."

I have had no further reply. The Trades and Labour Council of Townsville sent the following reply—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to deal with the principles contained in the motion, as outlined by the Premier, or the amendment. So far the hon. member has in no way connected his remarks with the principles contained in the matter before the Committee.

**Mr. BARNES:**—

"Mr. F. Barnes, M.L.A.,

"Frank Barnes Hotel,

"Bundaberg.

"Dear Mr. Barnes,

"We acknowledge receipt of your letter of 1 July last, and circular letter to Mr. Forde.

"I have been directed to advise as follows: This council is in complete agreement with your demand for the removal of the Menzies Government and its replacement with a Labour Government. This could have been achieved long ago had the Labour Party stood on a fighting policy, in place of the servile, boot-licking sham opposition game which has become its main characteristic now for some years past. Council are also in agreement with much of the other programme mentioned in your circular, and which could be given effect to, with much benefit to the workers, farmers, and middle class if we could elect to power

a Government with sufficient courage and initiative to take it on.

"At the same time we suggest, that you as a member of Parliament should address and force these demands on those who control the social, economic, and political positions of the State."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member has not yet complied with my ruling. I call his attention to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. As the hon. member is no doubt aware, that amendment reads—

"To make provision for an adequate measure of preference in employment to returned members of the Commonwealth Naval, Military, and Air Forces and for their training in land occupations and in skilled trades and callings."

There can be no doubt as to what the original resolution meant and the amendment. I ask the hon. member to confine himself to them.

**Mr. BARNES:** Are we talking on the amendment, or the motion, or both? Can we talk on the amendment only?

**The CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member is at liberty to discuss the motion and the amendment, but I want him to keep to them.

**Mr. BARNES:** With deference to you. Mr. Brassington, the motion speaks of adequate provision for men who return, and if you can tell me that we can talk about that without talking about finance I will resign from Parliament. That is what I am trying to bring about. I am trying to point out that we cannot do these things on orthodox finance. It is a physical impossibility.

The national debt in 1910 was £258,000,000. Last year it had reached £1,400,000,000. It doubles itself approximately in 10 years, and if it continues to do this under this supposedly sound economic system, in 70 years we shall owe so much money that each family will have to pay £13,500 in interest a year. Notwithstanding this, I am not allowed to speak of unorthodox finance. If any hon. member can also convince me I am wrong in these figures I will resign. We are supposed to be planning for something, but that something is an impossibility under present conditions. When I endeavour to put forward something to show how we can bring the desired effect about I am ruled out of order, despite the fact that every hon. member who has spoken went round and round the globe and spoke on every possible subject.

With a view to post-war planning and also war planning I went to Canberra to get Mr. Chifley to introduce clothes rationing, because the demands of those in receipt of big wages or salaries was becoming so great that ultimately there would be no clothes or textiles to ration. I desired to see that the poorer people could obtain their share of clothes. The clothes-rationing system adopted by the Prime Minister is disappointing. On 13 May, 1942, I wrote the following

letter to Mr. J. B. Chifley, the Federal Treasurer:—

"Dear Mr. Chifley,

"Re our conversation the other day, with reference to the rationing of clothes to prevent the rich from buying, and not letting the poor get their share, I little expected your Government to make such a mess when they did do this, and I would advise you and yours to eliminate the mental disasters in not carrying out your platforms—monetary in particular.

"Then, when you make such a decision as this clothes-rationing one, let it be equivalent to an adult's decision, and not that of a child of five. There has not been a more unpopular decision ever made than the decision for the rationing of clothes.

"Yours sincerely,

"J. F. Barnes."

The reply is—

"May, 18th, 1942.

"Dear Mr. Barnes,

"I have received your letter and note your comments.

"Yours sincerely,

"J. B. Chifley,

"Treasurer."

On 14 May, 1942, I wrote to the Prime Minister—

"Dear Sir,

"It is with grave disgust that I think of the mess you have made of clothes rationing. To think that clothes rationing was so necessary, and you defeat your purpose by doing it in a way a five-year old child would not do it. The poor workers! I pity them in a few months' time when they will not be able to buy certain lines that should have been distributed equally.

"I would advise you before it is too late—and I know what I am talking about—to go back to your Labour Party's platform and thus get rid of that mental hazard you are suffering, caused from within your own party. That will leave your mind clear to make such decisions as clothes rationing in a way that will suit the workers—not hinder them.

"Remember, John, the rank and file fighting in Caucus can easily be hushed up. But now it is more serious. They are fighting on the floor of the House. Wake up before you make any more silly moves to suit the Tories to capitalise on, and compensate the workers by using the People's Bank to finance all Governments and Governmental bodies and so relieve the workers of paying more than half their wages in direct or indirect taxation. In other words, carry on from where that grand old man of Labour, Hon. King O'Malley, left off.

"To prove my words, I shall quote your own A.L.P. paper ('A.L.P. Debators'

Bulletin'), March, 1942, page 11, para. 11:—

'Joseph Silver Collings, Senate Leader, is still hale and hearty at 77. He recently had a rough ride in a "Liberator" to Townsville and then to Charters Towers. Joe reckons that air travel is the best. Gets you there pronto! Wish we could say the same with Labour's Platform per medium of the political "Air" route.'

and para. 15:—

'Senator Darcey looks downhearted lately. For years he has been trying to educate members of Parliament into the mysteries of social credit, but has failed to penetrate the outer bastions of concrete that surrounds the cerebellum of politicians. However, we suggest that the insistent and persistent Senator take heart. Social credit is coming fast. The old financial system is rapidly reaching the Barney's Bull stage.'

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! If the hon. member will persist in reading long letters that have no bearing on the question before the Committee, I shall have to ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr. BARNES:** This is the Prime Minister's answer—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BARNES:** "Canberra, 20 May"—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BARNES:** It is a very short one—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BARNES:** It appears, Mr. Brassington, to be quite obvious that I must keep strictly to the motion. The Government in power during the last war promised the soldiers land fit for heroes to live on, and you can take my word for it that those soldiers got land that it took a hero to live on. Likewise, those same soldiers are going to get land that it will take a hero to live on because while they are fighting the war, at the front, we here are piling up debts amounting to thousand of millions of pounds for them to pay off when they come back. They will have to pay at least two-thirds of their wages in direct and indirect taxation, just as we are paying half our wages now in direct and indirect taxation. And this Government want to plan for the betterment of those soldiers! I suppose it is all right if we can "kid" ourselves that we are doing something for them. The hon. member for Herbert has suggested that we should give them land. What is the use of giving them land when the greater part of the goods they produce will be eaten up by the costs of the war? That is true, because this war is being financed on orthodox lines.

How did Germany finance her war? How is she financing her post-war plan? By unorthodox finance. As I have already told hon. members on a previous occasion,

Germany spent £5,500,000,000 to the end of June, while we spent only £3,500,000,000. Is there any such thing as inflation in Germany? No. Is there any such thing as inflation in Japan? No. What did Japan do? Japan saw that there was only one way to get the world's markets because the people who followed the orthodox methods of finance had left the gate wide open for her, and she subsidised all her industries to such an extent that she sold Manchester goods to Manchester. For six years the British people just stood and watched Germany and Japan outsell the world. We also watched them build a huge war machine, and we did not have the finance to build a war machine. We watched men and material wait on finance when finance should have waited on the men and the material. You can take my word for it, Mr. Brassington, that unless we can instill a holy flame of democracy in the Australian people we shall not win the war. The Germans fight because they know they are going to get something better after the war. They know what they are getting. And the Japanese are the same.

**Mr. Collins:** They think they know.

**Mr. BARNES:** They have already had some evidence of it. Before the war they had a taste of the something better that we would get after the war, but we have had no such evidence. So long as we keep to the orthodox policy, especially when this Government's policy provides for the nationalisation of credit, we shall continue to get a hiding.

In the streets of Australia to-day I suppose there are no fewer than 100,000 people selling raffle tickets of some description or collecting money in some way and it is a disgrace to the intelligence of the people of Australia that it should be so. If those 100,000 were at home knitting, sewing, or doing some such productive work for the war effort we should win the war. That is only one reason why we are losing the war—because we allow the time of these 100,000 people to be wasted—wasted in hindering and holding up people who are, perhaps, doing something of material benefit to the war effort. I realise that those 100,000 people mean well. How are they to know that they are wasting their time unless we, their legislators, point out that it is wrong to adopt these methods?

I congratulate Senator Keane for getting up and making a statement from the floor of the Federal House, a statement that I just made—that it is high time we got down to taintacks and made a war effort that is worthy of a country.

Why is the British Empire getting a hiding in this war? In previous wars we were always the head of the sea, we always had the biggest army. When the last war finished England had all her fields properly cultivated, her factories properly organised, and primary producers were receiving a better price than they had ever enjoyed, but England had to go through a deflation period after that war because somebody in England told the people

that they had to go back to the orthodox financial system.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** You look like a man of suitable age. You could help to prevent them from getting a hiding.

**Mr. BARNES:** The hon. gentleman says that I am of a suitable age, that I am eligible to go into the lines, but no soldier is doing a bigger job than I am doing. We are supposed to provide for these men when they come back, and believe me, I am going to provide for them when they come back, and so sincere am I that I am going to spend this, my last £100, on the Cairns by-election to force this Government and the Australian Labour Party to introduce a financial system that is fit for human beings to live under.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** Fancy you talking about the British Empire getting a hiding.

**Mr. BARNES:** Unless someone has the courage of his convictions and enough courage to speak up on these matters the Japs are going to walk straight through us. Why is it that we are getting a hiding? In the past we never got a hiding. There must be something wrong. I was going to quote the opinions of some notable men, but I was not allowed.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** You said that the Japs were better than the Australians.

**Mr. BARNES:** The Japs are fighting for a principle, or what they believe to be a principle. That is more than I can say of the Government.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** You told us that the Japs were better than the Australians.

**Mr. BARNES:** I repeat that the Japs are fighting for a principle or what they believe to be a principle, and if a man fights for a principle, he is still a man even if the principle is a wrong one. There is not one hon. member of the Government who is fighting for Labour principles. That is one reason why the Japs have got as far as they have and why the Germans have got as far as they have, too.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. RIORDAN (Bowen) (3.29 p.m.):** I have listened with a great deal of interest to the varied views expressed on this subject by hon. members generally, and the thought that strikes me most is that all Governments must be preparing now for the period of reconstruction when the war is over. It is strange that the outstanding thing that has emanated from hon. members opposite is their strong view that probably we shall not win the war.

**Mr. Edwards:** Who said that?

**Mr. RIORDAN:** I am not going to say who said it. I am one of those who firmly believe that we shall win the war. I do not think that any hon. member, whether on this

side or the other side, should adopt the view that we may not. I want to say emphatically that too much stress cannot be placed upon the importance of planning now for reconstruction in the post-war period. I know that perhaps the staff in many Government departments may be taxed because a number have gone to the fighting forces, but I am of the opinion that all the officers of the various departments should be engaged in preparing plans for a better social system after the war. That should not be left until the war is over. After all, the war may end suddenly, and more suddenly than some of us realise. What would be the use of then holding men in idleness? We should have troubles on our hands. Let us consider what happened during a period that I might describe as a stalemate when thousands of troops were in a state of idleness with nothing to do in the city of Brisbane. There was trouble brewing because these men were eager to get on and do something. They were fighting-fit and trained to the minute, and naturally, if they are not given something to do trouble is likely to happen. I believe that a very good purpose could be served by the State and Federal Governments' planning for the post-war period. I know that each and every one of us could probably offer suggestions along those lines, but I am content to leave the matter to those better able to judge as to what should be done.

**Mr. Barnes:** Why did the people put you in here?

**Mr. RIORDAN:** It has always been a mystery to me why the people of Bundaberg returned the hon. member to Parliament. He is the greatest misfit that ever came into a Parliament and that opinion is borne out by his ravings and rantings to-day. He said by implication that the Japanese were fighting for a principle and that the Australians were not. Any man who makes a statement like that should get out of Parliament.

**Mr. Barnes:** I did not say that.

**Mr. RIORDAN:** The implication was there and the hon. member repeated it time and again. He said that the Japanese were fighting for a principle, that the Germans were fighting for a principle, and that they hoped to get something out of the war. If an hon. member is prepared to make a statement like that is he a danger to others who are fighting for victory and striving to sustain our democracy? He comes into this Chamber and makes such a statement under the privilege of Parliament. That is the inference I drew.

**Mr. Barnes:** You could not draw anything.

**Mr. RIORDAN:** If I drew the hon. member I could give him a written guarantee that there would be no "blue." I do not want to be drawn off my subject by the hon. member for Bundaberg. Too much time is wasted on him already. A plan should be prepared now to cope with the problem of reconstruction and re-employment in industry when the war is over. The statement

was made to-day that there are about 1,500,000 persons directly associated with the conduct of the war, either in the fighting forces or in essential services connected with the war effort. I agree with the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs as to what is going to be the position after this war, if these men are left in a state of idleness.

Another point that appeals to me, and must appeal to all true Queenslanders, is that Queensland is essentially a primary-producing State. We are in the unenviable position that primary production is suffering from the military call-ups. The acreage of land growing such vital commodities as wheat and sugar has become less. Recently, a new primary industry, cotton-growing, was established in my electorate. It has been hampered through lack of co-ordination between the military and civil authorities. The Lower Burdekin area expected to harvest in the vicinity of 15,000 bales of cotton this season, but not half that amount will be obtained, because when tractors were required for cultivation they were impressed by the military authorities. I believe that proportionately there are more men in the fighting forces in Queensland than in any other State. That again is hampering our industrial efforts.

When someone comes here and talks about the post-war period and helping to establish a new world order, as well as a new system of finance—some crazy, bungling idea of making money out of nothing—it makes me feel that we are not only not facing up to the position but wasting valuable time. If we cannot get some better contribution to the discussion of post-war matters than this, then it is "God help Australia!"

If something definite is done by all State Parliaments to act in unison with the Commonwealth Government in post-war planning and development, we can accomplish something that will absorb the men in our fighting services in useful occupations. It is no small job. To-day we are still building up a mighty military machine in Australia. We have to reverse the process after the war. It must not be forgotten that in planning for victory we are scrapping many old traditions and customs. Many of our old methods of life are changing, and at the end of the war I am afraid we shall have to do without many things we have been used to. New industries will have to be created. We must build a bridge from one period to another, and that will tax the resources of our organisation. I hope that we shall not lose sight of the need for post-war planning, and I hope that the Government will see to it that arrangements are made for the transfer of their present organisation from a war-time to a peace-time footing as quickly as possible in order that a planned system of economy will be put into operation.

**Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (3.37 p.m.):** I am supporting the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I am surprised at the attitude adopted by some hon. members opposite, particularly the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, towards this amendment.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** I am always opposed to humbug and exploitation. I always have been.

**Mr. DECKER:** I suspect the existence of some underlying principle that prohibits some hon. members opposite from expressing their views on the amendment. I believe it to be the dictation of the unions. That dictation prevents them from supporting this principle of preference to the returned members of the fighting forces. The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs airily dismissed the amendment by saying that a similar provision already existed in the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act, and that there was no need to re-enact it. If it is reasonable for the Government to accept the principle in one case, there is no reason why that principle should not be accepted in this case. I believe, too, that the principle enacted in that Act is inoperative because it cannot be given effect to until the State Employment Council is formed. It may never be formed, and therefore it may never make a recommendation that such a preference be given. If it is formed it must make its recommendation to the Governor in Council, and such a recommendation might be turned down then. There is no certainty about it at all. If we all have genuine sympathy for members of the fighting forces we should lose no opportunity of placing this form of preference in all our legislation.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** If you think that is the best way Parliament can cater for the members of the returned fighting forces who may be out of work when this war is over, then you should not be in this Parliament.

**Mr. DECKER:** I know the hon. gentleman has a great place in his heart for returned men. We cannot escape our obligations to the men who gave up everything they held in the country's service. These men are offering their lives for you and me and everyone else who remains behind, whether he is working in a war industry or not. They are prepared to make the supreme sacrifice; no greater sacrifice can be made.

**Mr. Power interjected.**

**Mr. DECKER:** The hon. member for Baroona does not understand. If he had had the service that some hon. members have had he would know what preference means to returned men. It does not mean what the Minister said it means. Quite a number of these men will never come back at all, and many others will come back totally incapacitated and they will be provided with pensions. Some will come back partially incapacitated and they will need our assistance. Another section will come back and be able to provide for themselves. The men we have to care for are the men who are not in a position to fight for themselves. Those men will need help from the Government and the people for whom they have offered their life.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** Why should he scramble for a

job? Cannot we organise and plan better than that?

**Mr. DECKER:** The argument the Minister uses is in favour of implementing the amendment. We do not want that scramble for jobs. We do not want to see returned soldiers rejected and preference given to men who have not served. We have had that before.

**A Government Member:** Everyone is entitled to a job.

**Mr. DECKER:** We admit that, too. We say that preference should be given to these men because they have kept other men in security. What upset me more than anything else was to see the attitude adopted by the Secretary for Public Works, who rolled up the amendment as a scrap of paper and cast it on the floor, in one breath praising the services of the soldiers and in the next saying that he would not support the amendment. One cannot be on two sides. One cannot be a friend of the soldier unless one supports him. It is no use patting him on the back and then opposing an amendment that would help him get work. There is something wrong in that attitude; it is not sincere. The hon. member for Herbert spoke of the sincerity of our Leader. I point out to the hon. member that our Leader is a returned soldier, who has shown sincerity in this and the last war, and he has helped returned comrades, and he has a definite interest in this war. If the hon. member could say the same thing, he would be in a position to criticise, but if he has not those qualifications, then it is sheer cheek for him to make that statement.

**A Government Member:** It was only a slip of the tongue.

**Mr. DECKER:** I hope the amendment will receive further consideration and that it will be made clear to all that it is necessary and that it will be accepted.

I should like to say a few words on the motion, too. This Parliament is not doing all it should in the war effort. I am making a deliberate challenge to the Government—they are not doing all in their power to help the war position.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** What has been left undone?

**Mr. DECKER:** I will tell the hon. gentleman. First, the Government opposed uniform taxation. At the time it was said that the proposal would change the constitution of the States, but the statement to-day was that the real purpose, as the Premier said, was to see that the limit of a maximum of two years after the war was substantiated by the court, so that this motion could be implemented only for the year in which the war ended and one year afterwards. They did not trust the methods of the Commonwealth Government. They doubted the Federal Government's sincerity. At the time we were told they wanted the courts to decide on a certain issue, and now it is a different one. It is a case of mistrust between Govern-

ments, and the position has been clearly shown by the Premier to-day.

We have been told that this State is not badly done by. Under the scheme we get £5,821,000 a year, and we know, too, that the departments of State are carrying out work for the Commonwealth Government under various headings.

We know the public servants are not in the department to the same numbers as previously, and that the spending of the Government is therefore reduced, but for the Government, as in the case of the Austerity Loan, to grab all they can get out of the Commonwealth Government shows clearly that money matters more than war effort. That is my first proof.

The second proof that this Government do not fall into line behind a full war effort is this: the revenues from the State Railway Department will probably never be higher than the amount it will reach this financial year. We also know that whereas we have lost the moneys derived from income tax money is still derived from stamp duties and land taxation. Other sources have been augmented, nevertheless the Treasurer announced during his Southern visit his intention of taxing amusements. Fortunately, the Commonwealth Government squashed that. If the Queensland Government were aiming for a full-time war effort, how could they on the one hand ask the people to live austere and, on the other hand, grab everything it was possible for them to get and wherever it could be grabbed. The Government have the easy habit, to use a common expression, of "passing the buck." This afternoon we had the spectacle of the Secretary for Public Works stating that the Allied Works Council has taken over the responsibility of the Main Roads Commission, but when I ask a question about cash payments to a man I am told it is a Commonwealth matter and nothing to do with the State.

**The Secretary for Public Lands:** So it is. The officers have been seconded to the Commonwealth.

**Mr. DECKER:** There is too much bluff going on here. Whenever it suits the Government they take a certain course, but if it is against their interests, they then take another course. It is no wonder that to-day people are not trusting the Government.

**A Government Member:** They are not trusting your side.

**Mr. DECKER:** We know where we stand here; we have the inside running. I have always said, and it is reported in "Hansard," the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act was just propaganda and unworkable. This propaganda is being constantly repeated. We find the Secretary for Labour and Industry having 12,000 copies of the Act printed at the Government's expense and on it are printed only the favourable statements taken from "Hansard."

As I have stated before, and it, too, can be read in "Hansard," no planning for the future will be successful unless the States

co-operate with the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth co-operates with the Allied nations of the world. This is a matter of tremendous magnitude and nobody knows what he is talking about when he speaks of the new order. It is an obscure term. When we get to solid facts we shall find that the new order will be the terms that are acceptable to all the Allied nations of the world. Our particular interest will be protected. There will be none of this cross-bargaining—over-production, on the one hand, and starvation on the other. Foreign exchange will be regulated, as will all other problems that occur between country and country. This is something greater than a State matter. It is world-wide in its application, and the States will play only a minor role. It is time we faced realities and stopped talking of something we do not understand. We cannot expect Bills to be Utopian, because it would be impracticable to apply them. We must face realities, and it is in our own interests to show our appreciation of those who are willing to sacrifice their lives in the service of their country.

**The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. T. A. Foley, Normanby)** (3.51 p.m.): It has been interesting to hear the case presented by the Opposition, especially in view of the statements made by them from time to time that they were anxious to co-operate as far as possible with not only this but also the Commonwealth Government in bringing this conflict to a successful termination. Despite those statements we find that when a measure is presented by the Premier giving them an opportunity to co-operate they submit an amendment that would have the effect of embarrassing the Government on the returned-soldier question.

**Mr. Nicklin:** Surely preference to returned soldiers does not embarrass the Government?

**The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:** The amendment was moved not out of any sincere desire to do something for the returned soldier, but merely for the purpose of embarrassing the Government on the question of preference to returned soldiers. I desire to emphasise the fact that before the soldier for whom the Opposition are concerned ever went into khaki he got a fairer deal from this Government than his father got from the predecessors of the present Opposition, and if he is going to get a better and fairer deal when he returns from this conflict it will be a Labour Government who will give it to him, not an anti-Labour Government. In Great Britain, one of the countries where we heard so much about what was going to be done for the returned soldier after the last war, those men sold boot-laces in the streets. No planning or organisation was carried out in those days under the old anti-Labour regime, nor will there be any organisation or planning for the benefit of the returned soldiers if an anti-Labour Government are in power in this Commonwealth. The only Government who ever gave a fair deal to these men before

they donned the khaki were a Labour Government, and they can expect a better and fairer deal from this Government when they return after their job is done.

Last year, when the Government introduced the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill for the purpose of setting up an organisation to survey the potentialities of Queensland and to give every member of every section of the community the right to work, the very substance of the amendment that is being moved now was put forward by hon. members opposite, and the Government accepted the proposal without the slightest hesitation. After 1 October next a council representative of all interests in the community will be set up to make recommendations to the Governor in Council, and this Government will be in touch with the National Government.

Moreover, will any hon. member say that this important question will not be raised at some future conference of State Premiers at which the Prime Minister will be chairman? Certainly it will, and will be dealt with in an endeavour to get uniformity throughout Australia. We were not waiting for that day when we introduced what is known as the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill, and I remind hon. members that the object of that measure was not to give any preference or any favours to any one section of the community, but to give a fair deal and the right to work to every man and woman in the community who wanted it. That is Labour's objective. I admit that we have been a long while achieving it. I admit, too, that the journey towards this very desirable objective has been a very strenuous one and that many obstacles have to be overcome in eventually achieving Labour's goal.

Prior to the introduction of that Act, another organisation was set up under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act to cope with the problem of unemployment as it existed in the period from 1932 onwards. A Co-ordinator-General of Public Works was appointed for the purpose of preventing waste of energy and material and making the largest volume of employment available for the absorption of the unemployed. The Bureau of Industry was established, too. It was given authority to construct certain works, and it has accomplished a great deal. Then another organisation was set up to deal with rural problems, and so we have the nucleus of a splendid organisation that could be enlarged as finances permitted so that rural areas may be further developed. That organisation is the Bureau of Rural Development.

Some comment was made by hon. members opposite about my action in publishing a pamphlet outlining the main principles of the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act, but that is not the first time that such a pamphlet has been issued. A similar one was made available dealing with the Unemployed Workers' Insurance Act, which is another illustration that it was desirable that the purpose of a measure should be clearly set out in

a pamphlet for the information and guidance of members of the community who desired it. That is all I did in connection with the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Act. On the initiatory stage of that measure I purposely made my speech in such a way—boring though it may have been to some hon. members—as to give the fullest information concerning it to all who were interested in knowing its objects and purposes. Not all of the pamphlets have been distributed. The Act will come into operation on 1 October next, but in the meantime we shall have numerous inquiries from rural districts in Queensland and other parts of Australia, and the pamphlets will be sent in due course to those who desire them. The £54 that it cost to publish the pamphlet is not wasted by any means. Indeed, if we had had to supply copies of the Act itself to all those people who desire to know something about it, the cost would have been much greater.

Reference has also been made to the sum of £1,400,000 that the Treasurer mentioned would be set aside for important development projects that are necessary despite the fact that war is raging in the Pacific. In justification I should like to explain that we are being advised by the authorities responsible for the production of foodstuffs that there will be a very severe shortage of beef in the not-far-distant future, and that the country requires a greater production of meat, vegetables, butter, cheese, wheat, and other primary products. Naturally, if we have to produce greater quantities of primary products than are being produced to-day, it will be necessary to provide proper roads so that the farmer can devote the maximum amount of his time to the production of foodstuffs instead of having to trudge along improvised roads and wasting time, particularly in wet weather, in bringing his products to the nearest railhead or to market. It is necessary, therefore, that money should be made available to carry on the important job of building main roads and subsidiary roads, and do other developmental works that will help in the production of more primary products.

**Mr. Edwards:** Do you mean during the war period?

**The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:** Yes.

**Mr. Edwards:** I suggest that you put every penny you can into growing crops.

**The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:** Does the hon. member think we can throw every shilling we have into war loans? He must have a broader outlook than that. He must realise that we have men fighting and that we must have food for them. If our Allied services are coming in great numbers to help in the defence of Australia, and that fact tends to overtake our production, then we must produce more, but we cannot produce more unless we have a developmental programme providing the facilities that are a necessary adjunct to production. One can only refer the hon. member to the 1932-1942 period as to the amount of loan money and State develop-

ment tax money that has been expended with that purpose in view. He can refer to the Commonwealth Statistician or the A.B.C. of Queensland Statistics, when he will note that the improvement that took place in production in that period, particularly in cattle, sheep, wool, butter, and cheese, corresponded with the increased expenditure in our developmental programme. That developmental work must proceed, notwithstanding the war.

As I stated at an earlier stage of my remarks, this attempt to exploit the returned-soldier question on this Bill are mean political tactics. It is merely an attempt to add something foreign to a measure brought down by the Premier and side-track the whole issue in an endeavour to make a political score. I can assure the Opposition, on behalf of the Government, and many men in my electorate catered for by the Government in their industrial programme before they ever donned khaki, that Labour will provide for them when this war ends and they return to their homes.

**Mr. YEATES** (East Toowoomba) (4.7 p.m.): I wish to take this opportunity of first congratulating you, Mr. Brassington, on your election to the office of Chairman of Committees. I first met you at Augathella 20 years ago when I was addressing a meeting there. There was a formidable opponent in the hall, and I said to my chairman, "Who is the young chap down there?" He replied, "That is Sam Brassington, quite a good man." I am glad that we have met here again to-day and to see that you have done so well. I hope that your term of office during the 18 months' life of this Government will be a very pleasant one.

I had no intention of speaking on this Bill, but I have been drawn into the debate. I believe in the Bill sincerely, but I am supporting the amendment also. In doing so, I should just like to run round the Committee, as it were, to reply to certain arguments. The food problem, which comes under the heading of finance, is a vital one. I disagree with the Prime Minister when, as he is reported, he says that he would rather have men than tucker. We must have food production; otherwise what good is an army? I am prepared to say that if the food problem, at this end of Australia at any rate, was left to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, it would be in good hands, because that hon. gentleman has made a speciality of this subject and has studied the position well. It is a question that should be above partyism. I was exceedingly sorry to see the party spirit enter into this debate. Incidentally, the debate initiated last Thursday by the Leader of the Opposition was of a high order on both sides. I left the House feeling pleased with its high tone, but that high level has not been maintained to-day.

One way to overcome the food problem is to increase the prices to the producer or certain commodities. The price obtained by the dairymen, for instance, is not sufficient to encourage them, while the munition and other city workers are paid considerably more. I do not

include the A.I.F. I hope those in authority at Canberra will take steps to remedy that fault. There has been too much delay. I cannot understand it. I hope the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock will send some urgent telegrams South. There is something plainly wrong with Mr. Scully and the Department of Commerce. I also believe there is a great amount of extravagance in a considerable part of the war work, and it is just as well to remind the Federal Government about it. Many economies could be put into effect, but I shall not go into details now.

I listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the Secretary for Public Works. The hon. gentleman stated that the Main Roads Commission was doing virtually all the work of the Allied Works Council. I am wondering how this compulsory unionism has been brought into the system. It is unquestionably wrong, and the sooner that is eliminated the better.

As to post-war policy, it is, of course, very necessary to think ahead and plan ahead. I realised that in business. Our first business to-day is certainly, as the Secretary for Public Works stated, to win the war. We can look ahead and plan for the future, but do not let us overdo this post-war talk. I am with the Minister when he says that it creates the impression that things are all right and it leads to complacency, leaning back in arm chairs, and more cigars. That is wrong. It is essential that we impress upon the people the realities of the position. We are fighting three great nations, whose peoples know how to work and who have worked for their country from the cradle. They certainly have an eye on this country and the British Empire, particularly this country. I do not depart from the opinion I held from the day Japan entered the war that before it ends—we are going to win, but only by straining every nerve—the fighting will be in Australia, on Australian soil. That is my opinion, whether people like it or not. I am endeavouring to show how serious the position is. It is much worse than the newspaper headings of to-day, yesterday, and the week before suggest.

The hon. member for Herbert said that some of the hefty young fellows in the Opposition should be put to farm work. I am wondering where the hefty young fellows of the Opposition are. How about the hefty young fellows on the Government side? The hon. member for Bowen is a hefty, strapping man, and I would go out with him to bring in the harvest on the Darling Downs. The Secretary for Agriculture and Stock expects 5,800,000 bushels of wheat. The hon. member for Herbert is a decent chap and I like him. Probably he did not mean what he said.

I would remind the hon. member for Herbert that the Opposition are only a small group, but it is easy to count 12 of their sons who are right in the war and who have been for some time. I have no wish to mention these things, but as they are brought forward one must reply. I offered my services to Mr. Menzies, Mr. Fadden, and Mr. Curtin for any job at all, such as organising, in

fact, anything that they thought fit to give me in an honorary capacity. That offer stands good. If they want members of Parliament to gather crops or help with the cows at the week-ends, I shall, with the hon. member for Bowen, be ready to do what I can.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry made a very spirited speech. He was like a schoolmaster holding the cane over his pupils. All through he gave evidence of being a good party man. It was "Labour Party" from beginning to end, but when the hon. gentleman spoke of the settlement of soldiers he omitted to mention the howling mess the Labour Party made of the Beerburrum soldier settlement. I have no wish to bring up these matters, but hon. members opposite have done so. There are other matters that should be referred to, but I feel that the vote on this motion might be taken this afternoon so I will not take up more time.

**Mr. POWER** (Baroona) (4.17 p.m.): At the outset I wish to make it quite clear that I am not opposed to preference to returned soldiers. Those men who have left Australia's shores and are doing the best they possibly can under adverse conditions so that people in Australia might live in peace are entitled to the best Australia can give them.

The Opposition can make no claim to being the only people who are looking after the interests of the returned soldier. I would remind them that it was a Labour Government in control of the national Parliament in Australia who improved the conditions of the fighting forces. Previous Administrations, those of Menzies, Fadden, and company, had ample opportunity to do so, but did nothing for them. It was left for a Labour Government to give these men at least a little more than they were receiving for the task they were performing. I also remind hon. members opposite that whilst these men are fighting for 6s. a day to protect Australia they are protecting the money invested in war loans by a number of wealthy people who are receiving a very handsome sum in interest.

As to preference to returned soldiers, there are a number of young men in this country who have made application to join the Australian Imperial Forces, but who have obtained what is known as a B2 pass, and consequently cannot be accepted for the fighting forces. A number have enlisted for home defence and others have been called up to serve in the militia. These men are receiving only the same rates of pay as those who have left the shores of Australia. These men have volunteered to take their place in the front ranks, but because of physical disability or the state of health are not permitted to go. They are performing war duties here. Are they not entitled to the same consideration as that given to those who have gone overseas?

There are also a number of men in reserved occupations, in which they get perhaps the basic wage or £5 a week. A number have interviewed me. They have applied to their employers for the right to leave their employment to join the Australian Military Forces,

but in accordance with the man-power regulations are not allowed to do so. Is it right that at a later stage they should not receive any consideration? Let us be fair in these things. The unborn child and even the child of two years or three years at the time of the last war when eventually seeking employment could not obtain it if preference to returned soldiers was the unalterable rule. Is it right that they should be penalised? It is the duty of the Government, no matter which party may be in power, to do the right thing by the majority of the people.

Take the railwaymen. There are a number of railway employees who are eager to join the fighting forces, but they are not allowed to do so, and the same applies to the Queensland Police Force.

Under the present system of call-up for the militia, the man-power officer decides whether the young men shall go into the militia or whether they shall be sent to a job that it is thought they are qualified to carry out. Is it right that young men like that should be penalised because they are sent into another section of industry?

Then we have the man who is engaged on the land, the man who plays a very important part in the defence of the country. Mr. Curtin has said that he would prefer to go without tucker rather than without an army, but I disagree, because we must have an army on the land to produce food so that those men who are doing the actual fighting may be able to carry on. Is it right that the people engaged in the land army and in food production should be penalised because they are compelled to remain on the land?

**Mr. Pie:** They are not a post-war problem.

**Mr. POWER:** Men are going off the land from day to day. What is going to be their position if drought forces them off the land? Again, what about the men who are engaged in private munition factories? When the war is over and those factories close down, what is going to become of those men? This is not a question of sectional interests; it is one of the interests of the majority of the people, and we as a Government should plan so that when the war is over we shall be able to convert these wartime industries into peacetime industries and provide employment for those who have played a prominent part in the defence of this nation.

I warn the Committee that the young men who are in the army now, playing their part in the defence of the country, are not going to put up with the conditions that operated after the last war. Those men have become educated and they are going to see to it that they get at least that to which they are justly entitled, what every decent citizen wants—food, clothing, a home, and the right to educate his children. We as a Government and the returned soldiers themselves do not want preference for themselves. They want to see that the country is filled up and developed along sound, progressive lines so

that every member of the community may enjoy a decent standard of living.

I should say that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition has been put forward merely for the purpose of kite-flying, and of winning the votes of the soldiers. I do not want it to be thought that the remarks I am about to make apply to all hon. members of the Opposition, because a number of them were not in Parliament between the years 1929 to 1932. At that time those people who say they are out to do all they can for the returned soldiers were governing this State, and a system was in operation at that time such that returned soldiers, in fact all sections of the community who were not able to obtain employment, were compelled to live under conditions and on rations totally inadequate to meet their requirements, when money that should have been used for the development of the State and the providing of employment was made available to other States.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** Several of them that I know lost their homes in the depression during that period, and that party would not lift a finger to save them, although the homes were nearly paid off.

**Mr. POWER:** Let me go further. These lip-loyalists on the other side of the Chamber who claim to be anxious to do everything they can for the returned soldier compelled the returned soldiers who had fought at Gallipoli and other parts of the world to walk 28 miles before they could obtain rations. That is what operated when the Opposition were a Government, and they have the temerity to rise in this Chamber now and contend that they are the only party that is anxious to do something for the returned soldiers and others in the community. All I can say is that the returned soldiers and the people of Queensland know that they can safely leave it in the hands of the Labour Government of this State to see that the right thing is done in the interests not of one individual, but of the whole of the people of Queensland.

The Bill is an important one, having for its object the suspension of certain tax-gathering provisions so that the Government of Queensland, acting in accordance with the decision of the High Court and in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government, may receive the money to which they are entitled under the agreement that was entered into.

The Government did the right thing in deciding to test the constitutionality of the Commonwealth legislation, and their action is supported by the fact that two Judges of the High Court were of the opinion that the Commonwealth did not have the power to do what it was seeking to do and that opinion was held, too, by a prominent member of the Tory Party in the Commonwealth Parliament, Mr. Menzies. However, the court decided by a majority decision that the Government had the requisite power and the States must accept that decision. The Queensland Government

have done that and appropriate legislation is now to be introduced to clarify the position.

I hope that the war will be brought to an early and successful termination and that when it is over Labour will be in control in the national Parliament and the other Parliaments of Australia, so that when peace terms are being discussed we as a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations will have a voice in them. I feel confident that with a Labour Government at the helm in the national Parliament, supported by Labour Governments in the States throughout Australia, we shall be able to do something of benefit to the country and that in the post-war period we shall be able to give the people peace and contentment with constant employment and happiness all round.

**Mr. NIMMO (Oxley) (4.30 p.m.):** The hon. member for Baroona argued that there should not be preference to returned soldiers alone and that similar treatment should be extended to other sections of the community, such as those who had failed to pass the medical examination for entry into the army, men in exempted industries and others in a similar class, but surely to goodness we have enough understanding of human nature to know that these men would not envy the preference that we might give to the men who had fought the battles for us on the fighting fronts?

Labour has consistently opposed preference to returned soldiers. The Secretary for Labour and Industry said that the purpose of the amendment was to embarrass the Government. How is it going to embarrass the Government? Are they going to be embarrassed by the fact that some people will not be able to get jobs ahead of returned soldiers for whom preference is sought? I would remind hon. members opposite that a Nationalist Government was in control of the Federal Parliament for quite a long time, with the exception of a short period when the Scullin Government were in office. They had a big majority but they crashed.

**A Government Member:** They did not have a majority.

**Mr. NIMMO:** All Nationalist Governments have given preference to returned soldiers, and how wonderfully it has worked!

**The Attorney-General:** Preference to live on the dole.

**Mr. NIMMO:** That is the greatest rot that any hon. gentleman could put up and I am surprised at the smallness of the hon. gentleman's mind. The Nationalist Commonwealth Government did a great job of work in planning the preference to returned soldiers throughout Australia. They played the game by the returned soldiers in granting them preference. I know that if an hon. member suggested that someone from his electorate should be employed he was promptly told that there was a returned soldier available for it and that the policy of the Government was preference to returned soldiers. The returned soldier got the job.

perhaps in the Post and Telegraph Department or elsewhere.

The Labour Government have been in power for a very long time in Queensland, but they have never given preference to the returned soldiers. The Secretary for Public Works said in the course of his speech that certain jobs in his department were all held by returned soldiers, but when he was asked a specific question on the subject recently about how many returned soldiers were working in his department he said he had not made any inquiries and could not tell. That is to say, he made no inquiries as to what employees of his department were returned soldiers or what employees were not, but this afternoon he told us that he has given preference to returned soldiers. As a matter of fact, this Government have never given preference to returned soldiers. That was evidently due to their antagonism to the principle of preference to returned soldiers.

**The Attorney-General:** You know all liftmen in the Department of Public Works are returned soldiers.

**Mr. NIMMO:** What about the new watchman?

**The Attorney-General:** The watchman, too.

**Mr. NIMMO:** That is all very well, but we on this side know different. The fact remains that preference to returned soldiers can and should be given.

The amendment should be accepted because it is only reasonable and fair. I say emphatically that the majority of workers throughout the State would agree with it. They would say, "Well, my boy, you went to the front, and fought the battle, and on your return we will give you preference of employment again." Why is the question being opposed so strongly? The Government say that they are bringing in the millennium, through the Act passed by the Secretary for Labour and Industry. If that is so, then there is no need for preference for any section. The way the Government are fighting this amendment makes one think that they fear that bad times are coming again, that they are coming very strongly, and the natural inference is if preference is given to returned soldiers, it will keep other men out of employment.

I should like to point out the general treatment meted out to returned soldiers. We know that after the last war the Government initiated certain returned soldier settlements at Beerburum, Coominya, and Stanthorpe, and that they picked out the very worst land in Queensland for the returned soldiers. Those men struggled on with their task, but it was not till the Moore Government came into power that their rents were reduced and their areas extended. To-day we find that the Secretary for Public Lands recommended an increase of these rents by 45 per cent. but the Land Court would not allow it.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry made a great song about his co-ordination

policy for industry. If there was less talk about this co-ordination of industry and less interference by the Bureau of Industry and similar bodies operating in the State and more encouragement for the establishment of private enterprises, the State would progress very rapidly. The Labour Government fought very strenuously the introduction of uniform taxation, which would place all our industries on the same level with similar industries in Australia. There has been a considerable improvement in industry in Queensland since the uniform tax came into operation. That improvement will continue.

This amendment was moved with the definite object of having the principle of preference to returned soldiers established and placed on the statute-book. If the amendment is not carried the whole thing will go by the board and the returned soldier will not get the preference he is entitled to.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs rushed into this debate. He was very insulting, shall I say, to hon. members on this side of the Chamber. As a matter of fact, whenever the Government get into a spot of bother they send for the hon. gentleman and he "puts the dirty stuff over." The general opinion outside is that he is not infallible. I took the trouble to look up the "Courier-Mail" of 5 March, 1936, for one of his statements. It was this:—

"Germany's Lost Colonies.

"Mr. Hanlon Would Return Them.

"Neighbour Needed in Pacific.

"The Minister for Health and Home Affairs (Mr. Hanlon), who served with the A.I.F. in France, indicated yesterday that he favoured the return of its war-lost colonies to Germany.

"He defined his attitude when discussing a cable message in the 'Courier-Mail' which stated that the possible return of New Guinea or any of the former German colonies had never been contemplated in British Government quarters. It was obviously to the advantage of the Australian people to have strong European nations interested in the Pacific and possibly Australians would not feel so lonely if they had such a neighbour, said Mr. Hanlon. A nation like Germany with an ever-growing population must seek colonial expansion, and it was far better that the necessities of a great European people should be frankly faced and met—and any change in the spheres of influence of European nations could be met on a basis of friendly understanding and co-operation—"

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** What are you quoting from?

**Mr. NIMMO:** I am quoting remarks of yours.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** From which paper?

**Mr. NIMMO:** From the "Courier-Mail," 5 March, 1936.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** Will you lay that on the table of the House?

**Mr. NIMMO:** Yes.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** I want to have a look at it.

**Mr. NIMMO:** The Minister comes into this Chamber and insults hon. members on this side. I do not know why he always adopts that insulting way of speaking.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. NIMMO:** As a matter of fact, the hon. members on this side of the Committee brought the amendment forward in good faith, and they have no reason for bringing up matters that are foreign altogether to the debate; but the Minister came in and accused the hon. member for West Moreton of doing things that were contrary to the approved practice.

I shall now turn to the motion itself. I think the Premier, in moving it, did the right thing, because we have to fall into line with the rest of Australia, but I think it was a scandalous thing—as has been said by previous speakers—that Parliament was not consulted before the ex-Premier incurred expenditure in fighting the matter before the High Court. The uniform tax is going to affect the war effort vitally. We have had statements made in this Assembly that the Commonwealth Government are going to gain a very small amount of money by uniform taxation, but I say that many people will be surprised when they see the amount that will be raised as a result of the change.

**The Attorney-General:** They will be surprised when they get their assessments.

**Mr. NIMMO:** They are going to get a surprise. Income that previously escaped taxation is going to attract taxation. The point I make, however, is that it is for the war effort, and if we get through this war even with only sufficient left to live on after taxation is taken we shall be very lucky.

The hon. member for Carnarvon made certain statements that deserve attention, because it looks as if that might be the only way to preserve the status quo after the war is over, and we should have the things we could build on after we had won the contest. It is no use saying continually that people are still making money out of the war and people are living at a rate greater than they lived at previously, while others are doing all they possibly can for the war effort. The Government were wrong in contesting the legislation of the Commonwealth Government and the Premier should make inquiries and see why the ex-Premier did it without consulting the whole of the elected representatives of the people. There is too much of this going on—too much of the attitude, "I have a brutal majority behind me; I can put anything through Parliament." Surely reasonable arguments can be put up. Why not? I know some of the ex-Premier's followers

thought he was wrong in opposing uniform taxation.

**Mr. Power:** Name them.

**Mr. NIMMO:** The hon. member for Baroona might be very inconvenienced if I did name them. The fact remains that there was not unanimity in the party on the matter. The case was fought, and the Premier lost. To-day he has resigned, which he should have done after losing.

**Mr. Luckins:** Is that the reason for it?

**Mr. NIMMO:** The hon. member can form his own conclusion. The fact remains that he lost, and when a man fights and loses it is time he got out, and he got out. The only thing to do now is to pass this measure, but I hope the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition also will be carried.

I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Herbert say that the Leader of the Opposition was not sincere.

**A Government Member:** He withdrew.

**Mr. NIMMO:** Then I will not pursue that subject.

I wish to refer to the Allied Works Council and the Main Roads Commission. I have grave doubts whether, so far as Queensland was concerned, the Allied Works Council was necessary. The Main Roads Commission, under the able leadership of Mr. Kemp, was operating, and now, I understand, a little friction is creeping in already. I trust that it does not increase.

Men are supposed to be conscripted for works under the Allied Works Council. They are taken to the North and other places when required. If the Main Roads Commission wants men in a hurry, it can draw from this labour pool of men in camp and put them to the work to be done. If General MacArthur, in charge of the military forces, wants men, he, too, can draw on that labour pool. We imagined that these men were enlisted in the ordinary way, put into camp under military discipline, and were bound to carry out the work they were instructed to do. Do hon. members know that certain men in these camps have been running away from them, saying, "I am not going to Mount Isa," and then returning to Brisbane? Apparently nothing has been done by the authorities. These men are allowed to flout the regulations. I contend that it would have been very much better to allow the Commissioner of Main Roads to carry out that work. He has carried out such work admirably in this State, and it would not have been necessary to call up men for these works. Mr. Kemp has a way of handling them. Irrespective of what part of the State the men were taken to, he had no trouble in holding them on the job. The road from Camooweal was built under his direction and nobody can fault that. However, I hope an investigation is made into this matter as far as Queensland is concerned and that friction will not develop between the Main Roads Commission and the Allied Works Council.

**Mr. DART (Wynnum) (4.48 p.m.):** Mr. Brassington, I offer you my heartiest congratulations on your appointment to the Chair. I also offer my congratulations to the new Premier. The hon. gentleman has had a long and varied experience. There was a patriarch who had 80 years' experience before he took on his big job and he lived for about 40 years after doing that. I hope the Premier will be as successful as the man who led the children of Israel. I wish him good health and hope that his worries will be few.

Far too much friction has been apparent in this Chamber to-day. I thought it was our intention to co-operate with each other, and work in complete harmony during this session, held as it is in a time of stress.

I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, because it is a simple amendment and should have been included in the Bill. In moving it, the Opposition are merely trying to get something for the man who has had the courage to don a uniform and go to the front. Such men are deserving of something more than those who stayed at home, who are, of course, reaping fair benefits, and with overtime are able to save money and thus provide for the future. The soldier may return to his homeland limbless or otherwise disabled and will need assistance.

I was surprised at the attitude of the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs. The Premier said that he expected and looked forward to victory, whereas his colleague was pessimistic—he was doubtful. I am afraid that if the Japs hear that the Deputy Premier of Queensland is very doubtful of victory they will have additional encouragement to press on and invade Australia.

The Bill promises to be a good one. It is simple, and it is the result of negotiation between the Commonwealth and the States, although I am sorry to say litigation had to be undertaken before the people of the Commonwealth knew exactly where they stood. The Bill has for its purpose the legalising of the payment of these moneys to the State, and therefore it should be supported. Of course, we can all understand that the Government would be loth to give up their handsome revenue, especially that income of over £2,000,000 from the State development tax, but I am pleased to be able to say farewell to a tax that really was an imposition on the working man of the State.

**Mr. Collins:** But the basic-wage-earner was exempt.

**Mr. DART:** If he happened to be thrifty and saved to provide a home for himself and his family, then bought another home for the purpose of deriving a little income by way of rent, he had to pay his tax on the whole of his income.

Last year I advocated exemption for family men, and although I feel sure that some hon. members on the Government side were convinced that I was right they had not the courage to support me. Now we have the Federal Government over-riding this iniquitous

State development tax, and by the passage of the proposed measure we shall be able to say good-bye to it for the duration of the war and 12 months after.

The Secretary for Public Works has referred to the complaint made by the Opposition on many occasions that men could not make a living from the land, but I say that if an industrious man was unable to make a living then the whole blame rested with the Government. Recently the Government were good enough to vote the sum of £33,000 to 138 farmers in order to encourage them to grow cotton. This worked out at an average of less than £250 each, a very small sum when we consider that at the present moment we need unlimited supplies of cotton. The reason why men are not able to live on the land is that they are not being given the help that should be given to them by the Government.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry suggested that we were opposing the Bill purely for political purposes. The man on the land knows, and so does the Minister, that our criticism of the Bill is aimed at improving the benefits to be enjoyed by the people of this State. I regret that the Minister should take the view he did and that he should suggest that the Leader of the Opposition was not sincere in moving the amendment, but was actuated by a desire to gain some political advantage. He has had the experience of a returned soldier and he knows something of his requirements. We have heard a great deal about what Governments have done for returned soldiers, but we must remember that the future is very uncertain, that we do not know what it holds for us, and that if we are not willing to help those who are in need of help, the situation will become worse for us than it was in the past. The Labour Government were in power when the soldier settlements were established at Coominya and Beerburum, and if the Government taxed the returned soldiers off those settlements that is their business. We must have something better than that.

When I was an alderman in the Brisbane City Council and the council comprised men of the same political faith as hon. members in Opposition here, preference in employment on the lifts was given to returned soldiers. I supported a proposal that the totally incapacitated returned men should be exempted from the payment of rates and this was agreed to by the council and put into effect. In that way, as well as in many other directions, we were able to do something for the returned soldiers.

I doubt if the amendment would have been moved if the motion had not included the words—

“to make further provision in aid of the planned economic development of the State, having in view war and post-war requirements, and for other purposes.”

After the war the returned soldiers will go into various vocations. Some will enter skilled

trades, after receiving adequate training, and others will go on the land. Money will have to be made available to help them, and I hope the Premier will accept the amendment and thus indicate to the public that although we may have had a weary day of discussion we have been able to reach harmony on the subject. The Treasurer has informed us that he is to receive the sum of £5,821,000 from the Commonwealth as the State's share of the income tax to be raised by the Commonwealth. He also said that the sum of £1,300,000 was being set aside for post-war purposes. I am of the opinion that that money could not be spent in a better way than in encouraging shipbuilding and aeroplane construction, and in inducing people to go on the land.

One of the important ways to help people on the land is to provide means of irrigation. This country is subject to frequently recurring droughts and help is needed to cope with them. I could discuss the subject at length, but I desire to make my speech as concise as possible. However, I should like to impress upon the Premier the importance of spending the money so that everyone will get a proper deal and that there will be equity and justice all round. That is all we ask. If a man is willing to fight for his country, it is our bounden duty to help him when he returns. I trust that the Premier will endeavour to maintain a proper standard of living in this country, that he will always display the humanitarian outlook, that he will look forward to victory, and that he will do his best in the interests of the people, especially the returned man, who on his return is entitled to at least something better than he had before he went to war. If he did have a raw deal in the past, let that be a lesson to us to treat him better in the future.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I suggest that the hon. member not repeat himself.

**Mr. DART:** I am satisfied that a part of the £1,300,000 could properly be spent in the country to provide reasonable outlets for properties engaged in the growing of crops by irrigation.

There is one other matter I wish to refer to before I sit down. We must take into consideration the transportation of our primary productions to the nearest market. Transportation is a big element in production, including that in the sugar-growing districts. At the present time, on account of the shortage of fertiliser, the growers are not able to produce the crops they could previously, and help in transportation should, therefore, receive efficient consideration. The Allied Works Council is doing good work. It does not now need the funds placed at the disposal of the Main Roads Commission in years past for road purposes, but with the programme of works it has in hand it should be able to help in getting produce transported to the nearest market. The Government can also help primary producers by teaching young settlers efficient methods of cultivation.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS** (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (5.5 p.m.): I have no wish to prolong this debate and I did not think that it was necessary for me to add to the remarks I made at an earlier stage of it, but the hon. member for Oxley made certain remarks that call for a reply. I do not think that any reasonable person can say that I was insulting to the Opposition this morning, or that exception could be taken to anything I said. I simply looked at things in a realistic way, as I always do. I took a realistic view in this debate. I took the view that in the past the returned soldier has been treated exactly the same as the aboriginal in this country—he could get no darned thing for himself to enable him to get a decent livelihood but words, words, words—words all the time.

**Mr. Nimmo:** You know that is not correct.

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** The hon. member for Oxley quoted from a report appearing in the "Courier-Mail" on 5 March, 1936. I am sorry he did not complete the quotation. Had he done so it would have saved me from having to do it. I have not had occasion to recall any of my words, nor have I had to apologise for anything I have said in this Assembly at any subsequent discussion, and I have been here for 16 years. That can be proved by reference to "Hansard." On this occasion, 5 May, 1936, the movement for a perpetual peace was very strong in Europe. The desire to put an end to the periodic blood-bath for civilisation was very strong everywhere in Christian countries. It was canvassed in England and other parts of the world that it might be possible to prevent a recurrence of war by having a proper understanding between European nations as to colonial interests and the possibility of giving European nations room for expansion. As a matter of fact, the seeds were laid at the time for the Atlantic Charter, which has just been propounded by President Roosevelt after consultation with Mr. Churchill and others. It is a great pity this Atlantic Charter was not propounded at that time.

**Mr. Nimmo:** Do you think it would have made any difference?

**The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS:** That is hard to say; we always gamble on the human element. I am going to read the full statement that the hon. member for Oxley credited to me:—

"The Minister for Health and Home Affairs (Mr. Hanlon), who served with the A.I.F. in France, indicated yesterday that he favoured the return of its war-lost colonies to Germany.

"He defined his attitude when discussing a cable message in the 'Courier-Mail,' which stated that the possible return of New Guinea or any of the former German colonies had never been contemplated in British Government quarters. It was obviously to the advantage of the Australian people to have strong European nations interested in

the Pacific, and possibly Australians would not feel so lonely if they had such a neighbour, said Mr. Hanlon. A nation like Germany, with an ever-growing population, must seek colonial expansion, and it was far better that the necessities of a great European people should be frankly faced and met—and any change in the spheres of influence of European nations could be met on a basis of friendly understanding and co-operation—than that there should be a continuation of the system of bloodshed that had persisted through so many centuries."

I do not take a word of that statement back. I hope that when this blood-bath is over the nations of Europe will arrive at a proper understanding which will enable them to settle their differences satisfactorily and work by means of friendly co-operation. I hope that sooner or later these periodic blood-baths will come to an end.

The hon. member for Oxley, as he was interested in my statements at that time, might have proceeded to quote a statement that I made just a few days afterwards on Anzac night. I then pointed out to the people of this State that somebody was building up a war with Japan. That was in 1936. I pointed out what a calamity that would be in the condition in which this country was then.

The country was being riddled with anti-Japanese propaganda and Japan was being riddled with anti-British propaganda. Hon. members must remember the anti-British propaganda that was pouring through Asia at the time, and similar propaganda was going on in Japan. I could see no reason for it. I could not see any advantage to Japan or the British Empire to be involved in a bloody war. Those two statements go together, and I have no apology to offer for any word of them. We are in the middle of a blood-bath, which will leave this country and every other country in the world filled with sore hearts, because men have not the courage and capacity to stand up to the need for organising our world. This world has made very much scientific progress in the last half century. It has grown beyond us. Our public men do not seem to have the capacity to stand up to the task of keeping order among our own people. There is no need for Christian people to be slaughtering each other as they are.

At that time I saw the position very clearly. I saw the growing discontent in Europe, and people thought at the time the League of Nations was not doing sufficient, and there should be some friendly rapprochement between the European people if European civilisation was to be preserved. At the same time I saw clearly the fact that war in the Pacific was being forced on them. I warned the people of this State, and I do not apologise. Now we are in it, the job is to do it, and see that this time the men are not betrayed. After the South African war, after the wars with France, and after the war with Russia the men who fought have always been betrayed. As I saw it at

the time, and as a number of other people saw it, the men who died and the men who suffered in the last war were getting the usual betrayal. Despite their anxiety to keep out of the war and save their people from another war, their children were being condemned to death by public men in all countries and by newspapers of all countries. I expressed my objection to it and my hopes for a peaceful future. The opportunity for a peaceful future has passed. This country and the other democracies are engaged in a more bitter and bloody struggle than ever. We have to win the war but we have also to see that there is no other betrayal of the men who fought. Words are not enough. I say quite frankly, just as I was right in pointing to the approaching war in 1936, so I believe I am right in saying the men will not lay down their arms without justice on this occasion.

**Mr. EDWARDS (Nanango)** (5.13 p.m.): I had no intention of speaking on the question before the Committee, but I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am not a prophet like the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. When all is said and done I want to say that this debate has been a disgrace to this Committee and to Queensland and to the British Empire. It has been no credit to this Assembly. We tried to set an example. It is cursed party politics. There is no occasion for it. But we may not want it any more. I tell the hon. gentleman, who is so clever about all these things and who knows them all, that we may not want them after the war—we may not want to bother about them. Ramsay MacDonald was the cause of the present difficulties of the British Empire, but I am not blaming him. He thought as the hon. gentleman that there would be years and years of peace and there was no need to arm. He went to the country with a disarmament policy and was put in with a huge majority.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** It was the policy of all democracies.

**Mr. EDWARDS:** He was mistaken, but it was he who started the disarmament. We were not ready. The man who gets up in this Chamber and definitely says that this war was brought on by another section of the community belonging to Britain is damnably wrong.

**The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs:** I did not say anything of the kind.

**Mr. EDWARDS:** Yes. It was brought on by a man with a sour soul. He set out to organise his people for one purpose only—world domination. To further his accursed policy, he would not care if his German people were murdered too. He does not care whether they disappear so long as he gains what he set out to gain. After the war, as I have stated previously, the common sense of the people must rule. Mistakes will be made, but if the people only show common sense and stability they will see to it that things are rightly done.

**The PREMIER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer)** (5.16 p.m.): When introducing this proposal this morning I did not think that we should spend the whole day over it, and I express my thanks to the Opposition Whip for having decided to pluck the beam out of the eye of the Opposition before worrying about the mote in the eye of the Government.

**Mr. Nimmo:** What about your own side?

**The PREMIER:** I have no desire to go into the discussion further. The matter has been well debated. It has been proved beyond doubt that all the Opposition desire to do by way of this amendment is already provided for. This Bill, however, makes further provision. The word "further" is inserted purposely—it is a Bill to make further provision. There is no question that that has been proved to be so, and therefore the amendment so far as that is concerned goes by the board.

I am compelled to say that I have to accept the assurance of the Opposition they were in earnest in this matter. All sorts of people are in earnest in various matters. The youngster who throws his leg over a broomstick and trots up and down the footpath and calls it a horse is in earnest. The youngster who raises his arms, clenches his fists, and then swings his arms in a circular movement, at the same time shuffling his feet along the footpath, making believe he is a locomotive, is in earnest. This earnest make-believe is evidence of an immature mind, and the bringing up of this matter by the Opposition displays that immaturity in political strategy. It was the worst exhibition of political strategy I have seen in this Chamber. It was a dud. It was a bomb that failed to explode. The thing has already been done, and well done. I think we can now pass that part of the business over.

**An Opposition Member:** All the Cabinet Ministers have spoken.

**The PREMIER:** They had to refute all the extraneous matters brought in in this debate—quite properly brought in because there is a wide scope at the introduction of a measure such as this, but this would not be possible at the second-reading stage, because that debate is limited to the discussion of the principles on which this Committee has decided. This, therefore, is the time for these things to be brought up. There was a wide debate, and naturally certain things have been introduced.

The evidence as to the treatment by this Government of returned soldiers after the last war shows that the treatment was good. Not only did they keep their word that they would give every man who went to the front his job back or an equivalent job that he was able to do, but they employed thousands of others. They made all the provision it was possible to make. If anybody fell down on the job it was private enterprise, and that was the reason why the Commonwealth Government at the outbreak of this war passed a regulation that every employer must

give a man his job back when he returned from the job of fighting. That regulation was forced upon the Commonwealth Government by reason of the fact that men came back from the last war—

**Mr. Barnes:** They will all be broke and they won't get their jobs back.

**The PREMIER:** That is another matter. Maybe we shall have the hon. member's press at work printing some paper to meet the situation.

I do not want to say anything more than that. I believe this Bill is necessary to meet the conditions imposed on the State by the Commonwealth Acts. It is also necessary because, as I stated at the beginning, the money is going into Consolidated Revenue and the Treasurer is to be a corporation sole to administer that fund instead of the Secretary for Labour and Industry, and, consequently, all the powers given to that Minister under the Income (State Development) Tax Act will be handed over to the Treasurer to allow him to proceed with the work set out in the Act that has been so much maligned here but so well received by the whole of the State of Queensland.

**Mr. NIMMO (Oxley)** (5.21 p.m.): I am very sorry that the Premier should have tried to ridicule the arguments of the Opposition.

**The Premier:** I am not ridiculing your arguments; I am ridiculing your actions.

**Mr. NIMMO:** It is the same thing. The fact that four of the Ministers, the big guns of the Government, were brought along to-day to try to refute the arguments of the Opposition show that our arguments were strong, and the Government failed dismally in their efforts to refute them. As a matter of fact, the public will judge on this matter and will certainly not agree with the unsympathetic reception of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Not one constructive argument has been put up as to why preference should not be given to these boys when they return.

**The Premier:** No argument to that effect has been put up.

**Mr. NIMMO:** Of course it has. At times I have found that the Premier puts up arguments that seem to be quite sound when there is no-one there to knock them out. I heard him put up an argument on one occasion that it is the community that makes a man, that there is no self-made man—if a man was put on an island by himself he could not become a successful man—but I remind him that if the man who was put on the island by himself, on an island where there was no community, was any good at all he would soon bring the community to him. Communities have been made by self-made men in all parts of the State.

As a matter of fact, the Premier's arguments are rotten. There is nothing in them. Even at this eleventh hour I ask the Government to agree to the amendment, because it will certainly go out to the world and our

fighting men at the front that the Government of the day have agreed to give them preference of employment when they return, and they will derive some encouragement from that. The Government are fighting the amendment because they feel that there is no possibility of finding employment for everyone on his return. I have nothing more to say except that the Premier will have to get out of that habit of trying to belittle hon. members of the Opposition who are trying to put up a constructive case. That we have put up a good case is proved by the fact that the big guns have been called in to try to damage our argument.

**The PREMIER (Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer)** (5.24 p.m.): I have no intention whatever of accepting the amendment, and for one good reason—it is redundant. The matter is already on the statute-book. Why agree to something that we have in the statutes already? I am sorry if the arguments I have used have been considered hurtful to hon. members of the Opposition.

**The Minister for Transport:** They are purely political propagandists. (Opposition laughter.)

**The PREMIER:** For the reasons I have advanced, I do not propose to accept the amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (Mr. Nicklin's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 18.

Mr. Barnes	Mr. Müller
„ Brard	„ Nicklin
„ Clayton	„ Nimmo
„ Dart	„ Sparkes
„ Decker	„ Walker
„ Edwards	„ Yeates
„ Luckins	
„ Macdonald	<i>Tellers:</i>
„ Maher	„ Moorhouse
„ Massey	„ Pie

NOES, 29.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jones
„ Bruce	„ Larcombe
„ Bulcock	„ Mann
„ Clark	„ Moore
„ Collins	„ Power
„ Conroy	„ Riordan
„ Cooper	„ Slessar
„ Copley	„ Theodore
„ Dunstan	„ Turner
„ Farrell	„ Walsh
„ Foley	„ Williams
„ Gair	
„ Gledson	<i>Tellers:</i>
„ Hanlon	„ Devries
„ Healy	„ O'Shea
„ Hilton	

PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Mr. Plunkett	Mr. Smith, W. Forgan

Resolved in the negative.

Motion (Mr. Cooper) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Cooper, read a first time.

The House adjourned at 5.37 p.m.