

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 1944

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy



Queensland Parliamentary Debates.

Legislative Assembly.

FIRST SESSION OF THE THIRTIETH PARLIAMENT

Appointed to Meet

AT BRISBANE ON THE FIRST DAY OF AUGUST, IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE VI., IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1944.

[VOLUME 2.]

TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER, 1944.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Brassington, Fortitude Valley) took the chair at 11 a.m.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Public Accounts of the State for the year 1943-1944.

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer—Premier): I move—

“That the paper be printed.”

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.1 a.m.): Before this motion is passed, I should like to say that there is a matter of great importance on which the House should be satisfied. I refer to certain serious irregularities in connection with the Consolidated Revenue Account that have not up to the present been dealt with by the Auditor-General in his annual reports to Parliament.

The Commonwealth and States Financial Agreement Ratification Act of 1927 provided for sinking-fund contributions by the State and Commonwealth Governments of 5s. each per £100 borrowed. In respect of loans to cover deficits, however, the agreement provided that the State Government concerned should make a sinking fund contribution of £4 per cent., and the Commonwealth Government should make no contribution. In the years 1932-33 to 1934-35, the Queensland Government account discloses deficits totalling £3,247,000.

A Government Member: During the period of the Moore Government?

Mr. NICKLIN: 1934-35, I ask the hon. member to take particular notice of the year. I do not remember that the Moore Government was in power during that period.

This amount was financed by the issue of Treasury bills and therefore was liquidated by loans, which should have been subject to the sinking-fund contribution of 4 per cent. for which the Act provides. No such contribution has been made and the Auditor-General has never reported the matter to Parliament.

Mr. Walsh: Why?

Mr. NICKLIN: That is what I want to know; that is what every hon. member wants to know also—why this matter, which has a serious bearing on the finances of this State and also on the finances of the Commonwealth, has never been even mentioned in the Auditor-General's report presented to members of this House.

I have here a letter on this subject that has been addressed to me by Mr. Peter McCaffrey. (Government laughter.) Before his dismissal he was a senior audit inspector. I ask hon. members to listen to what Mr. McCaffrey has to say and then judge the matter on the contents of the letter. It is dated 23 October, 1944, and reads—

“Disclosures by me to the Federal Treasurer, Hon. J. B. Chifley, including details of falsification in Queensland Treasury accounts, that have adversely affected Commonwealth finances, caused members of the Loan Council and of the National Debt Commission, after prolonged investigations and after obtaining opinions of four leading counsel, to request the Federal Parliament on 31 August, 1943, to bring in legislation to validate certain illegal acts perpetrated during the past decade. The Federal Treasurer is a member of both the Loan Council and the National Debt Commission.

“The States, including Queensland, during the period stated have, contrary to law, short-paid to the National Debt Sinking Fund £17,000,000 and the Commonwealth Government, contrary to law, has overpaid £1,000,000 to the National Debt Sinking Fund. These doings constitute illegal acts and no effective action has been taken by those responsible to obtain adjustment of these large discrepancies.

“In addition, as far as Queensland is concerned, various expenditures of the Railway Department were made out of Loan Fund, instead of Consolidated Revenue. The total of such payments, at 30 June, 1940, was £508,000. This also falsified the State Revenue account and enabled the Government to escape sinking fund payments to the Commonwealth.

"Ventilation by me in official documents of these falsifications and manipulations in Queensland Treasury accounts and of the consequences of such falsified financial recordings was solely responsible for my dismissal from the Public Service in 1940.

"However, my main object in writing to you is to inform you of the falsifications of the Treasury account of this State and to suggest that you should demand that the fullest possible information regarding these matters be given to Parliament in the next Auditor-General's report.

"Yours faithfully,

"(Sgd.) P. McCaffrey, F.I.C.A."

The letter speaks for itself and before this motion is passed I think hon. members of this Parliament should be assured that these matters are dealt with and the facts fully disclosed. If the report is deficient in this respect, as it has been in past years, it should be referred back to the Auditor-General with the information that the matters in question should be included. After all, the Auditor-General is the watch-dog of this Parliament and it is his duty to report to this House on any shortcomings that there may be in the public accounts. This is a matter that has been going on for a number of years, and as a result of the continued representations that have been made to the Federal Treasurer is has now reached the stage, I understand, in which both the Commonwealth and the State Parliaments have in the near future to introduce legislation to validate things that have been taking place. These things have been taking place over these years wrongly and not one single word have we had in the reports of the Auditor-General presented to this House on this matter for the information of members. That is why I raise this question and why I suggest that if the Auditor-General has again on this occasion failed in his duty to this Parliament the report should be referred back to him asking him to make reference to these things, to which he should undoubtedly make reference before he presents his report to this House.

Mr. KERR (Oxley) (11.9 a.m.): I support the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Cooper: Are you seconding the motion?

Mr. KERR: I am supporting his statement. The motion is before the House, as the hon. gentleman knows.

The allegation that has been made is a very serious allegation and requires the deepest investigation. If there is, as the Leader of the Opposition states, a non-disclosure of these facts and of the true position as between the State and the Commonwealth it is high time the Auditor-General was asked to submit his information fully in his report to this House. When the Auditor-General's report is presented and tabled the motion is carried and that is the end of it. It is then far too late to do anything. This is the time when some action should be taken so that members of this House should have the opportunity of perusing the Auditor-General's report before it is tabled and printed.

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer—Premier), (11.10 a.m.): In reply, I desire to say that this is of course a very good mare's nest that has been discovered, and a motion on which it is intended that the Leader of the Opposition should tear a passion to tatters; but knowing his case to be particularly feeble, he was not able to do that. The circumstances of this case are very well known indeed. I would remind this House that there are in Australia seven Auditors-General. There is one for the Commonwealth and there are six for the various States, and not one of these Auditors-General has referred to the matter in his report.

Mr. Maher: The National Debt Commission.

Mr. COOPER: That does not happen to be the Auditor-General. The National Debt Commission investigated this matter and Sir John Latham, the chairman, expressed his doubts as to the validity of what had been done in the past. That was the first intimation that the Loan Council had that this matter had been questioned. The matter having been sprung on us—speaking from memory (I am not too sure) I think the remainder of the National Debt Commission were of the opinion that the actions taken in the past were valid but Sir John Latham had expressed a doubt and was a legal gentleman of very high renown—the Loan Council came to the opinion that rather than have any doubt about it, the matter would be put right, and at the last meeting of Premiers it was unanimously agreed by the Commonwealth and the States that legislation would be introduced validating what had been done in the past.

The statement by the Leader of the Opposition and the letter read by him give the impression that this has been a deep-laid plot and plan right since the beginning for the use of Treasury bills for the indebtedness, but that is not the case.

Mr. Maher: That is the case.

Mr. COOPER: That is not the case, and the hon. member well knows it.

Mr. Maher: I do not. I dealt with it.

Mr. COOPER: After Mr. McCaffery had made the statement, but not before.

Mr. Maher: No.

Mr. COOPER: Of course. No-one, not even Sir John Latham, had any idea of the position until attention was drawn to it by Mr. McCaffery, and I believe attention would never have been drawn to it by Mr. McCaffery except that he was discovered in a particularly mean and paltry theft in connection with public funds. The gentleman had extracted these 2d. and 3d. from the State for his own personal gain. The paltriness of his thefts was so great that no-one could tolerate it and, because he was discovered, he then discovers this desperate position about the Financial Agreement. The Commonwealth Government did not know the position and this was going on not under the regime of the Curtin Government but under the regime of many Commonwealth Governments.

Mr. Kerr: That does not make it right.

Mr. COOPER: I know that, but it was no deep-laid plot, no deep-laid plan by which the State was being excused of the payment of certain money or by which the Commonwealth was being robbed. As a matter of fact, the Commonwealth is satisfied and the States are satisfied that if a mistake was made it was an honest mistake, and they believe, too, that that is what the Financial Agreement said and what it intended. As a high legal opinion—that of Sir John Latham—is that it does not bear that interpretation, the Premiers of the Commonwealth have decided to make the Financial Agreement say what it was intended it should say, and legislation will be introduced into this House during this session to carry out the agreement arrived at by the various Premiers.

This is not a matter that I believe concerns the Auditor-General in any way whatever; it is a matter that concerns the Loan Council and the National Debt Commission. That being so, and the opinion having been arrived at that there may be some doubt, the matter will be put right. But this idea to raise the boggy that some great deception has been purposely and wilfully going on over all these years will not hold water.

Mr. Hanlon: We have paid every penny that the National Debt Commission said should be paid.

Mr. COOPER: Every penny that the National Debt Commission thought should be paid by the State was paid, and the National Debt Commission accepted the payment in full, believing it to be the correct payment by the State. A doubt having arisen, the matter is being put right by the necessary legislation.

Motion (Mr. Cooper) agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

WAR HOUSING SCHEME.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) asked the Premier—

“What is the formula arrived at by the Commonwealth and State Government in determining the normal rental of houses built under the War Housing Scheme for letting purposes in this State?”

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer) replied—

“I refer the hon. member to my reply to the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition on 7 September 1944.”

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“1. What are the terms and conditions of repayments of purchase price offered to purchasers of homes built under the War Housing Scheme through the State Advances Corporation?

“2. In addition to the contract price and cost of land, what additional costs are added to determine the purchase price, and what percentage does this added cost bear to the contract price of a building?

1944—2H

“3. Are the homes erected purely on a speculation basis, assuming some purchaser will eventually come forward and buy, or are they built to the order of an applicant?”

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (The Tableland) replied—

“1. The terms and conditions prescribed under the State Advances Acts, 1916 to 1934, are being applied to applications for home purchase under the war housing scheme.

“2. Nil.

“3. They are built to the order of the approved applicant.”

DEHYDRATION PLANT, BURDEKIN DELTA.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“In view of the statement made in this house on 12 October by the hon. member for Townsville referring to the fertility of the Lower Burdekin, its suitability for irrigation, and the proposed establishment of a dehydration plant, and in view of the fact that the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. Scully) said on more than one occasion, “that he had advised the Secretary for Agriculture in Queensland that, whenever it was clear that a suitable area in Queensland could guarantee a continuous supply of vegetables of kinds and quality suitable for dehydration, a dehydration plant would be installed and operated,” will he take steps to see that this means of developing the North is advanced, in order that production of vegetables there may be extended?”

Hon. T. L. WILLIAMS (Port Curtis) replied—

“The hon. member for Townsville has consistently supported the producers in the Lower Burdekin area in their efforts to secure the establishment of a canning and dehydration plant to absorb surplus production of fruit and vegetables in that area. Before a favourable decision to establish such a plant can be made, the Commonwealth authorities insist on an assurance that continuous supplies of vegetables and/or fruit suitable for canning or dehydration would be available. Although there is every likelihood that this assurance could be given insofar as the Lower Burdekin area is concerned, many problems associated with the marketing of canned or dehydrated vegetables or fruit in North Queensland require to be fully investigated. The establishment of plants in suitable areas has been and will continue to be the subject of representations to the Commonwealth authorities concerned.”

PAYMENTS TO JUDGES.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba), without notice, asked the Premier—

“In view of the following statement of Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas contained in

'Truth' of Sunday, 22nd instant, relative to the retirement of ex-Chief Justice Blair, namely—in addition, he received a large but unnamed sum in lieu of long-service leave. The amount has not been disclosed, but I believe it was somewhere about £4,000.'

"1. What lump sum was paid by the Government to Mr. Chief Justice Blair upon his retirement?"

"2. Will he kindly bring on the Estimates of the Justice Department for discussion today in order that this matter may be debated by Parliament as soon as possible?"

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer) replied—

"I thank the Leader of the Opposition for giving me sufficient notice of his intention to ask the question to enable me to have the following reply:—

1. The ex-Chief Justice (Sir James Blair) was paid on retirement a sum of £121 17s. 6d., being the cash equivalent of undrawn recreation leave from 1 July 1939 to 16 May 1940. His Honour was paid on 5 July 1939, some time before his retirement, a sum of £3,881 5s. The total payment was as computed hereunder:—

	<i>£</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
1 April 1922 to 1 April 1925—3 years' service or 3½ months' leave at £2,000 per annum	600	0 0
1 April 1925 to 16 May 1940—15½ years' service or 18 ³ / ₁₀ months' leave at £2,250 per annum	3,403	2 6
	£4,003	2 6

"His Honour E. A. Douglas was granted one months' recreation leave from 10 February 1936 and the gross amount of salary paid in respect of this leave was £166 13s. 4d.; an Acting Judge appointed in his place was paid £160 4s. 8d.; Mr. Justice Douglas was also granted seven months' recreation leave from 14 February 1938 and a sum of £1,166 13s. 4d. was paid in respect of this leave; an Acting Judge was paid £1,166 13s. 4d. to take His Honour's place.

"His Honour R. J. Douglas was granted three months' recreation leave from 8 February, 1932 and the gross amount of salary paid in respect of this leave was £400; an Acting Judge appointed in his place was paid £400; His Honour was also granted five months' recreation leave from 6 July, 1933 and the gross amount of salary paid in respect of this leave was £666 13s. 4d.; and an Acting Judge appointed in his place was paid £653 15s. 4d.; His Honour R. J. Douglas was also paid a further £666 13s. 4d. in respect of gross salary for four months' recreation leave from 14 February, 1938; an Acting Judge appointed in his place for this period was paid £666 13s. 4d.

"His Honour H. H. Henchman was granted six months' recreation leave from

9 February, 1935 and the gross amount of salary paid in respect of this leave was £843 16s. 9d.; an Acting Judge in his place was paid £843 16s. 9d. His Honour was granted a further three months' recreation leave from 31 August, 1938 and was paid £500 gross; an Acting Judge was paid £351 8s. 9d. On his retirement there was nothing due to him.

"His Honour L. O. Lukin was granted 12 months' recreation leave from 1 April, 1925, the gross amount of salary being paid in respect of this leave was £2,000; an Acting Judge in his place was paid £715 1s. 1d.

"On 21 March, 1929 Mr. Justice Macnaughton received 12 months' accrued leave of absence in cash equivalent £2,000 and £500 a year pension.

"Similarly Mr. Justice O'Sullivan was granted the cash equivalent of 6 months' leave on his retirement a sum of £1,000 and in addition a pension at the rate of £500 per year.

"Mr. Justice Brennan was paid the cash equivalent of 12 months' recreation leave on the completion of 10 years' service, amounting to £2,000.

"2. The Estimates for the Justice Department will be brought before the Committee of Supply so soon as the Treasury Estimates are approved."

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year 1943-1944.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

By-law No. 446 under the Railways Acts, 1914 to 1934.

Rules of Court, dated 13 October, 1944, under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1932.

Regulation dated 12 October, 1944, under the Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1941.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—
THIRD AND FOURTH ALLOTTED DAYS.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Mann, Brisbane, in the chair.)

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1944-1945.

THE TREASURER.

TREASURY.

Question stated—

"That £2,160,000 be granted for The 'Treasurer—Treasury.'"

Vote agreed to.

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (11.29 a.m.): I move—

"That £26,796 be granted for 'Bureau of Industry.'"

The appropriation of the current year is more than that of the previous year by £5,336. There is an increase in salaries and a small increase in contingencies. Each of the two contingencies items shows an increase for 1944-45. The amount for travelling expenses, postages, etc., being £104 more than last year, and that for stores, printing and railway fares being £1,505 greater.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (11.31 a.m.): First of all, I desire to pay a tribute to Mr. Colin Clark of the Bureau of Industry. Numbers of people do not realise that Mr. Colin Clark is administering a very difficult department. He has had to stand up to criticism for putting into operation legislation in the enactment of which he had no say. But I do want to point out to this Committee that in my opinion Mr. Colin Clark is purely a statistician and economist and like all statisticians and economists has not the capacity or experience needed for administrative problems. Many of us read with great interest some of his utterances in "Economic News." These are well thought out and I am sure at all times do not express the opinion of the Government but have been written fearlessly. They have been quoted in many other parts of Australia. But Mr. Colin Clark still continues as Deputy Director of War Organisation of Industry. In my opinion the work of that department should be just about completed, but we find that this coming year there is an increased appropriation of £132,542 for it. That department, instead of developing, should be discontinued gradually.

Hon. members may ask why I am bringing this matter up. During the discussion of my recommendation that a special department for the development of secondary industries should be created, the Treasurer interjected "We have the Bureau of Industry," by which I take it he meant that the Bureau of Industry was sufficient to develop secondary industries in this State, which is the greatest job this Government will ever have to face. On analysing the Estimates we find a small amount of £26,796 is allowed for the development of secondary industries in this State, and right throughout the Budget and the Estimates I cannot find any other allowance for the development of industry.

Mr. Hanlon: What do you mean by the development of industry?

Mr. PIE: I will explain that if the hon. gentleman will have patience, as I had when he was delivering the Financial Statement. I should say that this Government know full well the wonderful opportunities that abound throughout Queensland from here to Cairns for the development of industry from the State's natural resources, and when we realise the problem that lies ahead of us in employing the men returning from the war, they should allocate a sum of at least £250,000 to investigate that development.

Mr. Hanlon: £250,000?

Mr. PIE: £250,000 to develop it.

Mr. Hanlon: You are very good with other people's money.

Mr. PIE: We realise the Treasurer does not even go into these things. For the Department of Agriculture and Stock alone £215,000 is required and I say that secondary industry is just as important to this State as the Department of Agriculture and Stock, and until we do something about it we shall never develop. This bureau, which the Treasurer implies should take the place of a department for the development of secondary industries, has in Mr. Colin Clark a part-time officer and in Mr. Kemp another part-time officer. I say emphatically that we must have a department for the development of secondary industry, and the quicker this Government realise that something must be done in that matter the quicker we shall make progress in comparison with other States.

I appeal to the Government to give the younger men on that side of the House a chance, and show what they can do in a new department—in giving expression to their ideas in building industry, because this Government over a number of years have not shown the requisite initiative in making possible the development of this State's industry, which is the greatest employment-provider of all employment agencies.

Mr. Hanlon: I did not quite hear what you said about the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

Mr. PIE: I said that £215,000 is to be appropriated for the Department of Agriculture and Stock for the coming year. A Department of Secondary Industry should be created that would spend a sum of £250,000 for the development of industry in this State. But, Mr. Mann, what do we find? In September 1941 I gave a report to the Department of War Organisation of Industry that analyses all the possibilities of Queensland—the coast areas—and in this I stated—

"In my opinion the problems that we are confronting in Queensland are not difficult and could be overcome by efficient organisation in each main centre or zone. Planning in anticipation of present requirements both in material and manpower as opposed to improvisation after the need has arisen is essential."

I then proceeded to suggest a responsible honorary committee of three men in each territory, with perhaps the local member of Parliament as chairman irrespective of party, to work in conjunction with the Department of War Organisation of Industry. But now I say in conjunction with the Department for the Development of Secondary Industry.

The report continues that these committees should—

"Analyse all industry in each zone or territory.

"Register all tools and machines available.

"Get complete details of all the plant at present working, and what it could make.

"Details of capacity at present worked, and if worked to full capacity.

"Numbers at present employed.

“Numbers that could be employed.

“The raw materials that would be immediately required to work at full pressure.”

The report proceeds in this tenor and contains the basis for the creation of a Department of Secondary Industry that could develop in this State. It is absolutely essential in the initial stages if we are to analyse our industrial possibilities. Where is there in this State anywhere that one can go to ascertain the possibilities of even each city in Queensland? The other day I spoke to a man who desired to start a weaving mill in Queensland. Probably he will start one but he had to come to me for information. Why should it not have been possible for him to go to a State department to get all the details he required?

Mr. Hanlon: What would stop him from coming to a State department?

Mr. PIE: Because the Government have not a department.

Mr. Hanlon: Where did you go?

Mr. PIE: I will tell you—I want to fix you properly. The other day I spoke to a cotton-spinner from America, a colonel in the Army. He was thinking of starting here but there was nowhere for him to go to find out the possibilities. The other day a Victorian interviewed me. He wants to start cotton-spinning. He knows wool-spinning, he is running it in Victoria and is thinking of starting in Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon: You tried to frighten him to keep rid of possible competitors.

Mr. PIE: I will come at you a little later.

I am glad to see that the Bureau of Industry has extended to Rockhampton. A very capable man has been sent there and I feel certain that when he analyses the possibility of industries there we shall see some development in the Rockhampton area. I understand an officer has been sent to Cairns. I was very pleased to hear that, because he is a capable man and I am sure he will be able to analyse the possibilities of industry in that part of the State. I have received letters from all over the State—Charters Towers, Townsville, Mackay, and other places—from people who wish to ascertain the possibility of starting industries there. During the referendum campaign I was in Mackay and at a meeting of local business men—the hon. member for Mirani will vouch for this—consisting of Mr. Bagley and half a dozen others, I made it particularly clear that from the point of view of starting industry in Queensland it was absolutely impossible to decentralise existing factories. That is most important. In every factory there is a standard overhead that will absorb a certain turnover and it would be no use for that undertaking to have half its business here and the other half in Mackay. If industry is to be decentralised in Queensland new undertakings must be started. It is idle to put 10 or 15 machines in Mackay and

another 10 or 15 machines in Rockhampton, because it would then be impossible to absorb overhead. That is what the Commonwealth Government are doing in Queensland today—putting 15 machines at Beenleigh, another lot up the coast somewhere, and some at Caloundra. That is just stupid, because when the need for efficiency in production arrives these small factories will not be able to compete with larger factories. There is an obligation on the Government and on all the people in Queensland to endeavour to get new industries to come to this State, starting first of all with towns that have a population of 30,000 or over.

Mr. Walsh: Who is going to say where the new industries should be established—private enterprise?

Mr. PIE: I have it all planned here if the hon. gentleman is willing to listen. In the first speech I made in this House on 26 August 1941, I made the following observations:—

“May I suggest to the Premier and his colleagues that the Government can help and encourage these executives by the appointment of a Minister for the Development of Secondary Industries? This would enable constructive direction to be given on all problems confronting industrial expansion. A study is needed of markets, marketing conditions, new departures in industry, and new technical developments.

“Help may be given on problems of finance, factory lay-out, management, &c. A representative should be sent overseas in an endeavour to influence large British industries, whose plant is at present unemployed owing to the co-ordinate system operating in England, to consider starting in Queensland.”

These factories have come to Australia but they are in other States, and this statement was made three years ago when I knew the position that existed at that time. I continued—

“Such a Minister could look ahead, through research, in an endeavour to ascertain beforehand the industrial changes and difficulties confronting industry. Being forewarned of the approach of the causes of unemployment would render immeasurably easier the formulation of policy and plans to maintain at a higher uniform level regular employment, national income, and general prosperity.”

And so I went on. In that work alone there is sufficient to create a department for developing this State and helping maintain uniform employment.

“We come now to the Treasurer. He makes accusations about what the Government have done for me.

Mr. Hanlon: We had your word for it.

Mr. PIE: I have nothing to hide in my life and the Minister knows it. I personally know the advantages of the Industries Assistance Act.

Mr. Hanlon: What are you opposing it for?

Mr. PIE: The point I make is that a department should be created round that Act, but what do we find? We have about four companies operating under that Act. Is it not an indictment of this Government that that Act, which is one of the best ever put through this House for the development of industry, has never been used to its fullest extent? In South Australia they have an Act that is nowhere near as good as ours but the Government there have gone out after industry and encouraged the private man to start work. I have studied their Act and it is not in any way to be compared with ours.

Let us deal with the Treasurer now—I have been wanting to do this for a long time. During the election campaign the Treasurer made a speech that I desire to quote. If ever anyone wants to see a speech full of misstatements he has only to read this. It is one of the best I have ever read. This is what he says—

“That gentleman Pie——”

I am glad he calls me a gentleman——

“came along with a proposition that he could start knitting mills if he got the capital.”

What a lie! I say that is a lie.

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member's disturbance about being caught is no justification for the use of the word “lie” about me. I object to it and ask that you make him withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word “lie.”

Mr. PIE: I withdraw it and say that it was a gross misrepresentation of the facts. He says that I said I could start knitting mills if I got the capital. That knitting mill in which I was interested as a director, and which I guaranteed was started in 1928, not the year 1936 when I approached the State Government on behalf of the company.

Mr. Hanlon: And you got help, did you not?

Mr. PIE: Let us come to it. I have been longing for this for years and years ever since the hon. gentleman brought it up. He said that if it were not for the Government I should be on relief, or words to that effect. My retort to him is that if he were not a professional politician and if his brother were not a private individual running a private business, and if his brother were not a director of another company and if he were not on the hospitals board——

Mr. Hanlon: And he never came to the Government for assistance either. He supported the Government and never got anything from them, and he did not take Government money and then go round scandalising them.

Mr. PIE: I state quite positively that no Government ever made an advance to me and that no Government have ever guaran-

teed my personal account through the Bureau of Industry but on 11 January 1936 the Bureau of Industry did guarantee the account of a textile company established in 1928—not in 1936—in which I was interested as a director. It is important to note that the Government insisted that I should personally guarantee the Government against any failure and in order to do this—the Treasury may not know of it—I in turn had to mortgage everything I had.

Mr. Hanlon: Why shouldn't you?

Mr. PIE: My furniture, my insurance policies, all my personal assets; and here is the agreement that I had with the Government.

Mr. Hanlon: Why should you not put your own money in it?

Mr. PIE: I was the only man in Queensland at that time who had any faith in the establishment of a textile industry in this State. Three others had already gone broke, but I was willing to do everything I could for the development of this industry in Queensland. I should like to inform hon. members that in 1936 I employed 113 people in a business that gave a turnover of £42,269 but today that same business employs 311 people and does a turnover of £175,920. No doubt the Treasurer will say, “The Government did that,” but if he cares to read through the reports of the Bureau of Industry over the various years since the establishment of the industry he will find that it says—

“An exceptional season has enabled this company to experience a record year and it is expected that this most efficient enterprise will have no difficulty in releasing the Government from its contingent liability on the 30th June, 1939, as agreed at the time the guarantee was given.”

Because I had to mortgage everything I had to keep the industry going my credit was affected and in another business with which I was associated my credit was affected materially and so I had to work night and day to get relief from that guarantee. The Government had nothing to do with the success of that business; it was its efficiency that enabled it to come through.

I have tried to point out that the Bureau of Industry in helping four companies under the Industries Assistance Act and that the number should be 44. The only way in which to do that is to create a department to analyse the possibilities of industry, submit them to the Government and then for the Government in turn to submit them to private individuals if you like for the establishment of new industries near our natural resources. The other day I asked a question in this Chamber concerning the establishment of an industry at Atherton to utilise the maize product, but for the sake of £10,000 we have no company in Queensland. Maize Products, operating in Victoria with a probable turnover of £400,000 to £500,000 a year from Queensland glucose and maize. If the Queensland Government had put up that

extra £10,000 that industry could have been operating on the Tableland today.

Mr. Hanlon: Maize Products has been operating for over 25 years.

Mr. PIE: Maize Products has been operating for the past 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Hanlon: Now, now!

Mr. PIE: I know the hon. member for Cook will bear me out because he must have been very disappointed at the time but if we had established that industry at the time we should have had today an industry employing many people instead of having to send the raw materials to the southern States. Look at the position with Kingaroy and its peanuts—the peanuts go to the Eta Peanut Company and other companies in the South, to be returned to this State as peanut paste. What is wrong with establishing the industry in the area where the peanuts are grown? Furthermore, what is wrong with establishing various industries throughout the State near the natural resources? The Government will have to do something in this connection. It is all very well for them to say that private persons should undertake these schemes. It is the duty of the Government to analyse the possibilities of industry and then submit those possibilities to private enterprise if you like. If these possibilities are handled in the right way they will receive the attention of hundreds and hundreds of men who will come to Queensland to establish and develop industries here.

I have tried to make my position in the matter very clear. I feel very strongly on this matter. I feel that the possibilities of developing industry in Queensland are unlimited. I know that, because I have analysed pretty well every town in this State and I know what can be done. I am quite willing to offer my services in an honorary capacity to any Government. That will include any advice I can give and any knowledge that I have, with one object only in view—of trying to develop industry here and stop this terrific development in the other States with nothing in Queensland. This State of Queensland will never be great until she has secondary industries, and she never will have secondary industries until the Government go out and analyse the position in each area so as to make it possible for people, not only here but overseas, to take an interest in this State of ours.

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (11.55 a.m.): The great interest taken by the hon. member for Windsor in developing secondary industries in Queensland should have the support of all hon. members, as I am certain it has the support of all the people of Queensland. I say all the people advisedly, in whatever walk of life they may be. They are all interested in the establishment of manufacturing industries here. It is true that over a period in the development of Queensland we have been mainly a primary-producing country. Our great primary industries show wonderful promise. We have been able to show that we can produce primary and other rural products as well as, if not better than, any other

part of this continent and other parts of the world. There is no reason why we should not do the same in secondary industries. It is true that the secondary industries in this State are doing remarkably well, which shows that we can do as well in them as in primary industries, if not better. We find that our engineering works, for example, are equal to if not better than those in other parts of the Commonwealth. Our sawmilling industries are better than those in any other part of Australia. The hon. member for Windsor is perfectly right in his advocacy of secondary industries, because there is no reason why we cannot develop textile industries, for example, and produce equally well as any other State of the Commonwealth, if not better. His contention for the assistance of the Government to do something now for the development of these industries is one of the finest advocacies that he can make to-day on behalf of the people of Queensland. No matter where one may go throughout the whole length and breadth of Queensland, whether in small or large communities, the people are interested in this work. It seems strange that whereas we have a fully set-up department for rural industries in Queensland we have no such set-up for our manufacturing industries. The hon. member's advocacy must appeal to the Government. It has been remarked that the Industries Assistance Act of 1929 and the amending Act of 1933 are very fine pieces of legislation to aid the development of our secondary industries. I remind hon. members that the original Act was placed on the statute-book by a non-Labour Government.

Mr. Walsh: But your Government did nothing under it.

Mr. BRAND: We find not only in this Parliament but in other Parliaments throughout Australia, assistance is given by non-Labour Governments, particularly in social development and social legislation. Let me remind the Minister for Transport that members of the Opposition have persistently in and out of season over a long number of years urged on the Labour Government the development of secondary industries in Queensland. We require their establishment and development if we are going to march with the events of tomorrow. In order that we shall have a balanced economy we must have manufacturing industries side by side with our great rural industries. Manufacturing industries have long been referred to as the handmaiden of private enterprise. With a proper balanced economy in relation to each secondary industry we shall be able to find markets for our primary industries, which in the years to come will probably show a great advance on their present production.

I urge that the remarks made by the hon. member for Windsor, who is a practical man, should be heeded by the Government. He has not come into this Parliament for any selfish motives; on the contrary, his motives are unselfish and for the welfare of the people.

Mr. Walsh: You are one of his apologists.

Mr. BRAND: I am not apologising for anybody. I am quoting the hon. member for Windsor because I believe he is doing a great service for Queensland. He is doing more than the Minister for Transport is doing in regard to the development of the industries of this State.

Mr. Farrell: Do you not think the Minister for Transport did a grand job in re-establishing the timber industry?

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member surely does not suggest the Minister for Transport should get credit for establishing the timber industry?

Mr. Farrell: I do.

Mr. BRAND: I tell the hon. member for Maryborough that before the Minister for Transport was born we had a timber industry in this State. He had nothing to do with its development.

Mr. Farrell: He did much.

Mr. BRAND: He did not do any more for the timber industry than his predecessor. I do not know what the member for Maryborough is implying when he speaks of the great work of the Minister for Transport. I do want to say that the development of secondary industry calls for our maximum effort, and the valuable advocacy of the hon. member should be heeded by the Treasurer and the Government. If we are going to have a Department of Labour and Industry we should make it a really live department on the industry side. After all, we can have a Department of Manufacturing Industry. Secondary industry is going to be one of the strong features of our development. Hon. members realise that in primary industry we cannot go full-steam ahead; lack of markets is retarding fuller development. With manufacturing industry in our midst we should be able to find places for people with good pay and living standards, because the local market and in turn a greater population will offer markets for its products. We have done very little in the past in this respect, and development in South Australia in recent years is an indication of what can be done if Governments give their full attention to the matter.

Mr. Theodore: The war was responsible for that.

Mr. BRAND: The war could be largely responsible for our development. One of the reasons why South Australia has made such progress is that there is such a thing as the Holden works. Mr. Holden holds an important position on behalf of the Federal Government, and Queensland has not one of its citizens holding such an influential position, and possibly that is why South Australian industry has developed so greatly. At least we can say that we have not made the progress South Australia has made, consequently we should look to our deficiencies in this respect. The responsibility must lie with the State. We have been able to show development in primary industry

because we have encouraged it, and if we give the same encouragement to secondary industry we shall find a great improvement in its development also. We want a balanced economy. It should be the duty of such an instrumentality as a Department of Secondary Industry to advise people as to the avenues they should follow in developing manufactured goods. In other debates I have said it would be useless to encourage people to interest themselves in the development of certain lines of industry if it was felt the Government could advise them that that industry would not be a success here, that there were insufficient markets for the product. A balance must be struck, and it can only be done by properly constituted departments with knowledge of all the factors necessary to bring about a balance between the various forms of industry in Queensland.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (12.7 p.m.): I just want to have a few gentle words with the hon. member for Windsor. This morning he got annoyed and wild. It is very unusual for the hon. member to use the word "lie" or anything of that kind, but I am not taking back anything I said. I said the hon. member came to the Government and stated that he had an industry to establish—not that he had an old-established industry, but that he had an industry to establish. He did not say that he had an old industry that wanted a little bit of rejuvenation. He told us that he could not get outside capital. He came to the Government of Queensland.

Mr. Brand: Did he go anywhere else?

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member should know. He has been long enough in this Parliament to know. The hon. member for Windsor came to the Government and said he had an industry to establish.

Mr. PIE: I did not. I rise to a point of order. I said no such thing, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Treasurer to accept the statement of the hon. member for Windsor.

Mr. HANLON: Certainly. I was just expecting the denial that is so characteristic of hon. members opposite. Let me read an authority, "Hansard" of 1941, which perhaps the hon. member for Windsor would suggest is lying also. It is the report of the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton in this Chamber in 1941. His name was Mr. Pie—

"I want to be quite open about this, as I believe in being so. I went to the Bureau of Industry cap in hand, told them I had an industry to establish . . ."

Mr. Pie: Be careful, read the rest.

Mr. HANLON: It continues—

"that I could not get outside capital to do it."

Mr. Pie: How much are you leaving out?

Mr. HANLON: These are the words the hon. member has just taken exception to when coming from me. I thought I would get him in. I did not read the statement first. I made it, knowing that he would deny it again. The report continues—

“I got a bank guarantee under the Industries Assistance Act of £5,000. Because of that guarantee that industry was established.”

Mr. Pie: It was established.

Mr. HANLON: But the hon. gentleman has just denied it. Will he hold up a flag when he is telling the truth so that we can know when to take notice of him? He has just denied it, and now he says it was established. It is very difficult to deal with hon. members opposite when they will not stick to the truth or if they do not like the truth tell the same tarradiddle all the time. If the hon. member would do as I suggest we should know where we are. It is very difficult for Ministers to take notice of hon. members who will not tell us the truth. We want to know the truth. The Government are always glad to hear any case from any member of Parliament or from any citizen of Queensland, but we want facts. We cannot afford to take any notice whatever of people who have been convicted of telling other than the truth. The hon. member proceeded to say—

“Because of that guarantee that industry was established, and to-day we are free of that guarantee and the overdraft has been paid off.”

That is the sort of thing we get in this Chamber.

Mr. Pie: The industry was established.

Mr. HANLON: A living example of the old gag that gratitude is a lively sense of favours to come. Having got his fill, having got his industry established, having come to the Government cap in hand and got a guarantee of the people's money, many of whom were walking the streets looking for a job at the time, he has the temerity to get up here and say he had to give a personal guarantee, too. My goodness, does the hon. member suggest that he is one of the favoured of the Almighty who should be able to walk into the Treasury and take a shovelful of the people's money and walk off with it at any time without any guarantee at all? If that is the type of business man he is, I would quote him as an example of the type of business man who has made necessary all the criminal legislation for dealing with company-promoters and business people in this State. Could there be anything so ridiculous? Fancy complaining that while he received an advance of £5,000 on a guarantee by the Government, he also had to mortgage his bedroom suite, or his piano or some such thing.

Mr. Pie: And I was prepared to do it. That is all right.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member now says it is all right and that he should do it, but a few moments ago he was complaining about it. The difficulty about the hon. member is that he says things for political purposes without bothering whether the statements he makes are accurate.

Mr. Pie: Like getting a fine-tooth hair comb.

Mr. HANLON: Certainly: I was delighted to be of some service to a mother of the country, and I did not make a three-penny bit out of it. One of the privileges of being a Minister in this Government is that you get many opportunities of doing little kindnesses for people, and I regard that privilege as being just as valuable to me as dividends the hon. member gets from any of the companies with which he is associated are to him.

The hon. member was loose in his facts about Maize Products Limited. He says we should have got Maize Products established in the north of Queensland. If the hon. member knows anything about Maize Products he should know that that company was established many many years ago. It was established during the last war. One of the things that struck me when I came back into the grocery business after the last war was Dandy Starch, a maize product on our shelf. We had never seen maize starch before; all our starch was rice starch. Maize Products is in a big way. Maize oil was being sold in competition with cheap olive oil and the cheap imitation salad oils that were on the market in those days, before Labour legislation cleaned up the business people who were selling these diluted oils as olive oil. That company was established in those days. The hon. member tried to make a case here to prove that by some neglect on the part of this Government Maize Products was established in the South.

Let us go further. I never know whether the hon. member is an uneducated Socialist or a mere ultra Conservative when he is speaking about secondary industries. He runs up and down the coast of Queensland with a list of remarkable opportunities that are there for successful enterprise. What is private enterprise doing about it? What is the role of the Government in their aid to industry? Let us look at that question. As far as private industry is concerned, it is the duty of the Government of the country to give every aid to legitimate business that they can reasonably give. The Government of Queensland have developed the transport systems of the State. We have developed 6,000-odd miles of railway, many thousands of miles of first-class roads. They have developed the sea transport of this country. No other State has done that. We have seven major ports and a number of smaller ones on the coast of Queensland, all well developed with all the facilities needed for shipping. We have established the State Electricity Commission, which is setting about the systematic electrification of the State. No greater aid than the provision of cheap electric power can be given to any manufacturing or secondary industry. The hon. member for Windsor must know

that. It is because of that that the Government are providing electricity. We have ordered machinery years ahead.

Mr. Pie: A public utility.

Mr. HANLON: Of course it is, but it is valuable to secondary industry in that it makes cheap electric power available to manufacturing, and that would not be available if the Government did not embark upon a policy of electrification of the State. We provide water facilities. Industry cannot continue without water. We read in the "Courier-Mail" this morning that one of the reasons given by the Brisbane City Council for the necessity of restricting water supply is the tremendous demand made upon our water supply by the new industries established in Brisbane. That is quite true. Industry does require an ample water supply and the Government have been providing it. They have been developing all these things, and on the one hand make it possible for secondary industries to be established and to carry on while at the same time providing some service and amenities to the public in general.

I am not going to admit that it is the duty of the Government to spend public money merely to establish the hon. member for Windsor or somebody else in an industry in which he can get rich at the expense of the State.

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member will only get himself into another tangle if he starts to speak again. He made a big enough mess of the last speech.

It is not our obligation merely to throw public money into a sink to be lapped up by some private company-promoter. Our duty is to make available all of these national facilities and services that will aid the establishment of industry.

This is the position we are in; if private enterprise does not seize the opportunity to get into any of these secondary industries, are the Government of Queensland justified in saying that we are going to allow the people to go without the industries, or should the State step in and establish the industries? It must be one or the other.

The hon. member says that secondary industries are a necessity in the development of the State. I agree. And so, from the Government point of view, we have provided adequate and cheap transport, facilities for electrification and water, and under the Industries Assistance Act we offer liberal financial aid for the establishment of industry. Beyond that it would be infamous for any Government to go. It is the duty of the Government to provide the essentials for the establishment of private industry, but I think it is beyond the province of the Government to provide all of the money to enable private people to establish industries. If the Government have to put in all the money, all the facilities and all the amenities as the executors for the people, then the Government must own the industries on behalf of the people. If private

enterprise likes to come in and take its place we are not preventing it from doing so, and we have offered it every possible help in that connection.

We also have on the Bureau of Industry a representative of the Secondary Industries Commission established by the Commonwealth Government.

The hon. member never mentioned the Secondary Industries Commission established by the Federal Government. He made an attack the other day and never mentioned it then either. He never mentioned the fact that Mr. S. F. Cochran had been withdrawn from the Rationing Commission to become a member of the Secondary Industries Commission, and that he is not only Queensland's liaison officer now but is also one of the Commission. I think myself we have achieved a very fine thing for the State of Queensland in having Mr. Cochran as a member of that Commission and as a member of the Bureau of Industry which is in touch with all our State activities and with the commercial world in this State. The hon. member for Windsor admits that the Bureau of Industry is regarded highly by the commercial community because he paid a glowing tribute to its usefulness. There are companies of which he has control and others where he is a shareholder large or small, but all the companies have received a circular from Mr. Cochran asking them to supply him with the necessary information to let him see what they propose to do at the end of the war—what expansion they want, in what direction, what plant and equipment they might need, any new departure in industry—all this information is being sought.

Mr. Pie: By the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HANLON: By the Secondary Industries Commission.

Mr. Pie: By the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HANLON: What does it matter? as the Secondary Industry Commission has sent out circulars seeking all this information. This is the second occasion on which the hon. member has made a bombastic speech setting himself up as the champion of industry. This is the second occasion that he has done it and never mentioned the Secondary Industries Commission. I listened to him very carefully, but at no time did he say anything about the Secondary Industries Commission or mention the fact that the State Employment Council was working in this direction. He said that the vote of £26,796 was too small, and that it should be £250,000.

Mr. Pie: That is so.

Mr. HANLON: That is utterly ridiculous. The hon. member goes on with utterly ridiculous loose talk. For instance, how could £250,000 be spent in investigating this year? It is a physical impossibility, just a farcical statement, as the hon. member knows. How are these investigations made? How does the Bureau of Industry conduct these

investigations? It has returns of all primary production, secondary production, and marketing, returns relating to shipping and railway transport, reports on overseas markets, interstate and home markets, imports—all this information is available in the various Government departments and most of the investigations consist of collating the information so that advice may be given to private enterprise should private enterprise desire to take advantage of it. Then there is the additional method of obtaining information from branches and local people, which is being done now through the employment exchange boards.

Mr. Pie: They are not making much progress.

Mr. HANLON: I think we have made remarkable progress. Only a year or so ago our troops were in New Guinea, but today we are fighting as far afield as the Philippines.

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. HANLON: Oh, of course, that does not matter—the war does not matter to the hon. member. What does going to the Philippines matter to him? How can we develop secondary industries here now and at the same time devote our whole efforts to the war, as the hon. member is fond of saying when speaking at patriotic functions. He can tune his speeches in to any wave length that may be popular for the moment.

You cannot have it both ways. We have done a remarkable job. The Commonwealth of Australia, notwithstanding mistakes, notwithstanding shortages and inconveniences—many of which might have been averted had we been apprised of events beforehand—has done wonders, and we should appreciate what has been done by soldiers, sailors, and airmen, by men and women in industry, by women in the homes. The people of this continent have done a job second to none in any part of the world. I like the airy way the hon. member for Windsor says, "That does not matter." The position is that the Government through their various activities are planning to give every possible aid to the establishment of secondary industries here. We are not going to allow the opportunity to slip by of establishing secondary industries, but, Mr. Mann, we have to be sensible enough to know the time to do these things. Definitely I say that hon. members can be assured of this: that any person approaching the Government with any proposal for the establishment of a secondary industry will get no worse treatment than the hon. member for Windsor did. I feel sure that they will have nothing to complain of.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (12.27 p.m.): I have been amused with most of the debate so far. I say amused because I have discovered that not only did the Government launch the hon. member for Windsor into Parliament but they also started him in his private business.

Mr. Hanlon: He wanted to be a Labour candidate.

Mr. AIKENS: I realise now that had the Hermit Park A.L.P. associated itself with the Q.P.P. in the recent election instead of with the working-class movement I should probably have been a Cabinet Minister instead of being ostracised. I am also astonished to learn from the Treasurer that the Bureau of Industry was established merely as an advisory board for private manufacturers. If that is so it is time the Government altered its outlook in regard to the Bureau of Industry. I believe also that it is time the Government began to instruct the administrator, or whatever you might call him, of the Bureau of Industry to get on with the job for which he was appointed and not waste time on side issues and irrelevant arguments with other bodies that are tinged with his anti-working-class views and sectarianism. Let him get on with the job for which he was appointed.

I have been impressed by the remarks made in the various debates about the need for the establishment of secondary industries in this State. I for one have come to the conclusion that for too long has Queensland been the wood-and-water joey for the rest of the Commonwealth. It is time we began to assert ourselves and establish the various industries we are capable of establishing and that are vital for our very existence as a State in competition with other States. There has been a great deal of talk about post-war building plans; this subject has received considerable attention not only at question time but in the course of discussion in this Chamber. We are told that there is need for thousands of houses in the post-war period. I have had many active discussions with those able to speak on behalf of the timber industry. The last discussion I had with Lieut.-Col. Watson, Director of War Organisation of Industry in Townsville. He informed me that he believed the timber resources of this country would not be equal to the demand for building material after this war. So it is necessary for us to look further afield and find out what other building materials are available. I know that the people of the North have not yet taken to the idea of building with brick and concrete but I can remember the time when upholstered furniture was looked at askance in the North. If we build with brick and mortar, provided the architectural designs are suitable for the tropical climate, we shall be able to construct as many brick and concrete houses in the North as we have done with wood and galvanised iron. Within 35 miles of Townsville, on the railway line, we have one of the biggest natural lime deposits in the State. Outside Townsville we have a coral reef. If the Darra cement works are able to transport coral all the way from Moreton Bay to Darra and convert it into cement economically, what is to prevent cement works from being established in the Townsville area? We have brickworks at Partington, just outside of Townsville. It is true they are in a small way but they have supplied hundreds of thousands of bricks to various establishments in the North. There is absolutely nothing to prevent those brickworks from being extended and consolidated and in conjunction with a cement works, which the Government should establish in Townsville,

supplying all the material necessary for the local post-war building programme. Although I agree with the hon. member for Windsor on the general principles that secondary industries should be fostered in the State, I disagree with him when he says that private enterprise should do it. I think the Government can do it. The Government should call upon Colin Clark to set out in detail the possibility of establishing cement works and expanding the brickworks of Northern Queensland.

Mr. Decker: The Government lost money in State enterprises.

Mr. AIKENS: It is true the Government made mistakes in State enterprises and lost money but I point out to the hon. member for Sandgate that Woolworth went broke three times before he made a fortune, Henry Ford went broke twice before he established the Ford motor industry. Every man makes errors and mistakes. I deplore the tendency in debates here to live in the past. Members ask: What did they do in 1929? I suppose we shall hear next what Sir Samuel Griffith said. I know every Cabinet has misfits and incompetents, the same as this Cabinet. Let us not live in the past; let us look confidently towards the future. I believe the Government have within their ranks men who have the vision, the courage and the enterprise to put this State first and foremost in the Commonwealth. Let them wipe out the men who live in the past and take cognisance of the views of the men who look confidently towards the future.

A Government Member: Who runs the railways?

Mr. AIKENS: I will deal with that on the Railway Estimates. I shall no doubt cause surprise and consternation when I tell the hon. member then who runs the railways. It certainly is not the Minister for Transport.

Let us deal with the matter that was touched on by the hon. member for Warrego in a very fine speech—part of it was fine; the part that did not deal with me was rather excellent, I thought—in which he drew attention to the fact that ships are being used to-day uneconomically to take our greasy wool overseas and annually take thousands of tons of dirt overseas in the form of grease in the wool. He submitted a suggestion that I submitted in my Address in Reply speech, for the establishment of wool-topping, wool-spinning and wool-carding industries in the North.

Let me give an example of carting dirt uneconomically on our northern railway system. I have pointed out from time to time that we have in the North three of the finest meatworks in Queensland. They do not kill all the cattle that come in, because of the tapering rates the department allows to the sellers to the southern meatworks to enable northern cattle to be taken south. This one thing that has impressed me and every intelligent railwayman in the North. Every day during the cattle season we worked cattle trains from Townsville to Bowen, which is the limit of our run, taking northern cattle to the southern works. Prior to the war—

this has stopped since the war but it will be in full blast after the war—on our return trip we picked up a trainload of fertiliser from Murarrie that was being sent to the northern canefields. We would take the bullocks down and bring the fertiliser, the by-product of the bullocks, back to the northern canefields from Murarrie at 19s. a ton, which would not pay for axle grease. Why could not the northern bullock be killed in the North? Why could not fertiliser works be established in conjunction with meatworks so that the northern canefields and agricultural areas could get their fertiliser on the spot? Why could not that be done?

Adjacent to Townsville, where the big meatworks are, we have the Lower Burdekin, the finest agricultural area in the State, which could be made into the fruit and vegetable garden of Australia. To-day, owing to the war, a new outlook on diet has been developed. Quite a lot of meat and vegetables is being canned to-day. Why is it necessary for Burdekin vegetables to go south and northern meat to go south, to be canned in Brisbane or Sydney into mutton and green peas, steak and vegetables, steak and kidney pie, &c., and then go north for sale again? Why could there not be a co-operative canning factory in the North using north-western and northern cattle and Burdekin fruit and vegetables? A deputation is to wait on me to-day from the northern meatworks people who desire shipping space to take the by-products from the northern meatworks to the South, where they are treated. They are killing 600-odd bullocks at one meatworks in Townsville alone. I suppose in the ordinary season 75,000 cattle are slaughtered at the two Townsville meatworks and every one of the hides goes south to be tanned. Why cannot those hides be tanned in the North?

Every one of the sheep-skins must go south to be fellmongered. Why cannot they be fellmongered on the job? Why cannot all these things be done in the North? Why cannot the manufactures be established there?

An Opposition Member: Who is stopping them?

Mr. AIKENS: What's his name—Colin Clark. He is too busy indulging in his sectarian and anti-working-class dissertations to get onto the job of placing before the Government definite plans for the establishment of these industries in the North. That is what is stopping the job. We shall never re-employ the soldiers who come back from this war if we are going to put them on shifting sand from here to there today and from there back to here tomorrow. If money is set aside for building a railway, once that line is built it is finished, if money is set aside for building a bridge, once it is built that is the end of it—money has then to be raised to build another railway or another bridge. But if in addition Government money is used to build a factory those who build it have a permanent job in the thing they have built. That is ordinary economics. Anyone even of limited intelligence should be able to understand that.

Sugar refineries have been dealt with here from time to time but I do hope that the Government in the post-war period will establish them in the North. I agree with the Treasurer that these things perhaps cannot be done now. I agree with him that our first duty is to win this war but I agree that this war can be lost militarily and also lost in the peace. I am particularly suspicious of the way the Conservative Party in Britain, the Republican Party in America, and the various other representatives of the anti-working-class parties in Australia and in the other countries are putting their heads together now for the post-war subjection of the workers, just as the workers had to submit to the pre-war subjections by these people.

After the establishment of a cement works and a brickworks, the expansion of fertiliser works, meat-canning and processing, fruit and vegetable-canning and dehydration industries in the North, the most important things are those that have been stressed by the hon. member for Warrego and supported, I think, by the hon. members for Barcoo and Gregory.

Mr. Nicklin: Do not the meatworks there make fertiliser at any time?

Mr. AIKENS: They do a little. They could make more but they cannot get the cattle to slaughter.

Mr. Nicklin: You mean to say they are wasting the by-product?

Mr. AIKENS: No, they are making all the fertiliser they can but the extra cattle they should be killing are coming south. They should kill all northern cattle in the North.

Mr. Sparkes: Give them a price.

Mr. AIKENS: They should kill all northern cattle in the North and be supplied with refrigerated cars so that northern-killed beef and not beef on the hoof could come to the Southern markets, the same as has been done in America. Another thing that will make the North go ahead is the scheme that has been submitted by the hon. members for Warrego, Barcoo, Gregory, and myself.

As to the establishment of the wool industry in the North, it is a monstrous scandal that northern wool should have to come south in the grease. Most of it comes south in the grease and most of it goes overseas in the grease. Scouring and topping can be carried out in the North. The Government will not make them do it. I think it was during my speech on the Address in Reply that the Opposition benches asked what was to prevent the people from establishing scours and other plants in the North and asked how the State could prevent the sending of the wool south for treatment. There are many ways in which the Government can make a man do something in the interests of the State.

Mr. Sparkes: The State penalises people for scouring wool in the North.

Mr. AIKENS: It may. All these things have to be considered. If the Government or some co-operative society sets up in North Queensland a plan for spinning, topping, and carding North Queensland wool this Government should insist that all northern wool be treated there. It has been suggested that the Government cannot do that. But why can they not do it? They can refuse to haul wool except to these works, refuse to grant a licence for road transport except to these works. They can refuse port facilities to all wool except that coming through these works. They can do it if they want to do it. It may cause a minor economic revolution but nevertheless we have to do something like that sooner or later. I suggest that once we have the carding and topping and the spinning of wool in the North it will be only a step to the establishment of woollen textile mills in the North.

The same can be said for cotton. It was proved, disastrously and unfortunately for the farmers, that cotton can be grown in abundance in North Queensland but at the time the farmers grew it under duress. They were robbed both by the Government and by the Commissioner appointed by the Government, Mr. Justice R. J. Douglas. I believe no more terrible judgment was ever made than that given by him. Nevertheless it was proved that they could grow cotton commercially. The industry would then be complete, from the growing of cotton in the North at rates that would compensate the farmers for growing it to the establishment of textile factories. All these things can be done if the Director of the Bureau of Industry will get down to the job and submit detailed proposals for the establishment of each one of these industries. Let him submit to the Government, for instance, plans for the establishment of the cotton industry in the North on a sound basis. Let him submit to the Government detailed comprehensive plans for establishing wool-topping and wool-carding factories in the North, and then this Government can decide whether they are going to be merely advisers to private enterprise, whether they are going to say to private enterprise, "There are all the facts and figures. If you care to go on with it we will subsidise you." If I have anything to do with it—although at present my voice is strong physically but weak politically, it will grow politically—the Government will say, "This looks a good job to us," and up will go the cotton and woollen mills in the North. Then we shall have dinki-die decentralisation. If it is left to private enterprise it will establish these industries here in This great wen of population, Brisbane. This is where they will come and in times of depression when the workers have been paid off from their sand-shifting jobs and their road-building jobs private enterprise will have an army of unemployed walking the streets, and will use them as a lever and a bludgeon on the men who are still holding down jobs. Get our industries into the country, make the country self-supporting, and you will get vitally necessary decentralisation by that progressive policy.

The iron and steel industry has been touched upon by the hon. member for Bowen. As one who virtually grew up in the North-West—certainly I grew up politically there—it is shocking to think that these national assets, those many magnificent iron-ore deposits in north-western Queensland are merely a home for bandicoots and wallabies. In one mountain alone just outside Cloncurry, Black Mountain, there are hundreds of thousands of tons of high-grade iron-ore that could be easily treated. In Bowen we have abundant supplies of coal, yet this Government have stalled, procrastinated—that is all they have done, because they had the report of the Public Works Commission on the Iron and Steel Industry to work on—in the establishment of that industry, which would go a long way in developing North Queensland.

Mr. Foley: How would you get the iron ore to the works?

Mr. AIKENS: I do not suppose you would carry it there on your shoulder; I suppose you would carry it by rail or some other means of transport.

Mr. Foley: At ordinary rates?

Mr. AIKENS: When Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. was putting the screw on the New South Wales Government it was able to say, "We want to establish our iron and steel works in Newcastle and bring the iron-ore to the coal, but if you do not give us the concession we require we can just as simply take the coal to the iron-ore," so that, economically, anything is possible. If they like they can take the iron-ore to the coal, which I suggest they should do, because the coal is near the seaport, or, if they prefer it, they can take the coal to the iron-ore. Perhaps at the present time the establishment of an iron and steel works may not be economically possible, but do the Government know whether it is? Has Mr. Clark reported on the economic possibility of it? He has not. He presents a stereotyped report to Parliament every year, and in the meantime makes statements on behalf of the Government, which he is not entitled to do, and in his spare time he indulges in anti-working-class and sectarian arguments that do not come within the ambit of his job at all.

The first things we need are courage and vision. We have in this Government party men with courage and vision, and my job here is to make the best elements of the Government party endure, not to do as the hon. member for Windsor suggested—break the party down so that he can climb to power on the ruins and wreckage. That is far from my mind. I would decapitate him politically tomorrow if I had the chance. The only way to make the party endure is to push to the forefront men with the courage and vision to say, "There is the great North, there is the greatest area in Australia so far as potentialities for development are concerned. Let us then instruct our economic advisers to submit to us concrete plans for the development of that great area. Let us then submit those plans to Parlia-

ment, and then let us go on first of all with the best of them and enlarge on the programme later until we make North Queensland what it should always be—the great heart of Australia.

Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) (12.47 p.m.): I am just as interested as any other member, and so are the Government, in seeing that secondary industries are established at all possible places in the State. From time to time we hear hon. members say what should be done and what is not being done, but they always forget to mention the things that have been done by this Government over the years.

I have a warm regard for North Queensland because I believe that its possibilities are unbounded and that there would not have been the progress and development that have taken place up to the present if it had not been for the sound, determined and courageous policy of the Labour Government in this State. I think hon. members should be reminded of that and of the fact that if it had not been for the policy of the Labour Government in the sugar industry that industry would not have been able to supply Australia's sugar requirements in the present war.

Mr. Yeates: That is questionable.

Mr. THEODORE: It is not questionable because during the last war Australia had to import something like 109,000 tons of sugar at an average cost of £37 a ton and at the end of the war, somewhere about 1921, a further 50,000 to 60,000 tons had to be imported at a cost of over £70 a ton. There would have been no chance for the sugar industry and the people engaged in it to become sufficiently organised and developed to achieve the results it has achieved up to date on the wages and industrial conditions and the conditions between miller and grower that prevailed before the Labour Government introduced their legislation to provide for the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board and later in 1923 to provide for the establishment of the Sugar Board to acquire the total sugar output on behalf of the Government for sale through proper marketing channels. If it had not been for the sugar industry and the other industries established because of its success, we should not have been able to defend North Queensland or indeed Queensland at all as we have done it in the past two or three years. For instance, we could not have done it had it not been for the construction of the railway link from Rockhampton to Cairns connecting the North with the South, which was undertaken by the Labour Government many years ago. These are matters that cannot be overlooked and when we are prone to criticise the Labour Government it is well to bear in mind what the Labour Government have done for the future advancement and development of the State.

I realise that we must pay strict regard to the establishment of secondary industries and that we must look for considerable expansion in our rural industries too but we cannot

expect to establish secondary industries until we feel confident of being able to do so without increasing expenditure to an extent that would wreck our war effort. That is all that has held us back in the establishment of industries in Queensland in the past three or four years. I have heard hon. members opposite condemn hon. members on this side who have advocated the expenditure of money on the establishment of secondary industries or of other industries while the war still remained to be won. The Government have not been deterred by the bemoanings of hon. members opposite and indeed they have proceeded to the establishment of a State Employment Council with district exchange boards and five committees representative of the various sections of industry, on which there are some members of Parliament representatives. It is a duty of these committees to deal with the various proposals or projects submitted to them by any of the 25 boards throughout the State. Any private individual or any public body that is sufficiently interested in a plan or scheme may submit it through the local exchange board to the appropriate committee for careful consideration with a view to its adoption by the Government. Those are matters we are all concerned about but we should tackle the most important matter first. I do not think it is possible at this juncture to undertake some of the schemes that have been suggested, as they will require an enormous expenditure, but I do say it is possible, as well as practicable and reasonable, that those schemes that have been recommended by the proper authorities be investigated if it was possible to get the necessary expert advice.

Mr. Pie: They are doing it in other States.

Mr. THEODORE: Yes, as far as possible. One of the most urgent schemes in this State, which is tremendously valuable and rich in natural resources, that should receive the fullest possible investigation is in relation to its water-courses, with a view to conserving water for irrigation and the production of cheap electric power. No matter whom one may talk to in North Queensland everybody realises the richness of the territory he lives in. These people are anxious that something should be done with it. They are expecting that something will be done if not immediately then as soon as the time is opportune after the war. We have in the North tremendous timber assets, for instance, on which we are drawing to a tremendous extent at the present time. That would not have been possible had it not been for the foresight of a Labour Government in establishing roads in those areas. These timber resources have proved of incalculable value to the Commonwealth in its great war effort. I have heard members of the Opposition criticise the Government for being extravagant in establishing those works, particularly the Kirrama Range road, which runs for 25 to 30 miles into the timber areas. We had various views from those people, notwithstanding that they had inspected and realised the magnitude of the job. I do not blame them in any way for questioning whether the

undertaking would be profitable, because nothing but immense tracts of jungle could be seen on either side of the road. The construction of the road has enabled a wonderful asset to be converted to national use, and therefore the expenditure on it has been justified. Large supplies of timber have been drawn over the road from that area.

The development of our water resources will make it quite feasible to use many timbers now considered to have no commercial value for the manufacture of paper pulp. Paper pulp is in great demand and will be in greater demand after the war and wonderful possibilities exist in that area for the establishment of a paper-pulp factory. That industry will not be possible without cheap electric power. I say that for the purpose of ascertaining the greatest benefit that can be derived from the utilisation of our rivers in North Queensland an investigation committee composed of competent experts should be set up. I know such a committee will be created. I know that at the present time the State Electricity Commission is making certain recommendations for the expansion and linking up of the electrical systems in various northern towns. We should not delay any further in inquiring into the utilisation of our northern rivers for a supply of cheap electricity.

The member for Windsor was in a unique position during his last term in Parliament. He sat midway between the two sides of the House. He was able to agree with us on this side and he was able to agree with the members on the other side; and it did not matter much to the hon. member whether he agreed or disagreed, he was in the position to say, "That is my independent opinion and I am free to use it." Now he is in a totally different position; he is brought into line and has to follow one line of thought on many matters that are brought up in this Chamber.

An hon. member spoke about Holdens, the motor-body builders in South Australia. For many years that firm has been making motor bodies in Adelaide, and making a very good job of them. I have often asked why they could not make the motor itself, and the reply I got—and I could not refute it—was "You have not the population, therefore you have not the local market, and it would be uneconomic, and you could not possibly compete with countries like America, which mass-produce motor-cars." But when the war came we found that even if they could not make motor-cars they could make tractors and very high-class aeroplane engines and planes. I look forward to the day when we shall launch out on our own. We may lose something for the time being, but I do not suppose many businesses are successful right from the start. As the hon. member for Windsor pointed out, he suffered from financial difficulties at the start. We must look ahead and plan to meet the current conditions, which will rapidly change as soon as this war ends. It is not reasonable to expect us to be able to undertake some of these things at the present time.

Mr. Pie: They should be planned though.

Mr. THEODORE: On dozens of occasions I have stated that I agreed with the action of the Government in making plans as the Treasurer has outlined the Government are doing, and preparing for the near future, but we were condemned by members opposite.

The hon. member for Mundingburra mentioned the fact that bullocks were being carted from the North to Brisbane and fertiliser was being carted back to the North. Probably it is not practicable to do that today owing to war conditions, but I think that went on before the war and the reason for it I do not know. I do know they carted zinc concentrates to Japan and since the war they have had to send it to Tasmania because they have no up-to-date electrolytic treatment plant in this State. It should be possible to provide such a plant, but the electrical power must be cheap. These things will be overcome when we are able to utilise our resources for the production of cheap electric power, which is essential.

I am not parochial but I have spoken before of the importance of this great coal deposit in Blair Athol and I think I am justified in referring to it again.

It would be money well spent if £2,000 was allocated to the making of a thorough investigation into the amount of coal available there. But the development of that coal seam may involve a considerable outlay in providing railway transport to the coast. That scheme links up with the North Queensland scheme and would be a tremendous asset to this State.

The hon. member for Mundingburra suggested a sugar refinery in Townsville. I have often thought that a sugar refinery there would be a great asset to the North but I realise that there are some difficulties in the way of the establishment of a refinery in a district in which it is not possible to keep it working continuously through the year. That is one of the reasons, I understand, why a refinery is not established in the North.

As to the stress laid on the need for Governments to rush in headlong to give help or force the establishment of industries without proper investigation, we must not overlook the fact that a Government have great responsibilities. They are the guardians of the public purse and must see to it that money is not squandered. In my electorate a butter factory was established. Fortunately it is only a small concern, but although every effort has been made for its success, it finds it is unable to meet its financial obligations. Various conditions have brought about its failure. A Government cannot rush in headlong without satisfying themselves that eventually not only will they get back their money but that the people concerned will be able to carry on successfully. Therefore a Government have to exercise care in regard to the expenditure of public moneys.

Mr. Yeates: There is such a thing as being too slow.

Mr. THEODORE: I agree they should not hesitate where it is possible to render aid in establishing an industry, as soon as it is shown that it can be established on sound lines.

Many people advocated the establishment of the rubber industry in Australia, being of the opinion that it would be a success but after the receipt of certain information, which no doubt other hon. members also have received, the Government took the precaution of establishing an experimental station at South Johnstone. The Commonwealth Council for Scientific and Industrial Research also made certain investigations. When in Melbourne I interviewed those people and they proved to me that it would be uneconomic in North Queensland at any rate, one of the reasons being that it could not compete with the labour conditions of the sugar industry, which is already established there—the labour conditions would have to be similar to those in the sugar industry to make it at all satisfactory.

Mr. Luckins: What about power alcohol?

Mr. THEODORE: At the present time the power alcohol distillery at Sarina has been restricted. I understand the production is only half its capacity, but there are possibilities in power alcohol and there will be other discoveries that will be of great advantage to the various industries of Queensland. The Government are fully aware of their responsibilities in regard to the secondary industries that will be of vital importance to this State immediately the war ends. I know they will not fail in that respect.

Mr. Decker: What about fisheries?

Mr. THEODORE: That is one of the things that should receive immediate attention. In the North there is to be found one of the greatest sources of fish supply in Australia and this could be very advantageous to the industrial life of Queensland. The Government must go ahead and investigate the possibilities of all these matters with a view to meeting the demand that will inevitably be made on them to provide the service men and all others concerned with security and permanence of employment that are necessary after the war.

Mr. L. J. BARNES (Cairns) (2.27 p.m.): I appreciate the obstacles confronting the establishment of secondary industries in North Queensland and I also realise that as the sugar industry is only a seasonal industry other industries are needed to give employment to the people during the slack. In peace-time there is employment for approximately only 50 per cent. of those engaged in the sugar industry for six or seven months of the year. That being so, both the Government and private enterprise must find ways of employing the people during the slack season so that their earnings over the 12 months average at least the basic wage.

The hon. member for Mundingburra has suggested that these new industries should be in the form of State enterprise.

Mr. Aikens: Or co-operative.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The hon. member suggested that before the lunch hour. We know that State enterprises are a thing of the past so far as this Government are concerned. They have had their experience of that policy and it has gone to its grave.

Mr. Collins: Would you include the Commonwealth Bank in that?

Mr. Gair: Or the State Government Insurance Office?

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The State Government Insurance Office marks time with the combines. If these industries are to be established then I urge that they be in the nature of co-operative societies, not State enterprises. One hon. member asked about fishing. I might point out that I told the people of Cairns that at least 10,000 workers could be employed in the fishing industry in Cairns and north of Cairns in the very near future. I know that is possible, as is proved by the experience of a little town called Antigonish, in Nova Scotia, where at one time the population numbered 1,800. Someone got the idea that the lobster industry might have possibilities and within nine years there were 50,000 people engaged in the lobster industry in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. That proves what can be done by establishing a co-operative society that is co-operative in the true sense, under which the workers share in the profits.

So far as State enterprises are concerned, I have yet to learn that the railway employees have enjoyed any dividend from the Railway Department.

Mr. Collins. They should have had a big dividend in the last year or two.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The men who have been responsible for that £3,000,000 surplus in the Railway Department have shortened their lives by five or 10 years in making that effort. They have worked hard, and I make so bold as to say that if private enterprise had been employing them under those circumstances some appreciation for this huge surplus would have been shown to them.

I hope that the Government will co-operate with private enterprise in seeing that co-operative and not State enterprises are established in North Queensland. It must be admitted that any State enterprise is without heart or soul. No-one is the boss and nobody cares, with the result that although 50 per cent. of the employees might be interested in their work the other 50 per cent. are interested in sabotaging it to a certain extent, because there is no encouragement or incentive.

Mr. Aikens: Will you say that off the election platform?

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I have said that if a monopoly cannot be controlled in any other way I have no hesitation in saying that we shall have to socialise industries, but it

must be pointed out that if the State gets a monopoly of industry you have only the one employer. In Russia there is only one employer and the weakness in that system has been found out.

I admit of course that the people there are now getting more choice in the matter than they did eight to 10 years ago. Let us hope that it is not proposed to re-establish State enterprises and that the State proposes instead to work with private enterprise and co-operative societies. I am not even suggesting that the Government should subsidise someone to the extent of £25,000 just to start a big industry but I believe in the co-operative movement, in which the co-operative is the worker and the shareholder and so shares the profits.

Mr. Devries: High financiers may attempt to sabotage the venture.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I am well aware of the depredations of the high financier and how he has tried to put a spoke into the wheel of co-operative societies in various parts of the world, but there is plenty of evidence to prove that the high financier has been defeated in other countries where the co-operative system conducted on the Rochdale plan have been a huge success. Private monopolies were not powerful enough to beat them. There are, however, few big monopolists in this country and so far as hon. members in the Country Party are concerned I do not believe that they represent monopolists although they do represent the farmer and small industrialists. The big industrialist operates with an octopus grip that is sometimes unseen. If the Government require any new evidence of the success of the co-operative movement over big monopolists they will find it in the other countries of the world.

In mentioning the fishing industry in the North I am reminded of the fact that I have submitted to the Treasurer a scheme on behalf of four engineers in North Queensland dealing with the canning of shark-oil and other matters. These men know what they are about. The possibilities of the shark-oil industry are unlimited; they have never been adequately exploited. Then there are extensive possibilities in connection with shelling and pearling. There are other industries in the North capable of considerable development. I have in mind the firm of James Johnston, sawmillers, who during the war were asked to convert their plant to shipbuilding to a certain extent and when they started they did not even have a slip but it is amazing to see the work they have been able to do in the building of barges. I am not sure but I think they can build a 700- to 800-tonner on the slip with a little more machinery and were moving along very nicely until the Federal Government started to play ducks and drakes by asking them to sack approximately 100 men at a minute's notice. The manager communicated with Canberra and said he could not sack 100 at a minute's notice. However, the Government decided to give them more work. A great deal of work was being carried out for the Americans.

The whole thing clearly indicates the possibilities of ship construction in North Queensland. Much of the foundry work was coming down as far as Walkers Ltd., Maryborough, but there is no doubt that the North has wonderful possibilities in all industrial directions. James Johnston did not have a recognised shipwright when they began the construction of barges.

I should now like to refer to the important subject of fertilisers. The hon. member for Mundingburra said that the freight on it was 19s. a ton but I think hon. members will recall that on a previous occasion I complained that the railways were carrying munitions and would not carry fertilisers. The freight on fertiliser from Cairns to Brisbane, a distance of 1,000 miles, is about £1 a ton. I am not going into the merits or demerits of that matter at the moment. Common sense tells us that we should produce a certain amount of fertiliser in North Queensland if it is necessary, but I want to make the point that it appears to me from a layman's study of the statistics relating to fertiliser that artificial manures are not of such great assistance we believe them to be. Sir Herbert Howard, former director of the Institute of Plant Industry in Indore, Central India, a man of whom we should take some notice, said that the growth of parasites and disease is traced to the use of artificial manures.

Mr. Theodore: You would do very little good without them.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I do not want the hon. member to anticipate what I am going to say. Sir Herbert Howard points out that modern capitalism in agriculture ruins the soil. He says that he transfers from capital to current account or in other words that the fertility of the soil is gradually depreciated although he may get a temporary increase in production.

As the hon. member for Herbert well knows, one can go round in his electorate or in the Cairns district and gather statistics to prove that where the land has been heavily fertilised—I do not care whether it is with blood and bone fertiliser or some other fertiliser, although some fertilisers are more dangerous than others—the sugar farmers got 30 tons of sugar to the acre 30 years ago prior to using artificial fertiliser on inferior land, whereas they got only 15 tons now with fertiliser. It is recognised that sugar must be grown as a rotational crop. It has been proved—and I have heard officers of the Department of Agriculture and Stock confirming it—that sugar farmers must decide in favour of rotational crops. But apart altogether from this aspect of cultivation, the fact remains that the prosperity of the North depends on the sugar industry, but it is very doubtful whether the sugar industry will prosper after the war. Probably four years after the conclusion of the war we shall be compelled to find new markets or fresh contracts for our surplus sugar. It is very doubtful whether we can induce England to pay us £4 a ton more for our surplus sugar than she can buy it on the world's markets. I have stated over and

over again on the soap-box that unless our sugar farmers go in for mixed farming, thus putting their eggs into two or three baskets, they may suffer a serious setback. Statistics tend to show that. Even England has become 33½ per cent. more self-supporting in primary production than before the war.

Mr. Devries: Does that not apply more or less to all products?

Mr. L. J. BARNES: It applies more or less to all products. We export our surplus sugar, wool, wheat, butter and other primary commodities to England and overseas countries. It behoves every farmer to become as self-supporting as possible in order to be able to feed at least his own family. Quite a number of farmers in North Queensland grow sugar and sugar only. They buy even their own vegetables.

Mr. Devries: They believe in the principle of "Live and let live."

Mr. L. J. BARNES: That is so, but I am forecasting that the man engaged in the sugar industry will have to enter other lines as well. You cannot blame him for growing sugar and sugar only today. He is hedged in with restrictions, including rationing. I believe that if the facts are placed before the sugar farmer that he will voluntarily put his eggs in two or three baskets. It is absurd to say that some of the land now growing sugar can grow sugar only. The position is safe enough while the war is on and the present method of assignments is in force. As some have pointed out, it is probably time that the method of assigning cane lands was abolished, as sugar rationing is in force.

Mr. Devries: They have their cane assignments in peace-time.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I know that. Fortunately we had the consumers in peace-time because England carried us on her back, so to speak, by taking our surplus sugar and giving us £4 a ton more for it than she could buy it for elsewhere, but we have no assurance that England will be able to give us a pick-a-back in this direction after the war. There is a possibility that after the war sugar farming will suffer a setback unless the growers decide to put their eggs in two or three different baskets.

A very important conference of those interested in the future of North Queensland was held the other day at Cairns. It was attended by representatives of various organisations throughout the area. I recommend hon. members to read the "Cairns Post" of about the 10th or 11th instant for they will find in it some very interesting reading about the North by people who know something of its possibilities. It is all very well getting up in this Committee and talking about North Queensland, but the representatives at this conference, who came from all parts of the North, contributed much logic to its deliberations. This is a statement made by Fred C. Hodel—

"The highest mountains of Australia exist in the coastal range between Townsville and Cooktown. The heaviest annual

rainfall occurs in that belt, with the result that these conditions conjointly create a dozen or more splendid waterfalls, some of which have a head of over 2,000 feet. There is no area in Australia with such what might be called permanent power possibilities."

I stop here to mention that when Dr. Evatt, the Federal Attorney-General, went to Cairns and was told of this, he said it was impossible. The Mayor of Cairns, Alderman Collins, challenged him on the matter but I have not heard Dr. Evatt's answer.

I should like to mention the possibilities of power in North Queensland. Mr. Hodel, continuing, said—

"Convert the power falling hourly, daily, and annually into electricity and you have ample power for a dozen or more large manufactories.

"Once harnessed, this power is not affected by the whims of an unsatisfactory young woman or a hot-headed youth who has lost his dinner crib. Silly strikers would have no control over the power unless they adopted sabotage tactics. The number of men employed in the hydro-electricity department is, however, so small in proportion to the power produced as to cut out that danger from consideration. The power would exist hourly, daily, monthly and yearly without delaying for want of sandshoes.

"Add to those advantages what has often been described as the largest and finest area of agricultural land in Australia, most of which is waiting for the hand of man to convert into wealth. The coast lands with their humidity and hot sun produce heavier crops of sugar cane than elsewhere in the Commonwealth, while the large area of rich volcanic soil on the Tableland, 2,000 feet above sea level, is capable of enormous agricultural development of products requiring a cooler atmosphere.

"Not so very far away with the modern speed transport reducing distance so rapidly lies some of the most thickly-populated countries of the world with a reproduction rate far in excess of that of Australia. What is going to happen in the distant future? The overflow of population of Asia must find an outlet and the nearest poorly populated country will assuredly be Australia—the northern part. The demands of Christianity will insist upon the admission of Asiatics into the north if it is kept empty in years to come, unless the Australian Government exhibit a greater desire to people the North. This can best be done by promptly harnessing the existing latent powers and creating or encouraging factories to utilise that power.

"Build up a manufacturing community in the North and agriculture will develop proportionately. The conditions exist for the employment of many millions of people in the area north from Townsville. Agriculture is not like mining. The latter gradually vanishes as the mines are worked out, but the soil when supported by

humidity, ample sunlight and replenishment by various crops, will continue to produce practically for ever. I often recall the remark made to me by a former Government Geologist, who stated he had seen all the lands from Wyndham in West Australia to Cape York Peninsula, and if he were a young man seeking a centre for settlement it would be in the Cairns district, where the possibilities for future development were the greatest of any he knew.

"Have we not driving force enough in the district to place the claims forcibly before the Canberra authorities?"

Mr. Walsh: You want to keep the fires off your ranges up there, too.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The Minister says that you want to keep the fires off your ranges. I am well aware of how watchful they are. The Minister knows that the fires arise within the Crown lands, and the Naturalists' Society has been asking the Government to put out their own fires and telling them it would co-operate with them if they will give them more assistance to put out the fires on Crown lands. When the Minister went to Cairns he promised to send a man up from the department and I think about a week ago the man went along. He was met by different bodies including the Naturalists' Society and they talked about keeping fires off the Crown lands.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the hon. member a considerable amount of latitude. I hope he will connect his remarks with the matter before the Committee—the Bureau of Industry.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The Minister drew me off the track, but I gave him a reasonably good answer.

I wish to quote a few little things from the North. Hon. members have probably all heard of Councillor Tully. The following are extracts from the report in the "Cairns Post" of a conference that was held in the North:—

"Mr. Tully dealt with the question of the mining industry. He moved—

"That the Federal Government be requested to arrange for the personnel of the recently appointed Mining Panel to carry out a complete examination and survey of North Queensland's mineral resources so as to formulate a post-war mining policy for this part of the Commonwealth, and that it be a recommendation that as an adjunct to such survey that a thorough investigation be made of the Chillagoe district as to the possibility of the manufacture of cement on an economic basis."

"Councillor Gardner strongly urged the establishment of a cement industry. There were 1,500 people at Chillagoe when the smelters closed but today he thought the population was only about 100."

It is not my point to talk about Chillagoe—the Government are well acquainted with it—but I do bring under notice some of the suggestions made at this important conference

at Cairns. The fishing industry was mentioned by the president of the chamber of commerce. The report continues—

“Mr. D. Headrick moved and Mr. G. H. Griffith seconded, that the Commonwealth Government be requested to thoroughly investigate this industry as far as relates to the establishment of such in or around Cape York Peninsula.”

There are some very interesting submissions. They talked of dairying and cheese-making and then the Mayor of Cairns, dealing with a canning factory, moved—

“That the Federal Government be requested to investigate the economic possibility of establishing a canning factory in Cairns or district with a view to creating new industries and that the Commonwealth Government be urged in the interests of the establishment of secondary industries in North Queensland to grant a concession by way of a rebate of taxation or a sliding scale or grant a subsidy equal to such taxation until such industries are firmly established.”

The tobacco industry is mentioned and there is a suggestion that they should have central selling sheds. We know this is a long-felt want. There is also reference to the tourist trade service to Green Island, the possibilities of which are unlimited, as you know, Mr. Mann.

As you know too, Mr. Mann, for a number of years Cairns has been trying to get sewerage. We realise there are obstacles in the way but at this convention it was moved that the State Government be urged to investigate sewerage schemes for various cities and towns in North Queensland and that the Government be asked to take early action to drain swamps in populated areas. There are a number of areas in North Queensland owned by the State authorities and they are the breeding grounds for malaria. I suggest that they be attended to urgently.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (2.52 p.m.): I was mostly interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Mundingburra on private industry. He gave instances of how secondary industries could be of great benefit to the North and whereas I agree to a great extent that that part of the State has been neglected I do not think any hon. member, not even the hon. member for Windsor, touched on the real reason why until the advent of war Queensland had been neglected so far as secondary industries are concerned. I want to lay this right at the door, not of the present Treasurer although he was a member of the Government but of the Government who today occupy the Government benches. They are very much responsible for it by the high rate of company taxation they imposed. That is one of the great reasons why secondary industries drifted to the South—a rate of 2s. in the £1 as against approximately 13s. in the £1.

Mr. Walsh: Why don't you be honest about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed hon. members a great deal of latitude and I suppose I am rather to blame for the fact that the debate has got out of hand but I draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the vote before the Committee is that for the Bureau of Industry and I hope the hon. member will keep to that point, and not drag in side issues.

Mr. SPARKES: Thank you, Mr. Mann. I am more or less in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not a matter whether private enterprise or State enterprise should be the order of the day, and I will now restrict the debate to the vote for the Bureau of Industry.

Mr. Collins: It makes it very awkward.

Mr. SPARKES: Without in any way debating your ruling, Mr. Mann—and I would not do that for a moment as I have been here too long—you will admit that hon. members brought in these side-issues. I listened to the hon. member for Windsor and also the hon. member for Mundingburra.

Mr. Power: Because of the Chairman's generosity.

Mr. SPARKES: It is a pity that his generosity has not continued a little further. I have pointed out to hon. members opposite the position so far as private enterprise is concerned. I do not know whether the Bureau of Industry controls the matter to which I am about to refer but we have still Government enterprise of our railway system. I intended drawing the attention of the hon. member for Mundingburra to that. He is very desirous of having the Bureau of Industry establish many Government enterprises and I presume I am in order in saying that if that is the position there would probably be similar institutions to the railways.

Mr. Walsh: What about your bullocks if you did not have the railways?

Mr. SPARKES: In reply I would tell the hon. gentleman that my bullocks have frequently got into a damn bad way because of the railways and their slowness in taking them to market. On the other hand it is possible my bullocks have kept the railways going by the high rates charged on them. However, as we cannot speak on private enterprise as opposed to Government enterprise, I do not wish to take further part in the debate.

Mr. COLLINS (Cook) (2.56 p.m.): I have taken a deep interest in the vote before the Committee because the future of Australia is very largely wrapped up in the development of our industries both primary and secondary. We cannot have migration and carry the population we expect to have in this country unless it becomes a big industrial nation. We do not wish to build up our population merely for the sake of having a large population. From the defence point of view, apart from anything else, it is essential to have it and the only way this continent can carry such a population is by the

development of our industries. The Bureau of Industry was established for the very purpose of assisting both primary and secondary industries to become established, but I am not clear as to the functions of the bureau and I should like the Treasurer in his reply to make a statement more or less as to the ramifications of that organisation.

As I understand the present position, if one desires to establish a factory, to develop some primary, secondary or manufacturing industry, and if Government aid is sought, one submits the scheme to the Bureau of Industry. The bureau then investigates the proposal and informs the proponent as to whether it is sound enough to warrant the investment of Government funds. I have submitted schemes in connection with maize on the Atherton Tableland and received a very good hearing but I think the bureau should go a little further. It should have power to make a wider investigation, to embark on research along the lines of that conducted by the C.S.I.R. I could name a dozen possible schemes for the North, without knowing in any way whether they are practicable. I have not the ability to decide that.

Mr. Pie: But they are worthy of investigation.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes. There are several people who have enough money to undertake certain schemes if some department was available to them such as the Bureau of Industry that had investigated all these proposals from a business point of view and had the information available. Any information collected by the bureau could be tabulated for the benefit of prospective investors at a later date. Of its own initiative the bureau should undertake investigation into certain works or it could inquire into projects or industries on behalf of industrial bodies, both co-operative and private. All information collected would be of value not only at the time of investigation but even five years afterwards, if anyone became interested in that or a similar proposal and wanted information concerning it. By being able to obtain all necessary information immediately, he could avoid delay.

Mr. Nicklin: You must have read the Country Party's policy speech.

Mr. COLLINS: I have read it and approve of a good deal of it, because much of it has been copied from the Premier's policy speech. That which has been copied is good. This Bureau of Industry could be of great help in the establishment of industries.

Mr. Pie: But it has to be expanded.

Mr. COLLINS: It must be if it is to cover the field that I should like to see it cover. I agree that Mr. Colin Clark is a very valuable officer to the Government and that he has done excellent work in compiling statistics. I doubt if anyone could find much fault with his work in that sphere but I have not the same faith in his capacity to forecast the possibilities of the future. No person who has a knowledge of govern-

mental or private activities can overestimate the value of keeping careful records of what has happened in the past.

When it comes to forecasting, as Mr. E. G. Theodore once said, they are very like the stern lights of a ship—they can tell you very plainly the path over which they have come but cannot tell you the track you are to follow any more than any other person.

Mr. Pie: I think that Mr. Forgan Smith's description is more apt—that they should be on tap, not on top.

Mr. COLLINS: That is a very good one too. The Director of the Bureau of Industry, in the May issue of "Economic News" says—

"Complete industrial self-sufficiency for Australia would mean reducing the agricultural and pastoral population of Australia to about half of its 1939 level. It would mean the disappearance, not only of farming population, but also of many of the country towns which are in economic equilibrium with the farming population. It would mean a wholesale depopulation of Queensland and Western Australia and still further concentration of population in Melbourne and Sydney."

With that statement I entirely disagree. I agree that up to a point we must admit imports to this country but unless we are willing to do our own work here in the development of our markets we shall always be servile so far as the prices of primary products are concerned. If we have to compete on the markets of the world with the bulk of our primary produce then the farmers will have no hope of salvation, at least not in the near future, because they have to compete against those of countries with lower wages and inferior conditions. If we have to do that entirely, as is more or less suggested by the Director of the Bureau in his statement, we shall be reduced to the level of coolies and no-one wants to see that.

Let me make a brief review of what secondary industries have done for this country. It was only at the beginning of this century that we were able to build up any sort of industrial policy because before that we had no united control over imports and exports, but since Federation there has been a measure of control that has been employed to build up an Australian industry. From 1901 to 1937 the increase in real national income in Australia was from 665 units to 1,212 units. New Zealand, where production has risen from 880 units in 1901 to 1,770 units in 1937, has very much the same history. These figures have been compiled by the same gentleman who wrote the report and they show that secondary industries have been responsible for almost doubling the national wealth since the beginning of the century. Why then should we be afraid of establishing more secondary industries, which can do for us exactly what secondary industries have done for us in the past?

The statement by Mr. Colin Clark is challenged by another economist in whom I have a great deal of faith, Sir David Rivett, who

argues that we must build an industrial policy and unless we can build up industries in this country we cannot find a market for our primary produce. Where should we have been in this country if we had not had the big Australian market to sustain the price of our butter? It was done through the building of Australian industries. That is why I cannot follow the Director of the Bureau of Industry in his statement concerning the future of industry in this country. I believe that the salvation of this country lies in a balanced economy—in the building up of secondary industries so as to consume the output of our primary industries and so that we can in turn further develop export industries, as has happened in other countries.

The Director of the Bureau makes this further statement in the May issue of "Economic News"—

"The ideal of national self-sufficiency, like so many other bad things in the modern world, originated in Germany, as a preparation for aggressive war."

I contend that that statement cannot be sustained, because long before 1914 and ever since the American civil war the United States of America has been building secondary industries in that country. The people there argued that it was only by building secondary industries that they could successfully develop their primary industries and when they went in for a policy of self-sufficiency, as it may be called, they began to progress and so the country has become one of the greatest nations of the world. Since 1860 America has been able to develop her industries and increase her population so that she occupies the pinnae on which we see her today, but when she undertook to expand her industries and develop her country the position there was almost identical with that of the primary industries in Australia today. If she was able to do it, why cannot we do it also? We have good reason for building up these industries. One of the main reasons is to populate our country for its defence. That is a paramount reason why we should do our own work, so that if we are called on at any future time we also might do our own fighting. In that respect, while I think Mr. Colin Clark is a great economist, I cannot entirely agree with some of his statements as to the possibilities of building up the future.

Mr. Maher: He is a very colourful figure and a powerful personality.

Mr. COLLINS: I give the hon. member all that in.

Mr. Bruce: So was Jack Johnson.

Mr. COLLINS: He was very colourful indeed.

The Government have been very generous in their assistance in the establishment of many primary industries. For many years hon. members both on the Opposition and Government benches, know that primary producers desirous of establishing a butter factory had to find only one-third of its cost, and in many cases not even that—it was necessary for them to supply only one-third of the total

share capital. That applies to the establishment of bacon factories or sugar mills also. In fact, the Government have borne the entire cost of sugar mills in order to give the sugar industry a start.

Something has been said about establishing a maize products industry on the Atherton Tableland. I know more about that than I think any other hon. member, as I have been associated with the matter since its inception. In the first place, the Government constructed the Atherton maize silos as a possible nucleus of a maize-products plant—the first essential was storage. That is why storage was paid such attention to originally. These silos were erected without the farmers' being required to put up any money whatsoever. The whole of the £70,000, the original cost of the silos, together with an additional expenditure of £15,000 for improvements, was found by the Government without the farmers finding one penny. Since then, they have been asked to pay interest and redemption on the loans. The whole business is sound.

Mr. Pie: The farmers pay interest and redemption.

Mr. COLLINS: That is so, but the Government have not been unduly hard and the farmers have not paid redemption since the war started. The investment is sound. After that, the Atherton Maize Board spent £1,000 approximately of its own money in having complete investigations made of the costs and ramifications of a maize-products factory. It has collected all the data possible—very valuable data too. The farmers, as far as I know—and I know them pretty well; they are not a united body at the present time—are doubtful whether such a factory would be a wise business venture for them. The maize-products factory in Melbourne was established during the last war by the lolly manufacturers, who combined to find the necessary capital, because they could not import glucose for lolly-making. That was the foundation of the company. We have found on investigation that nearly all the lolly manufacturers are more or less tied up to the present maize-products factory, and that we should have to look overseas for the bulk of the market for the products of our factory. That took away a good deal of the attractiveness of the proposal. Nevertheless, it has some possibilities, because the maize now has to be transported to the South and the by-products in turn must be imported into this State from the South. If a maize-products factory was established on the Atherton Tableland, only the material required in the southern capitals would have to be imported.

One of the attractions of Atherton maize is it contains five per cent. more starch than maize grown in Southern Queensland, New South Wales, or Victoria; and in an output of 10,000 tons of maize 5 per cent. more starch means a great deal. The farmers on the Atherton Tableland are hesitant about risking a big amount of money in a venture that is highly technical.

It was not altogether the fact that it was impossible to find £10,000. In 1938, when

the proposal was put before the Government, they were not very happy about it and were doubtful whether it was big enough, because it would not consume the surplus. The plant under construction was a plant to handle approximately 9,000 tons a year, which was the average surplus they had sometimes to ship away overseas at a price of only £3 a ton. In 1938, when the proposal was put forward, they had a record crop of maize for which they were paid almost a record price of £8 a ton, and it would have required only a small levy per year on their maize for a few years and they would have found the deposit, if they had wanted it. They had no illusions about it. Their best idea is increasing their supplies of pigs to the bacon factory. According to the export prices for bacon, it would be better policy to feed pigs scientifically with maize and other products and thus turn it into pigs. That is the position as I see it and I have been very closely associated with it. I commend the suggestion to the Minister. If he would enlighten me more on the scope of the bureau's activity, how it can be approached by any individual, and what is the substance required from an individual before it will investigate business proposals not only in North Queensland, but elsewhere within the State.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) (3.17 p.m.): Judging by the debate there seems general agreement at any rate on one point, that is, that secondary industries should be developed much more in Queensland than they have been developed in the past. Unfortunately, however, the all-important question has not been discussed—and apparently, judging by your ruling, Mr. Mann, it cannot now be discussed—why secondary industries have not developed as intensively as apparently every hon. member in this Committee desires. Why for instance have our secondary industries languished? Why for instance has this State been for too long, as the hon. member for Mundingburra said, the wood-and-water joey of the Commonwealth, or, as he might have gone further and said, why has the Commonwealth of Australia been the wood-and-water joey of Great Britain?

The hon. member for Windsor blames the Government. I do not blame him for blaming the Government, because notwithstanding the personal explanation he made the other day I still hold he is a good representative of the capitalist class and I can understand why he blames the Government for the non-development of secondary industries in this State.

Mr. Pie: I did not blame the Government.

Mr. PATERSON: That is the impression I got from the hon. member—that he was blaming the Government—but I will accept his word for it that he did not and I trust that in future, whenever we are discussing anything like this, he will not blame them, that he will retain the same view that apparently he expressed by that interjection.

I agree that it would be a good thing if we could have a Department of Secondary

Industry, a department that would consider the development of secondary industries; but it must be clearly understood that I believe that development should take place along the lines I am well known for advocating, but with which unfortunately I cannot deal here this afternoon.

The hon. member for Isis says the onus is on the Government to develop secondary industries. He correctly said that if secondary industries are developed the market for primary industries will be increased. I must admit that so far I am in full agreement with him; the development of secondary industries naturally will increase the market for primary industries and the more we can increase the market for primary industries here the less we are dependent on overseas markets for our primary industries and the less we are dependent upon the great changes that take place from time to time in the prices of primary products on the overseas markets; therefore the better chance we should have of stable prices for our primary industrial products.

I agree with the hon. member for Isis that the onus is on the Government to develop a planned economy. Perhaps if I were allowed in this debate to develop my ideas to the full we should find our agreement did not go much further than agreement in that general statement.

If I were allowed to discuss the question what the Government must do to develop a balanced economy, that is, a proper balance between the development of secondary industries and primary industries, perhaps our agreement would not go very far. The Treasurer correctly replied to the hon. member for Windsor when he said—and it is as well as I could take it down, although I do not say it is exact—

“I am not going to spend Government money to enable private enterprise to make money or to fatten.”

The words were to that effect and I thoroughly agree with the hon. gentleman. It is high time those who speak of the development of secondary industries got it into their heads once and for all that they cannot just expect any Government to be at their beck and call to pay out money or give them money that they might make money at the public expense, and the moment times become bad expect the Government to carry the baby—look after the unemployed that are the result of the way they run industry or, as I said, carry the whole of the burden for them in bad times.

But when dealing with the development of secondary industries there is the important point that they must be developed on a decentralised basis. If they continue to be developed as they have been in the past—in accordance with the practice that produces the concentration of industry and the development of secondary industries in the large capital cities, I am opposed to such development. Of course, I realise that secondary industries must develop in large capital cities but at the same time that

development must be much more decentralised than it is. For instance, secondary woollen industry must develop closer to the places where the raw greasy wool is produced.

I disagree with the hon. member for Herbert as to the development of secondary industry in sugar. All the secondary industries connected with the industry should be as close as possible to those parts of the State where the bulk of this sugar is produced. If the Bureau of Industry can do anything in the matter it should throw its weight behind the establishment of a sugar refinery in North Queensland. I cannot follow the reasoning of the hon. member for Herbert when he suggests that it is necessary to have refineries in capital cities, otherwise they could not have continuous production. The bulk of the raw sugar is produced north of Mackay. Very little is produced south of that city and most of that is refined at the Millaquin refinery in Bundaberg. Surely to goodness, if refineries can operate continuously in Brisbane and the raw sugar is produced mainly from Mackay north, refineries established in North Queensland could be run continuously.

Mr. Walsh: Transport is a factor that has to be considered. Give a bit of attention to it and speak sensibly on it.

Mr. PATERSON: We all have different conceptions of sensibleness. It appears to me most sensible to establish a sugar refinery in the North and refine the sugar before you transport it to the South. I realise that the refined sugar has then to be transported to the point of consumption, but my point is that the more refineries are developed in the North the more you increase the number of consumers of the products of secondary industries in the North and the less you have to transport the raw products to the South, there to be manufactured into the secondary article. The same is true of the development of meat-works. The hon. member for Mundingburra stressed that and I did so the other day during the debate on the Financial Statement. I do not intend to deal with it again. There is great scope for work by the Bureau of Industry in developing our building-trade industries in the North and the manufacture and production of bricks and cement. As the hon. member for Mundingburra pointed out, there are great lime resources near Townsville. There are also lime deposits near Bowen and I have no doubt that other great lime deposits will be found in other parts of the North, and lime is one of the most important constituents in the manufacture of cement.

The development of the iron and steel industry should be taken up by the Bureau of Industry. There is already in existence the report of a Royal Commission. It could consider the matter raised by a member of the Government today in reply to the hon. member for Mundingburra when he suggested that the transport of iron ore from the Cloncurry district to the coast might be uneconomic. It might be, but that matter could be investigated by the bureau. It is admitted that it is economic to transport coal from

Collinsville to Mount Isa and coke from Bowen in order that the Mount Isa works may carry on smelting and refining. Mount Isa is 600 miles from Townsville.

Similarly, in days gone by copper ore was transported by rail some 480 miles from Cloncurry to Townsville, then 212 miles to Cairns and then about 100 miles to Chillagoe. I understand there have been times when copper ore has been transported by rail 480 miles to Townsville, then nearly 500 miles to Mt. Morgan, and on other occasions 480 miles to Townsville and then by boat to the Mt. Lyell smelting and refining works in Tasmania.

Mr. Bruce: It has been transported from Cloncurry to Germany.

Mr. PATERSON: That is so. It is obvious that transport is not the great obstacle that we might be led to believe it to be at first sight. In any case, the Bureau of Industry might well investigate this question, and we shall then be in a sound position to determine whether the iron and steel industry and copper refining and smelting industries can be established in this State.

Mr. Pie: They cannot be with present facilities.

Mr. PATERSON: That is obvious. It is obvious that to develop industries you have to develop the facilities. So too with regard to the canning industry. I think it will be admitted that the districts round the Burdekin and Bowen can produce such quantities of vegetables and fruits as will warrant the establishment there of a canning industry.

Mr. Walsh: What is stopping private enterprise from going in for that on the Burdekin?

Mr. PATERSON: I am glad of that interjection. I agree that private enterprise, not the Government, is to blame because it did not do it, but unfortunately I cannot go into this question, in view of the Chairman's ruling. I thank the Minister for Transport for the interjection, because it enabled me to say what I should have liked to have said with respect to that, except that I did not want to disobey the Chairman's ruling.

I suggest that the Bureau of Industry should go into this question of the establishment of a canning industry in the Bowen and Burdekin districts. If the Commonwealth will not do it, I suggest that the Bureau of Industry might recommend that the State do it. The State has complete constitutional power to build factories or workshops or to expand or develop or start secondary or primary industries. I suggest that the Bureau of Industry should give serious consideration to the planned and orderly development of secondary industries. We agree with the principle of planned and orderly marketing, but it is high time we realised that no matter how excellent may be our schemes for the establishment of planned and orderly marketing, they will crash ultimately unless they are linked with the planned and orderly development of our industries, both primary and secondary.

Orderly marketing can be successful only to the extent that an unplanned and disorderly system of production carries on without breakdown, that is, up to the time when we reach what is normally termed a crisis in our industry.

There is another matter our Bureau of Industry might well consider, and that is the advisability of aiding with finance at low rates of interest the growers in those sugar areas which now supply proprietary mills. They might well consider helping them with finance to enable them to buy these proprietary mills and run them as co-operative concerns. Here I want to point out to the hon. member for Cairns that notwithstanding the fact that I am a well-known advocate of Socialism I realise that co-operative enterprise—that is, in the small enterprise and not the big enterprise such as is owned and controlled today by the monopolies—can run side by side efficiently and successfully with great socialised industries.

I wish to deal briefly with the Director of the Bureau of Industry. I am pleased that the hon. member for Cook dealt with an article appearing in the May issue of "Economic News." I had that article marked at one of the places referred to by him. Now that he has dealt with it it will be enough for me to say that I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks concerning the two paragraphs he mentioned. It is high time the Government told the Director of the Bureau of Industry that while they will not interfere with what he does in his private time—and it must be made perfectly plain that he as well as all other public servants is entitled to say, do and write what he likes in his own time—he has not the right to print in the "Economic News" matter that is obviously contrary to the policy of the Government by whom he is employed.

I propose to refer now to an article appearing in the April issue of the "Economic News." The article is headed "Social Security—True and False," and the paragraph says—

"The Commonwealth now seeks by referendum power over 'employment,' and judging by the hints dropped by a number of Commonwealth spokesmen, including senior officials of the Manpower Department, such powers, if obtained, would be used to enact in peace time for 'direction of labour' which is a polite phrase for industrial conscription. Similar hints are being dropped in Britain. If once such powers are enacted, we shall become, in fact, if not in name, a Slave State."

I listened with pleasure to two splendid addresses delivered in this Chamber in the referendum campaign, one by the Hon. the Premier and the other by the Hon. the Secretary for Public Instruction. They were extraordinarily fine and vigorous addresses in support of a "Yes" vote in the referendum campaign yet we have here the Director of the Bureau of Industry writing an article in which he cuts the ground right from under their feet.

Mr. Maher: He should have that liberty.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, in his private time, but not in his public time. I will put it this way—that he can do it in his public time if the Government let him, but I am suggesting that it is high time the Government stopped him. Is it any wonder that that very paragraph was used by the Institute of Public Affairs in the issue of its periodical of July 1944, an institute that represents the real capitalist exploiters of this State and this country? Is it any wonder, I ask you, Mr. Mann, that I am speaking as I do when the Institute of Public Affairs bulletin, which is published by the arch-enemies of the Labour movement, including the Labour Party itself, has on page 1 of its July issue part of the paragraph by Mr. Colin Clark in the April issue of "Economic News"? Is it not time that members of the Labour Party began to exert themselves? I am not suggesting that they are to blame, because probably they did not know that that article was there and that it had been copied in the bulletin of the Institute of Public Affairs. Now that I have raised it, I suggest that Government members should take action to prevent a recurrence of such things.

Mr. Clark cunningly says that—

"Such powers, if obtained, would be used to enact in peace-time for 'direction of labour' which is a polite phrase for industrial conscription."

It is not a polite phrase for industrial conscription; it is a common-sense phrase for orderly production without which no country and no Government could remain permanently stable. We must have some form of planning of industry, and we must have some form of planning or direction of labour. Where would our railway department be today if the officials administering it did not have the power to say, "There is extra work in the West and running men must be diverted to the West," or "There is extra work on the coast and running men must be diverted to the coast," or "There is extra work in the North and running men must be diverted to the North"? Is it not just an ordinary common-sense way of running any other industry or for that matter, the Public Service? Where, for instance, would our Public Service be if its administrators did not have the power to direct labour, as for instance to send extra public servants to a particular part of the State to meet a new situation? It is true that the power of direction of labour can be abused, but it is equally true that the use of a knife can be abused. We can use a knife to carve meat thinly so that it will not be tough, but he would be just an arrant fool who would suggest that because a person with a criminal mind would use a knife to cut another man's throat we should abolish the use of a knife to cut meat. On the contrary, we should use the knife for a sensible and civilised purpose; and so let us use these other powers for the same purpose. We can use the power of direction of labour in a sensible and civilised way, and so let us favour the granting of these powers to a centralised authority for that purpose. My point

is that it was the Director of the Bureau of Industry who placed in the hands of the enemies of Labour, in the hands of the Institute of Public Affairs, the means by which the Queensland People's Party could attack the Labour Party in the referendum campaign. The Institute of Public Affairs used Mr. Colin Clark's statement and on the Institute of Public Affairs there are two members of the Queensland People's Party. I do not blame the Queensland People's Party for belonging to it. I am merely drawing the attention of the Committee to the remarkable state of affairs that exists. Not only that, but the Institute of Public Affairs, which is controlled by the millionaires in New South Wales and Victoria, who control all the banks and combines, thought that Mr. Colin Clark wrote so well in their interests that they were able to extract this paragraph from his article, not tear a few words from their context—they did not do it dishonestly but honestly because they found it to their liking—and thus the enemies of Labour were provided with material to stab Labour in the back.

There is one other matter to which I wish to refer before I sit down. I urge hon. members who have not already done so to read, "Queensland Politics during Sixty Years (1859-1919)," which is to be found in the library and is down here on the table, written by Mr. C. A. Bernays. I suggest that they read the last paragraph on page 494, page 495, page 496, and page 497 up to the paragraph headed "Guiding Spirits." I only wish that I had the chance this afternoon to quote all this in Committee, but under your ruling, Mr. Mann, I cannot. I therefore urge all hon. members to read it. There they will see the death blow to those false accusations that State enterprises were a failure. As a matter of fact, if they will read those passages they will find ample information and ample evidence by a very sound and reliable man showing how, for instance, the housewife here in Brisbane was protected very, very much in the years 1917 and 1918 against being fleeced by the private-enterprise butcher, and against being fleeced and exploited by the big cattle-owner out in the South-West of Queensland. I only wish I had the chance to deal with that in detail. If hon. members read it they will then perhaps learn that State butcher shops and stations run by the State at that time forced the price of meat and cattle down and enabled the people in Brisbane and in other places where these butcher shops were open to buy meat much more cheaply than they would have been able to do by buying from unrestricted private enterprise.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (3.42 p.m.): The vote under discussion is that for the Bureau of Industry but after listening to the speech of the hon. member who just resumed his seat one would wonder whether this vote gave an opportunity for an attack to be made on industry rather than a discussion for the purpose of helping it. I do not know whether the Government would be proud

to be allied with the person who has just resumed his seat, who gave the Government credit for anything done in opposition to private enterprise. One would imagine that these various industries were dragging the country down and were the real enemies of the country. I feel that on a vote like this we should help in some way by showing how industry can be created or encouraged by private enterprise, co-operatively, or by the Government. It is not so much a question whether industry be established by private enterprise, or by some other form of enterprise, or by the Government, as whether it is not the duty of the Government to assist in the promotion of primary and secondary industries wherever possible. Anything the Government can do in this direction will have my support.

The hon. member for Cook rather impressed me. If we engaged in talks like that we might assist secondary industries that do not exist. We might do much also to help private industry in a scientific way. We might help private industry by asking the C.S.I.R. to solve the problems of industry or by setting up a similar but smaller body in this State. Many of our primary industries require some scientific research. At the moment potato-growers are much concerned about their crops. We have an insect or a fly now attacking the potato crop which will destroy at least one-half of it, as the grower has not the means to cope with it. Unless we are prepared to deal with it in some scientific manner it is only a matter of time when the crop will be wiped out. A few years ago we had a parasite attacking our banana crop but owing to a united effort by the Government and growers we were successful in combating it and as a result the industry today is on a sound footing. The potato fly did not come about in a night. It has been present for many years. Its inroads have been greater where growers have allowed their potatoes to lie in the ground. When the ground opens up the fly attacks the potato. It is becoming so numerous today that if not combated it will be almost impossible to grow the potato. I believe that it can be combated by scientific research. I am not so much concerned whether it is done by private enterprise or co-operative enterprise.

Mr. Hanlon: The potato fly would be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

Mr. MULLER: That is so but the Department of Agriculture and Stock has no funds to deal with questions such as this. We have experts in the department but they cannot go far enough to deal with big matters such as this. Questions of this kind have to be dealt with in a big way and it could only be done by the Treasurer's finding funds and setting up an organisation such as I mentioned. The matter could not be handled by individual officers of the department.

Unless the Government are willing to encourage secondary industries to a greater degree in the future, all this talk about

developing secondary industries in the post-war period will not bear fruit. It is remarkable how much has been said about post-war days. Unless we plan today for the future, nothing much will be done in the post-war period. I listened to many speeches but I did not hear one practical speech on post-war reconstruction. I heard much talk but the Government have not shown in what way they are willing to assist secondary industries. A few days ago the cotton industry was discussed, and it is an industry that offers enormous possibilities for manufactures, but at the moment we do nothing. We go on importing cotton goods because the cost of bringing them here from countries that use black labour is less than if we manufactured them. We have to go much deeper than has been suggested during this debate. It is not only a question of allowing some individual to go into it. The growers require some help and unless they get help on scientific lines, first of all in regard to production and then in regard to manufacture and marketing, nothing will be done. I feel that such a department must be prepared to cover the production, manufacture, and sale of the finished article. Unless we discuss it in that light I feel that our secondary industries will remain in the same position as in the past.

I am not so much concerned about the point made by the hon. member for Bowen, who spoke about exploitation by private individuals in business. I do not believe all those statements are true. Whilst there are people in private enterprise who will exploit the community if given an opportunity, it must be remembered that generally speaking competition prevents that kind of thing from happening. If a man sets himself out to exploit the community in some way and is making undue profits, he usually does not remain in business very long. I do feel, despite what has been said, that the person engaged in private enterprise, generally operates in an industry he knows something about; he is generally an expert in the line in which he is engaged; and if he is an expert he is deserving of some encouragement. After all, we know he has been responsible for providing 80 per cent. of the employment. Railways and other Government departments cannot be run by private enterprise in the interests of the community, but industries that it is possible for private enterprise to handle should be carried on by private enterprise, and they should be encouraged. A department such as has been suggested could help them.

I was rather surprised at the interjection by the Secretary for Public Lands that it was the responsibility of private enterprise to develop its own business, and it could not expect the Government to provide money in order that it might deal with some of the problems that arose from time to time. It must be remembered that people in private enterprise are making a large contribution to the wealth of the State, therefore I say it is the duty of this department to co-operate with them and help them wherever it is possible for them to do so.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (3.50 p.m.): The matter mentioned

by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat of diseases in plants is handled by the Department of Agriculture and Stock. I do not think it would be right to duplicate the service and have diseases in plants and stock controlled by two different bodies.

The scope of the work of the Department of Agriculture and Stock is of course governed by the number of officers, and there are a number, employed by this department. I can assure hon. members that as time goes on and opportunities present themselves we will take advantage of them.

I now want to correct an idea that may exist in minds of hon. members that the Bureau of Industry is merely an advisory body. Hon. members will remember that the Bureau of Industry Act authorises the bureau to undertake work. Three of the great works undertaken in this State are being controlled by the bureau today. There is the board that built the largest bridge in the State and the second largest in the Commonwealth. There is the board that constructed the Somerset Dam and is today operating it. A board has still under way the construction of our greatest building enterprise, the new University. Under the Act the bureau is authorised to undertake any works, not only their construction but their operation, and it is within its powers to undertake to set up an industry where it is necessary. There is no doubt that that may be done when opportunity offers. There is a tendency today to say that as the Government have money now, all these things should have been done long ago. I would remind hon. members that until the outbreak of war this Government had been wrestling with the great unemployment problem in this country. The finances of this State had just got on a even keel and opportunity for development had just arrived when war struck us. That naturally held up many things that would have been done today had there been no war. Many extensions of the services to the community by the State, by the Bureau of Industry, in particular, would have been going ahead had the war not prevented them. I do not think any hon. member can dispute that.

Mr. Pie: You are not including that in the post-war estimates, are you? Under what heading?

Mr. HANLON: Power rests with the Bureau of Industry and the bureau will not go out of business in the post-war period. It will go fully into operation. Its field of work will be broadened.

The hon. member for Cook made the suggestion that scientific investigation and research into industry should be undertaken as to the possibilities of production, manufacture, treatment, and so on. That was a good suggestion.

Mr. Pie: We must do it.

Mr. HANLON: Yes. It is a good suggestion and no doubt will be acted on. It is an excellent suggestion and a work that the bureau will certainly undertake.

Mr. Pie: At the present time it has no hope of doing it.

Mr. HANLON: The bureau can create any operating body it likes. Hon. members must not get it into their heads that the bureau itself is the only body that can operate. It has power to create a research institute if it so wishes, the same as it created the Story Bridge Board, the Somerset Dam Board and the University Works Board. These boards undertook the work for the Bureau of Industry. The bureau has power to let contracts to do the work and there is nothing to prevent it from creating an authority to go into all research and investigation of problems associated with industry. Obviously, if it is to give the services for which it was created, that will be one of the directions in which it will have to work. There is no doubt about that and I want hon. members to understand that the bureau is not limited merely to construction. The bureau can undertake the establishment of industry if the industry is of sufficient importance and value to the State.

I would point out that there are a number of difficulties in starting secondary industries. That is where the real test of the bureau's capacity to serve the people will come in and that test will be its power to control or destroy the efforts of some sections of private industry to control or destroy other sections. I think I heard the hon. member for Windsor and Aubigny cross-firing the other day about tariffs. Those in private industry do not always agree. Each one is for his own kind of business at the expense of the other. A number of people in primary industries object to tariffs on various forms of industry whose products they use. Secondary industries seek to have low prices for primary products so that secondary industry will be a success.

Capitalism in its profit-earning aspect is cannibalistic. It will eat up anything that gets in the way of its making a success of an enterprise. Private enterprise must be in its very essence cannibalistic. If it can eat up its competitor it does so.

Mr. Pie: Not at all.

Mr. HANLON: Why have we always had opposition by the southern confectionery manufacturers to the Sugar Agreement? Simply because the southern confectionery manufacturer wants the cheapest possible sugar. He is not a bit concerned about how the cane-grower, the cane-cutter and the mill-worker live. He is not concerned about whether they have a decent standard of living. All he is concerned about is getting the cheapest possible sugar to make the greatest possible dividends out of confectionery. That is the truth and hon. members know it.

Then there are all sorts of tie-ups in these things. Certain industries are tied to certain banks. Some of our banks are tied to certain primary industries. The bulk of their investments and advances have been made in primary industries. There are other banks that have tremendous interests in secondary

industries. The result is that these two groups of banks never agree. Then there are other banks whose investments are in imports. One of the strongest opponents the protectors of Australian industry had in the old days was this group of old financial institutions that had all their investments in importing and transporting goods. They had interests in wholesale warehouses and shipping companies. They did everything they could to prevent secondary industries from starting. In tackling its problems the Bureau of Industry has to take into account all of these efforts of one section of private capitalism to destroy another.

As an example, take one industry that has been mentioned today—wool tops. The hon. member for Windsor may not know that an attempt was made and much money invested in the wool-tops industry at Charters Towers some years ago. The Arida family, who were particularly patriotic Charters Towers people, were keen on establishing it in Charters Towers and they put a great deal of money into it. They received orders for all they could turn out, including orders to supply Japan. But what happened? The mercantile agents and wool brokers here killed the industry. They would not allow them to handle the wool that was coming from the West unless they paid freight on it down to Brisbane and back. That cannot be denied. The Aridas could have made a complete success of the venture and supplied wool tops to Japan at a profitable figure had they been able to buy the wool at the price the grower got for it plus freight to Charters Towers. Would the wool brokers and bankers stand that? Not a bit of it! They were unable to get wool unless they paid the freight to Brisbane, selling charges in Brisbane, and freight back to Charters Towers. That is one of the problems that the Bureau of Industry is going to have to tackle. Hon. members must remember that if the Bureau of Industry is going to be of any use in building up secondary industries in this country that is one of the problems it must consider, and hon. members opposite must not complain if some of their fingers are pinched when the Bureau sets about building up these secondary industries.

At 4.1 p.m.,

Mr. DEVRIES (Gregory) relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. Pie: It will get all possible help from this side.

Mr. HANLON: I hope the hon. member will remember that at some future date. I hope that I have not to quote it in "Hansard" at some future date.

Mr. Collins: Will anybody be able to approach the bureau?

Mr. HANLON: Yes. As a matter of fact, I have had a couple of American officers in to see me already about the prospects of commencing business. One came to inquire about the conditions under which the fishing industry could be established here. The

department gave him all the information we had and he went away happy.

Mr. Sparkes: How do you account for the fact that this wool had to come down if those men had their own wool up there?

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member need not pretend to be dense. The manufacturers did not have the wool; the growers had the wool and it was consigned to certain agents in whose hands and under whose hands the wool clip was. The hon. member knows that most wool clips are covered by liens, that most of the growers are, under financial obligations to some bank or firm.

Mr. Sparkes: I am glad to hear you say that, because many hon. members on the Government side are always telling us about the wealthy wool men.

Mr. HANLON: There are quite a number who are wealthy, but the hon. member knows perfectly well that even wealthy people make use of bank advances and overdrafts. That was the fate of an attempt to establish a secondary industry in Charters Towers that would have been of great value to the State. Consequently, hon. members must understand that the Bureau of Industry in doing its job may have sometimes to deal very heavily with certain sections of private enterprise.

The matters mentioned by the hon. member for Bowen were not of great importance, except his outburst concerning the publication by Mr. Colin Clark of an opinion that he held. Mr. Colin Clark publishes "Economic News," and I think most hon. members have found it interesting reading so far as the statistics are concerned. We do not always agree with him, and if I found that I was in agreement with, say, the hon. member for Windsor I should go away and analyse my thoughts to see what was wrong with me. The statement by the hon. member for Bowen was particularly interesting because he and his party are in the habit of talking about free speech. They prate about freedom of speech, but free speech apparently to them is only their own speech. Mr. Colin Clark expressed his own opinion. Would the Government be justified in objecting to his expressing his own opinion? The people of this country had opinions from all sides on the referendum and I think they were fogged because of all the opinions they got. They were allowed to hear the case both for and against the referendum, and they made up their minds accordingly. Personally, I think they made up their minds wrongly and that some day they will regret the mistake they made. However, they have decided, and it is our duty to accept their decision. No Government of this State, no Opposition or anybody else has any right to suppress any personal opinion on a matter of that kind. I could have had just as much reason to demand the gagging of the hon. member for Bowen and the hon. member for Mundingburra in some of their attacks on the Labour Party which I considered to be capable of doing injury to the Federal campaign. I contend that people have the right to express their opinion.

Mr. Pie: You do not want public servants to become the spokesmen of the Government.

Mr. HANLON: We do not allow that. I have objected to that very strongly. The Government are not economists or statisticians, and so they have to engage professional men to supply them with the data that will enable them to carry on their business, but we are not compelled to accept the conclusions of either Mr. Colin Clark or of any other Government officer. The Government are not merely a rubber stamp for officers of the Public Service, but the members of the Government party and Ministers of the Cabinet generally appreciate the really sound service that they get from senior members of the Public Service, advice based on experience and study, although they do not always accept it. Sometimes the views of public servants conflict, and you cannot accept advice that is both "yes" and "no." The Government must take the common-sense view after having obtained all the information available. I should regret very much indeed thinking that any officer of the Public Service thought that he had to shape his advice to his Minister by what he thought the Minister would like. That would be fatal. The first thing any Minister desires to know in coming to a decision on any problem is what are the facts, and having got the facts it is not a hard matter for any man to do the right thing. It is the duty of every senior officer to advise honestly and sincerely so that recommendations may be made to the Cabinet. The views expressed by Mr. Colin Clark on the referendum proposal were his own personal views. The hon. member for Bowen said that the Institute of Public Affairs published an isolated statement by Mr. Colin Clark, but I should like to remind him of the many things that the Communist Party said about the Labour Party and which were published in the anti-Labour Press.

There is nothing else I wish to reply to. I want to assure hon. members that the Bureau of Industry, like other functions of government, is more or less circumscribed by limitations due to war activities. Hon. members in fairness should recognise that. I assure hon. members that as soon as the way is clear the activities of that department will be greatly increased.

Mr. MARRIOTT (Bulimba) (4.10 p.m.): I was particularly interested this afternoon in listening to the addresses and splendid suggestions put forward by some hon. members. I was interested to note the reply by the Treasurer that the Bureau of Industry is not just a mere advisory body, that it is also a constructing body and as such can authorise construction by other bodies as well. Huge undertakings have already been undertaken by the Bureau of Industry.

Mention was made of industries that had been established and had not flourished as they might, and of other industries that had possibly been prevented from becoming established because of the administration of the

Labour Government. It is within my recollection that 40 odd years ago we had a number of tobacco factories in the Fortitude Valley, one in Petrie Bight, and one at Kangaroo Point. What happened? They transferred their activities south. No Labour Government existed in Queensland then to harass their activities. Nor will you tell me, Mr. Devries, that these factories transferred to the southern States to bring them nearer to where tobacco leaf was produced. Tobacco leaf was not then produced in the South but a limited quantity was produced in Queensland. What was the cause of their transfer? It certainly was not because a Labour Government harassed them. I have been thinking seriously of what will happen to some of the industries that have been established through necessities arising from war. For instance, take shipbuilding. The construction of both wood and steel ships was carried on in this city many years ago—I have mentioned that fact on previous occasions—yet that construction ceased. That industry has been recommenced as an absolute necessity on account of the war situation, and both steel and wooden ships have been built. Is that construction to cease when the war is over? The answer may be "Yes" of necessity.

I had an interesting argument on another point. I pointed out that while ship construction had been engaged on in the South and was still being continued there, that was not to say that we should not re-enter the field of shipbuilding in Queensland. I well remember the time when private enterprise at Kangaroo Point was very busy. It was a regular and interesting sight to see new locomotives being taken off the stocks in Evans Anderson's works, along Main Street, Kangaroo Point, and then put on the railway line at Woolloongabba. Locomotives were also constructed at Walkers Ltd., Maryborough, while their construction was carried on continuously in the Ipswich workshops. But there seems to have been a lag in the building of locomotives in this State. It is not to say that that lag is to continue and their construction is to cease after the war.

Let us get down to small matters. I have been thinking of them lately, too, and just applying the principle that operates in regard to them and finding out the whys and wherefores about them. I was struck during the debate by an interjection by the Minister for Transport that private enterprise should get busy and tackle the canning of vegetables in North Queensland. In effect the interjection was: if the possibilities are there, why does not private enterprise enter into the business? Let us deal with some of the results when private enterprise engaged in similar ventures.

In 1941 I went to a comparatively new local firm, Handiworks Pty. Ltd., and was about to place a contract with them for 100 primus stoves for shipment to Russia as part of the necessary equipment of field sterilisers for field hospitals. The export of these sterilisers was held up by the Federal Government temporarily and we did not place the

contract with that firm, which was the first to start to manufacture primus stoves in Australia. This firm was very successful, and from 1941 to a few months ago the whole of its output, roughly 1,000 primus stoves a month, was taken by the three fighting services, the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Previously that very necessary article was imported from Sweden but as a result of the difficulties of transport occasioned by the exigencies of war importation ceased. So successful was the firm that some competitor opened up in Sydney and when the services no longer required the full output of this factory it was told, "You must work on a quota." Incidentally, this firm had immediately set about the supplying of the needs of the Queensland market for primus stoves. The War Organisation of Industry people told this firm its production was limited to 250 stoves a month—about a quarter of its output and that it must not do its full output to supply the people of Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon: That is not done by the Queensland Government.

Mr. MARRIOTT: I am pointing out what happened to a locally established industry and what is likely to happen unless the Bureau of Industry or anybody else who has an interest in the welfare of Queensland industries gets busy right now and not in the future. These people were put on the quota and at the same time they were faced with the transportation from Sydney of the output of their competitor in the South. They were not allowed to supply the Queensland market with its requirements; they were reduced to 250 a month when they were able to turn out 1,000; and despite the difficulties of transport that we hear so much about stoves were being brought from Sydney to compete with the local production on the Queensland market. When representations were made to the Federal member for that division they were told they would be allowed to use the stocks of material they had on hand, which would last them about four months. At the end of this year they will be out of stocks of material and what then? It is problematical whether the Department of War Organisation of Industry will be good enough to allow the Queensland firm to continue manufacturing primus stoves for the Queensland market, seeing there are southern competitors, acting on the old axiom that imitation is the most sincere form of flattery set up in that line of manufacture in the South. It appears to me that has gone on in the past—that industry must be concentrated in the Southern States, that we must not have any secondary industries in Queensland. Is that policy going to continue for the future?

At 4.19 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. MARRIOTT: Close to my own home in Bulimba a splendid industry has been started in a small way by A.J.S. Propty. Ltd., manufacturing small steel tools. It has a small staff of excellent steelsmiths

and has been doing military and naval work and has also entered into contracts with southern firms to supply them with large quantities of woodworkers' tools. The firm supplying steel, B.H.P., was so interested in what was going on that it sent its representative to this steel foundry and took samples of woodworkers' tools and chisels to its laboratories in Newcastle.

Practical tests were made by skilled tradesmen, after which laboratory tests were made—smashing the firm's implements into small pieces and examining them to see what had happened—to test the forging of these skilled men in the local factory. The experts of the B.H.P. were surprised and stated they had never expected that Newcastle steel would stand up to the working these men had subjected it to. We expect that small steel factory to expand as soon as the war is over, if other interests do not get busy and decide that such an industry must be in the Southern States. The Bureau of Industry should be interested in things of this kind. It is not a question, as some hon. members have suggested, of going to the bureau and asking for advice. These industries have already been established in a small way, and show that they are payable businesses. Unless something is done they will be squeezed out of existence and the industries concentrated in the Southern States, as in other instances. I hope the advisers to the Government and the Bureau of Industry will find much food for thought in the suggestion I have put forward for the advancement of secondary industries.

Vote (Bureau of Industry) agreed to.

LAND AND INCOME TAX.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (4.23 p.m.): I move—

“That £33,588 be granted for ‘Land and Income Tax.’”

This is an increase of £1,183. There is an increase in salaries and a decrease of £600 for contingencies, in spite of an increase of £240 in travelling expenses and incidentals.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) (4.24 p.m.): Because of war-time arrangements income tax becomes a Federal matter, and the employees of the State Income Tax Office are virtually Federal employees at the present time. A section in this vote relates to the super-annuation payments of men in the services, which shows that the Government are interested in the future of such men. I know they are, and for that reason I bring under notice of the Government something that will be of interest to them, and after hearing me on this matter I think they will take action. The Premier this morning indicated that.

Certain men of the State Income Tax Office joined the fighting forces approximately in the middle of 1943. Up to that time they were in a reserved occupation and unable to join the fighting services, but they were then permitted to do so. After being in the services for approximately 12 months they

received notification from the Taxation Department, now under the Commonwealth Government, that they could be discharged from the forces and returned to the Taxation Department as their services were necessary to cope with the great amount of work that had accumulated. As these men were not doing any work to speak of in the Air Force they decided that they would apply for their discharge. They did so and returned to the department some six weeks ago, and worked in that department in Brisbane. On 20 October they received notification that they were to be transferred to the Sydney office. Nine men were concerned, seven being married and two still unmarried. They were not given any option as to whether they would or would not go to Sydney or did or did not desire to be transferred. A number of men in the Taxation Department have not seen war service at all. Many men of equal ability to those of whom I am speaking were not forced to transfer to Sydney and have remained in the Queensland office. These men of whom I speak had no option of staying in Brisbane or going to Sydney, which was unquestionably unfair discrimination against those who had been in the services.

I do not believe that the State Government, now that they have heard about it, will allow this position to continue. These men are supposed to leave their homes and wives and start work in Sydney on 1 November. I bring it before the notice of the Government because I feel confident they will take immediate action to stop these transfers.

Mr. Cooper: They are Commonwealth officers for the moment.

Mr. MORRIS: They are being transferred by the Commonwealth, but they are primarily servants of the State Government, and I believe that this State will not allow those of its own servants who have seen war service to be treated in this way when other officers of the department who have no war service have not been subjected to this treatment. I appeal to the Government to intervene on behalf of these men. If anyone is to be transferred South, at least see to it that single men who have not been away from their homes on war service for a long period are sent. I understand that as a result of the dissatisfaction that has been expressed at these proposed transfers the department has called for volunteers, and no doubt some of the younger men may offer their services. If enough volunteers are not obtained, I again urge that the balance required for Sydney be taken from single men who have not been away on war service.

Mr. MOORE (Merthyr) (4.31 p.m.): This matter is not new to hon. members of the Government. We have known of this proposal to transfer certain officers of the Taxation Department for some days. The Taxation Office applied to the Army for the release of certain officers who were in the fighting forces. In a number of cases the signal did not state specifically the place at which the proposed releasees might take up

service. One of my constituents informed me that he was acquainted of the signal when in Dutch New Guinea and was asked if he desired to be released. He decided that he would like to be released, and he and others returned to Brisbane and took up duty in the Taxation Office here. It appears that the work in the Sydney office has got behind and the Commissioner of Taxes wants men of experience to take up duty down there. These proposed transfers were intimated to a number of members of this party, and many of us have been in touch with our Federal members in connection with the matter. The position today is that the whole question is now under consideration and is the subject of discussion between Mr. Jackson, the Federal Taxation Commissioner, and Mr. McCarthy, the Deputy Commissioner here. I can assure hon. members that everything possible is being done by both State and Federal members of the Government party to clarify the position without causing any injustice to those men who have seen military service. I feel optimistic that the whole thing will be straightened out to the satisfaction of the nine returned men and the Taxation Office.

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (4.33 p.m.): It appears to me that when the Federal Government took over the responsibility for a uniform income taxation scheme, it took over also all the men associated with the Taxation Department.

Mr. Cooper: There is no question about that.

Mr. BRAND: Took them over?

Mr. Cooper: Yes.

Mr. BRAND: According to the interjection by the Premier when the hon. member for Enoggera was speaking, the Government have no more concern with these employees.

Mr. Cooper: No more control.

Mr. BRAND: These men have been taken over temporarily, but it is probable that 12 months after the war ends the income taxation may revert to the States.

Mr. Aikens: I hope not.

Mr. BRAND: And the people hope not too. What will happen to the employees?

Mr. Hanlon: They would revert to the State too.

Mr. BRAND: Yet in the meantime these employees may be transferred to other parts of the Commonwealth and the Queensland Government can exercise no control whatever over their former employees who were taken over temporarily by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hanlon: That is what you wanted.

Mr. Cooper: No more control.

Mr. BRAND: The most remarkable thing is that the men who are to be transferred are those who have served on the field of battle. The Commonwealth Government are going to

treat the returned men so well that they will badger them about this country when they return from the battle front.

Mr. Pie: Imagine them trying to get houses in Sydney!

Mr. BRAND: Yes. These men who have returned from the battle front desire to settle in Brisbane in the positions that they held prior to their enlistment. Indeed, on their enlistment they were guaranteed that their positions would be reserved for them when they returned, but now when they return we find that a so-called benevolent Government are prepared to transfer them from their homes to other parts of Australia.

Mr. Moore: You must not forget that the Taxation Department approached the Army for their release for a specific purpose.

Mr. BRAND: The specific purpose has not been stated to be that they were to be transferred from here. I gather from the interjection by the hon. member for Merthyr that he recognises the justice of these men in trying to avoid their transfer to other parts of Australia.

Mr. Moore: Against that you must be fair and admit that the Army release was not for the specific purpose of serving back in the Taxation Department in Brisbane.

Mr. BRAND: There is this one feature that should not be lost sight of, that when these men enlisted they were to return to their old jobs upon discharge, but we have it from both the Premier and the Treasurer that the Queensland Government have completely lost control of these men, who were transferred temporarily to the Federal Government under the uniform-tax scheme. There must have been some oversight there. One can understand the adoption of a uniform taxation scheme for Australia involving the temporary transfer of officers of the State but one would have thought that the Government would have protected their employees who were transferred only temporarily. Therefore, I say that the position as disclosed to us by the hon. member for Enoggera is one that has the sympathy of every hon. member and I hope that whatever can be done by the Minister in control of the department will be done in an endeavour to get the Commonwealth Government to protect the men in Queensland.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) (4.38 p.m.): The contribution to the debate by the hon. member for Isis furnishes us with a classic example of what some returned soldiers might expect to find with men who are more concerned about gaining political advantage than attending to the welfare of returned soldiers. We have had a fair presentation of the case by the hon. member for Enoggera and I commend him for his zeal in endeavouring to protect the interests of the returned soldier. Then we have the hon. member for Merthyr, who appears to be more conversant with the matter than the hon. member for Enoggera.

He stated what action he had taken and the action the Federal member for the electorate proposed taking to protect these men; therefore there is no need, except in the exercise of his right as a member of this Assembly to get up as often as he pleases, for the hon. member for Isis to intervene in this debate so far as helping the returned soldier is concerned. The only reason he intervened was for the purpose of discrediting the Labour Government. I am very doubtful indeed whether any member of the Labour Government would have been aware of the fact that any or all of these nine men had been released from the Army and transferred but for the representations made by the Federal member at the instigation of the hon. member for Merthyr. The hon. member for Isis cannot have it both ways. He says in the one breath that it is a good thing for Queensland that we have uniform taxation in Australia and he hopes that those powers will be retained by the Commonwealth. I hope they will not be retained for this reason: if the hon. member—and he was a very vigorous advocate in the recent referendum campaign for the retention of State rights—is desirous of retaining State rights he must see to it that the State retains its sovereign right to impose taxation. The reason why tax rates were higher in Queensland than in other States is one of the penalties of having a Labour Government, in whatever State it may function, and that is necessary because it must be in the vanguard of social reform, which means that it must impose higher taxes than other States not provided with a measure of similar services. To the extent that the Commonwealth proposes to increase and improve social services in those States so shall we come into closer alignment with the incidence of taxation in those States.

The matter raised by the hon. member for Isis is not the responsibility of the State Government.

Mr. Hanlon: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUGGAN: It is primarily the responsibility of the Commissioner of Taxes in the Federal sphere. He found in his administration of the tax offices that he required additional assistance and asked for the release of these men. The men in question, as mentioned by the hon. member for Merthyr, accepted the invitation by the Commissioner of Taxes to take steps to obtain their release. The point is that the Government did not know of these steps and that the matter is now being rectified in a friendly and proper way. I object to members of the Opposition's using any section of returned soldiers as victims of party political propaganda and political footballs for the satisfaction of those who are opposed to the Government.

Mr. POWER (Baroona) (4.43 p.m.): The hon. member for Isis butted into something he knows nothing about and merely indulged in party political propaganda at the expense of returned soldiers. After I have finished he will not only not like my words but he will know that application was made for the

release of these soldiers from the Army for a particular purpose. If the soldier refrains from entering the position for which he is released he is again made available by the Man-power authorities to the Army, called up again, re-enlisted, and re-sworn in the Army. In the cases mentioned the application for release was made by the Commissioner of Taxes in order that the men in question might re-enter the service of the Taxation Department.

Mr. Sparkes: Not necessarily in Sydney, though.

Mr. POWER: Not necessarily, nor in any other place. The Commonwealth Government have taken over the field of taxation and these men, as taxation officers, must service in any part of Australia that the department desires. In addition they, as Crown employees, can be transferred from the Taxation Department to any other sphere of Commonwealth Government activity. The State Government cannot accept any responsibility for what is happening in the matter. On the contrary, they went so far as to protect the seniority rights and rights of promotion of these members of the fighting forces during the period they were absent from duty and attached to the Army. That is the true position.

I might mention, while on the question of taxation, that the hon. member for Isis, prodded by the hon. member for Hamilton, talked about taxation, mentioning that owing to high taxation certain industries went from this to other States. There is this important point that cannot be overlooked.

Today we have the land tax and succession duties, which must be imposed so that we can develop our country on sound and progressive lines. I warn the hon. member for Isis and the hon. member for Hamilton. The hon. member for Hamilton made a statement that was quoted to him by the hon. member for West Moreton in which he said that as a result of the high taxation in Queensland he had all his manufacturing done in the Southern States.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. POWER: That is what took place in connection with the matter. I, like the hon. member for Toowoomba, take strong exception to the attitude adopted by the hon. member for Isis for the purpose of making political footballs out of men who have fought for their country. That is all he has been attempting to do. He has little or no knowledge of the position; and being the Deputy Leader of the Country Party he should at least make himself conversant with the facts before he makes statements which he is unable to substantiate.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (4.46 p.m.): I cannot agree with the hon. member for Toowoomba that the treatment of returned soldiers is not the Government's concern, that it is a matter for the Commonwealth Government—

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. I used the term "responsibility" not "concern." I ask the hon. member to accept that denial.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Sandgate to accept the denial of the hon. member for Toowoomba.

Mr. DECKER: I will. It is just a question of words. I say without any political bias that it is the responsibility of every man in this Chamber, irrespective of where he sits, to see that a fair deal is given to returned soldiers. When a matter like this is brought up by the hon. member for Enoggera, I should expect everyone on both sides to regret that soldiers were treated in that way.

Mr. Moore: We took some action.

Mr. DECKER: I am pleased that some action has been taken. I congratulate the hon. member on taking some action, without being political. I also say that we have a Deputy Taxation Commissioner in Brisbane who is seconded from the State Government to the Federal Government for the purpose of administering the Commonwealth taxation laws and he is the man responsible for allowing a position like this to arise. We need to be particularly careful. If we do not take up a strong attitude on a case like this to prevent things like this from happening, the returned soldier will be getting a pretty poor chance. If we as members join together in recording our disapproval of an action of this sort we shall make our officers particularly careful as to how they handle the returned men and the returned men will get the deal we expect they should get.

I ask all members not to view this matter politically, but as a matter of concern to us all. Whether it is a Commonwealth matter or whether it is a State matter is of no consequence; let us take the responsibility ourselves and see that justice is done to the returned men.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) (4.50 p.m.): I wish to make one point very clear. I have not introduced this matter for political purposes. I never have introduced a matter affecting returned soldiers for political purposes, and I would resent any suggestion that I ever did so.

Mr. Duggan: Nobody accused you of that.

Mr. MORRIS: I make that quite clear. In a general way I know the Federal Government can transfer any of their officers if they so desire. I know also the State Government had no hand in the transfers. I believed when I came to this House to-day that the State Government had no knowledge of the transfer and it was for that reason I brought the matter to this Committee. I wish to point out only 10 men have been transferred from what was the State Government Office here in Queensland in the past two years, and every one of those 10 men are ex-members of the forces. I think this Committee should

know it; that was my purpose in bringing it up.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (4.51 p.m.): The matter is one that does not concern this vote at all. These people are not employees of the State Government. We have no Income Tax Department employees in Queensland today.

The member for Isis rather amused me with his story about the terrible thing that had happened, that we had no control over the income-tax employees. He was one of the people who howled loudest for single taxation in Australia.

Hon. members of the Opposition supported the Federal Government's taking over the power of taxation and castigated the Queensland Government because we contested the power of the Commonwealth to do it. The position is that these people are employees of the Federal Government and the State Government have no control over them. The hon. member for Merthyr and other hon. members on this side took the correct action when they heard of the matter. It is not as easy for any aggrieved public servant to get in touch with the Federal member and the men concerned came to those members whom they knew would be their friends. They consulted the hon. member for Merthyr and other hon. members on this side, who promptly took the matter up with the Federal members, who have the responsibility for the Federal Public Service. That is only fair. The hon. member for Sandgate, like Don Quixote, throws a challenge to the Federal Government to come out and fight but he also displays his complete lack of knowledge of the present situation when he refers to our Commissioner for Taxes. We have no Commissioner for Taxes.

Mr. Decker: The Deputy Commissioner for Taxes.

Mr. HANLON: In his capacity as Deputy Taxation Commissioner he is a Federal public servant and the only way in which he has any connection with the State Government is in his control of the Land Tax Department.

Mr. Decker: I said he was seconded.

Mr. HANLON: What is the good of suggesting that we have an officer who is responsible for it? No doubt these people were transferred by a superior officer and they objected to it. It is wrong that they should be transferred on their return but it is a matter for Federal members of Parliament and I have no doubt that the matter is now a subject of discussion between the Federal Taxation Commissioner and the Deputy Taxation Commissioner in Brisbane. The Deputy Commissioner has called for volunteers to go to Sydney and more than likely the whole thing will be cleared up but not as the result of any power the Government of Queensland have in the matter.

An Opposition Member: You have power.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member is talking nonsense. We have no power to interfere

with the control of the Federal Public Service.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANLON: It would be a bad thing for the State Government to interfere with the Federal Public Service or the Federal Government to interfere with the State Public Service.

Mr. Morris: Seeing they were State Government employees, you could make representation.

Mr. HANLON: These men were ex-members of the State Public Service when they were in the Army and the hon. member would not suggest that the State Government had the direction of them when in the Army?

Mr. Morris: The Federal Government had them withdrawn.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member must face up to the position that they were just as much ex-State Government employees when they were in the Army as they were when in the Federal Taxation Department and this Government had no more control over the Federal Taxation Department than they had over the Army. They were under the control purely of the Commonwealth Government. Of course, I accept the denial of the hon. member for Enoggera that he raised this matter for political purposes. I believe he was sincere when he said that, because he had been approached by some member of the service and endeavoured, in the way he thought right, to ventilate their grievances but nevertheless hon. members who knew nothing at all of the matter bought into it because they thought it would be an opportunity to slander the Government.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (4.55 p.m.): I cannot sit down and take remarks like that from the Treasurer. It is all right to pass the buck. Ever since I have been here the Government have been masters at passing the buck. If that matter had been brought to the notice of the Government before it was introduced here by the hon. member for Enoggera, I see no reason why a Cabinet Minister could not take up the matter with the appropriate Cabinet Minister in Canberra, if there is any liaison between this and the Commonwealth Government. When there is a just cause and one that could be taken up, surely the best representation that could be made would be that made by the Government! It appears to me Ministers can pass the control to Federal representatives when they please, although holding the powers of the governing body of the State. What is the use of having a State Parliament that cannot stand on its own legs? The State Parliament has no stomach and I am afraid that in any little controversy here that causes a difference between the State and the Commonwealth we shall always get the same remarks, "It is a Commonwealth matter and the State cannot interfere."

It is about time the State did interfere. There is no need to talk as the hon. member

for Kurilpa did about carrying a gun. We can do it by letter, telegram, or telephone conversation. All we want is interest in the subject and I think that those interested should bring about a liaison between the Commonwealth and State Governments. If that course is adopted we shall get much further.

Mr. MOORE (Merthyr) (4.57 p.m.): The hon. member for Sandgate does not appear to appreciate those things that are the State's responsibility and those that are the Commonwealth's responsibility. I cannot help taking the uncharitable view that they are carrying on now the political and not the factual side of the argument. It appears that they want to continue to criticise this Government on matters that are not the responsibility of the Government.

As all hon. members of the Government know, we are employed for the whole of our time in attending to the requirements of our constituents. Two of the men concerned came to me during the week-end and told me of their cases. I know enough about the relative position of State and Federal affairs to know that there was no need for me to worry the Premier or the Treasurer on this matter. I did the sensible thing. I got in touch with my Federal member, the Hon. George Lawson. He then telephoned immediately to Mr. Jackson, the Federal Taxation Commissioner. The question is now one for Mr. Jackson and the Deputy Taxation Commissioner here, Mr. McCarthy. It is not one in which any other person can interfere. It is under consideration and I think it will be straightened out to the satisfaction of all concerned. The Opposition are only wasting the time of this Committee in trying to make political capital out of it.

Vote (Land and Income Tax) agreed to.

HARBOURS AND MARINE.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (5 p.m.): I move—

"That £92,207 be granted for 'Harbours and Marine.'"

The amount required is £1,686 more than the provision for 1943-44 and £6,812 more than the expenditure for that year. The salaries exceed last year's provision by £5,116 and contingencies are £6,570 higher than last year.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) (5.1 p.m.): I wish to refer in particular to that part of the vote dealing with the Fisheries Department in which we have nine officers now who are doing a great job policing the fisheries of the State. The point I wish to make is that we allocate so little money and have so few public servants looking after this very important producing industry. I wish to sound a note of warning that if we do not spend more money on our fisheries, in the near future we shall have no fishery. Each year there has been a gradual diminution of the amount of fish going to the markets. I admit that shortage of labour in this industry has

caused a drop in production, but it might be fortunate for the fishing industry in general that the number of men engaged in it in normal times are not now in this industry, because in this way the fishing grounds are being relieved a little.

The falling off in the production of fish that has been taking place over the years is something that we should take note of. Fish is a valuable food. At the present time the Government are endeavouring to bring fish to Brisbane through the operations of the Fish Board, but that is a matter for another vote. The point about which we are concerned at the moment is the policing of our fishing grounds and the need for some endeavour to increase the production of fish.

One of our greatest troubles arises from the fact that we do not keep a sharp enough eye on the breeding grounds which from time to time are devastated by the use of dynamite and nets of small mesh, leading to the destruction of small fish that should be left in the water. The State should spend more money to encourage the fish industry and the first thing it could do would be to appoint one more officer whose duties it would be to conduct investigations—to ascertain the reasons for the falling off in the supply of fish, to devise means of protecting breeding grounds, and to help generally in the protection of the fish. I should like to see the appointment of an officer with scientific training to work in conjunction with the officers of C.S.I.R., whose officers are engaged in these investigations along the Australian coast. It should be the duty of the officer so appointed to concentrate on Queensland waters with a view to building up the supply of fish in this State. There is plenty of room for it.

Mr. Devries: Investigation in the rivers and creeks too?

Mr. NICKLIN: Rivers, creeks and estuaries. In fact, more attention to be paid to the rivers and creeks leading to the estuaries, which are actually the breeding grounds of the fish, because if our rivers and creeks are not protected eventually there will be no fish. It would appear that because of war activities and the operations by the military authorities in the vicinity of Moreton Bay and the inlets running into it there has been a serious effect upon the small fish—the fry population as they are called—because of the bombing and shelling in the various parts of the bay and inlets. I suppose that is the inevitable consequences of war but I am of the opinion that there has been a needless dropping of bombs and the shelling of waters round about the various parts of the bay.

Mr. Aikens: The discharge from oil-burning ships kills a large quantity of fish too.

Mr. NICKLIN: That does not get right up to the breeding grounds of Moreton Bay. It very seldom gets beyond the beaches of the bay and rarely up to the creeks leading to Bribie Passage and the creeks leading into Moreton Bay south of the Brisbane river. This is a matter that calls for the most careful

investigation and if the investigation is not carried out we shall find ourselves in a very serious position in regard to the scarcity of fish, particularly in the metropolitan area. It is a job that should be tackled scientifically and I again suggest to the Minister the appointment of a scientific officer to carry out the investigations. There should be consultation between the Fisheries Department and the Fish Board, which is in control of the marketing of fish, because I feel sure that if the fishermen were approached in the proper way they would be willing to pay a levy of so much a case to sponsor the investigation into the fish industry that is so urgently needed if we are to maintain and increase our fish supplies, especially in Southern Queensland.

Mr. GUNN (Wynnum) (5.8 p.m.): The matters covered by this vote are of vital concern to the Wynnum electorate and particularly to its shores along Moreton Bay. I have no doubt that many hon. members have at various times cruised past the Wynnum electorate on the waters of Moreton Bay and have in other ways enjoyed themselves at Wynnum and in various parts of the bay.

Those who have been cruising in Moreton Bay may have noticed that many of the channels have silted up, and that many of the beacons are missing, having been either blown out of their positions or shot down in practice by the Air Force. The channels at the southern end of Moreton Bay, which is the most beautiful part of the bay, which were used by the sailing fraternity some years ago, have silted up. I recommend to the Treasurer that he have them reopened and the buoys that have moved from their bearings replaced. This will help the fishermen in their calling. Moreton Bay is the centre of a very large and important fishing industry. During the last few years fishermen have experienced a very hard time because of lack of gear, nets particularly, and I commend the Treasurer for obtaining a supply of nets, which will probably result in a more plentiful supply of fish from this area.

I observe that the Treasurer has already given consideration to the dredging of Wynnum Creek and that he has ordered soundings to be taken. On the shores of Waterloo Bay, a bay within Moreton Bay, is situated the premier sea-side resorts of the metropolitan area, namely, Wynnum, Manly and Lota. I wish to draw attention to the channels leading in from the bay to those resorts. They are anything but trafficable today. I am sure that when victory is assured the Treasurer will give consideration to having these channels cleared of silt so that the small white boats that grace the bay will be able to enter these resorts again. No doubt some hon. members have been stranded for a night on some of the sandbanks while cruising in the bay. In fact, most of the channels leading to the fishing grounds have silted up and much exploration work needs to be carried out by the department to enable the fishing boats to take short cuts to those grounds. I know many of the fishermen operating in Moreton Bay.

They are to be commended for doing an exceptionally good job in keeping Wynnum, Manly and Brisbane supplied with such a necessary food as fish. They must work in all weathers at all times of the year in their tiny boats. Therefore, every consideration should be given to them in the directions I have mentioned. Thanks to the fixing of fish prices by this Government, the fishermen are doing fairly well today as compared with bygone years and are looking forward to entering on more prosperous times.

Another matter I wish to call attention to is the beacons at Peel Island which have been shot away by the Air Force at target practice. It is necessary that they should be replaced to enable boats coming from the direction of King Island to enter the river channels. I trust that the Treasurer will have an inspection made of these channels, paying particular attention to the buoys and beacons, and will not forget the channels leading into Wynnum, Wynnum Central, Manly and Lota. If he does so, I feel sure that in the near future fishing and pleasure boats will be able to enter this channel with a certain amount of security and comfort.

Mr. HILEY (Logan) (5.15 p.m.): The administration of the Harbours and Marine Department attracted to itself during the last year the fiercest spotlight of any of the sub-departments. From time to time in the administration of large corporations in the histories of Governments things happen, defalcations occur, and major misappropriations are recorded. Their dimensions cannot fail to attract public attention.

If we are to accept the pleadings of the Crown in some matters that were fully ventilated before the public the Harbours and Marine Department certainly managed to write its name on the records of this State amongst those departments that happened to be the vehicle for extremely notable shortages. I realise that this important matter may still be at a stage at which it is regarded as rather delicate to speak about. I am informed that it has been the subject of criminal proceedings and I notice it is still the subject of a civil writ. I do not wish to trespass on the privilege of the House in endeavouring to discuss in any embarrassing detail a matter that may still have to come before the courts of this country and in which the rights of litigants concerned still have to be determined by the ordinary process of the law, but I do believe there are two aspects of the matter on which the Committee is entitled to some information and I merely approach it on that basis.

The first request I make to the Treasurer is: that he would in the fullest manner he feels suited to the exigencies of this delicate matter, take the Committee into his confidence and let us have the best assurance he can concerning all the steps that have been taken to deal with what apparently must have been some loose accounting that permitted such a major trouble to continue over such a lengthy period. The other matter to which I think we are entitled to some word of explanation is this: if the pleadings of the Crown in

the earlier trial were correct a fraud of record dimensions is suggested, but when I turn to the Auditor-General's report, where a record of incidents of this nature are set out, I can find no mention of this item.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I inform the hon. member that the matter is still before the courts and in my opinion the Auditor-General would not have been in order in mentioning it because it is sub judice, and the hon. member must not trespass too far into the matter.

Mr. HILEY: I realise that. I should like to be guided by you, Mr. Mann. Is it the rule of the House that no matter which is sub judice may be discussed?

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

Mr. HILEY: Thank you.

Another matter I wish to raise in connection with the administration of this department touches the extent to which expenditure has been incurred on what might be regarded as up-to-date plant. I know we have a new Minister in charge of the department and if we can judge by the record of the Treasurer in the administration of his previous department, at least that record does not suggest that he will deny the Harbours and Rivers Department the best that can be obtained for its purposes. My impression is that the Harbours and Rivers Department has suffered from being starved of suitable plant. Much of it is exceedingly old, and, if my information is correct, there is little which could be regarded as suitable modern plant. Whilst the difficulties of obtaining such plant may be very real at the moment, I hope the Treasurer will follow the lead he set when he administered his previous department, and that in the years to come we shall find the Harbours and Rivers Department employing the very finest plant available in the world for the purpose.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert) (5.20 p.m.): I wish to speak on behalf of a section of the community living on the islands of Moreton Bay who have difficult communications with the mainland. There are many farmers on these islands who grow vegetables and other crops. Everything they grow must be sent to the mainland and everything they buy must come from the mainland. To a great extent they live in isolation. They are not attached to any local authority and there is nobody to whom they can turn for assistance in regard to the wharves and jetties that are essential to them. All their dealings as regards necessary repairs, wharves, and jetties must be directly with the department.

Mr. Hanlon: Who has provided the wharves?

Mr. PLUNKETT: The Marine Department. The wharves can be regarded as their railway stations and when applications for repairs are made much time is taken up with inspection before the necessary work can be done. I appreciate the shortage of labour

to do the essential work in the war period but I again express the view that knowing the good job these people are doing we should do our utmost to see that they have the opportunity of getting their produce to market and the necessary transport to permit of their remaining on these islands. I was pleased that the amount under the heading of contingencies is substantially increased, as it is from this item that money for these repair jobs would come. We should be more generous towards these people so that they will not feel they are left out in the cold as it were because they are not in direct touch with any local authority. I ask the Treasurer to keep them in mind.

We have not exploited or done as much as we could for the fishing industry in Queensland. Of course, again because of the war the question of the available labour comes into the matter. Moreover, there must be a shortage of fishermen because a number are in the fighting services, but there is a need for somebody to survey these areas and see what can be done.

Mr. FARRELL (Maryborough) (5.24 p.m.): I pay a tribute to the officers of the Harbours and Marine Department at Maryborough, Captain Gray and his staff. I pay them the highest compliment possible because in the period that we have been building ships the job has been very arduous. The Mary River is not easy to navigate and unless it is done by very competent men mishaps are likely to occur. I assure the Committee that we have a very competent officer in Captain Gray and the men associated with him are also efficient.

To Mr. Price and the officers associated with him in the Fisheries Department I pay tribute for the excellent work they are doing. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I think some consideration should be given to the appointment of an officer whose qualifications are such as to give added assistance and advice in the development of our fishing industry. We are singularly fortunate in the Maryborough district in having so much fish in the adjacent waters that it is one of the places on the Queensland coast from which much pleasure can be obtained on a fishing holiday.

A matter causing much concern to me and also the member for Wide Bay, through whose territory the greatest length of the Mary River runs, is the dredging of the Mary River and straits. Probably I should not have spoken on this subject had not a recent happening in Maryborough caused me again to draw the attention of the Treasurer to the unnavigable part of that river and straits. From time to time we have brought under the notice of his predecessor the need for having the river made so navigable that the work of shipbuilding can be continued at Walkers Ltd. This firm and those associated with it have done a magnificent job in building ships in the war period.

According to all reports, a great deal of difficulty is being experienced in taking the ships down the river for their trials and, upon completion, to start on their duty on defend-

ing the country. For a period of years there has been no harbour board at Maryborough, all dues being paid to the Treasury direct, the result being that no-one other than the Government has been responsible for effecting improvements. The responsibility for improvements must be borne by some section of the community and for that reason I had Mr. Hope visit Maryborough in order to gain some knowledge of our difficulties and requirements. As a result of that investigation we suggested to those who are most desirous of having the work done that some consideration might be given to the question of who should pay for the necessary dredging, which it was estimated at that time would be about £15,000. It was suggested that the Government should provide £5,000, the shipping companies £5,000 and the trade itself £5,000. Because it was going to cost them something, the proposal was rejected. One shipping company was willing to pay but the other said that it had no trouble in navigating the river. The fact is that it is very desirable that something be done to rectify the position.

As a result of representations that have been made on behalf of people associated with the industry, an investigation of the various straits in the river was made by Mr. Kemp's department. It was found that certain buoys could be moved but in the main it was agreed that certain passages needed dredging. The only authority controlling dredges at the moment is the Commonwealth Ports Committee and nothing can be done until that body releases dredges. We have made representations to that committee for the release of dredges and have been told quite plainly, that the dredges were doing more important work elsewhere within this Commonwealth for the war effort. That is quite right but it is necessary that some dredging be done in the river so that our work may be carried out more efficiently. We have been informed that the only dredge that would be suitable for this work is the "Fitzroy," and I am told that the "Fitzroy" will be released to dredge the river as soon as possible.

I might inform hon. members that Walkers Ltd. have built many ships for the navy. It is proposed now to build coastal boats. Walkers Ltd. now have an order to build five of the E or "Babinda" type of vessels, with a cargo space of something like 700 tons and propelled by Diesel engines constructed by Walkers Ltd, under licence. Walkers will also build five other Diesel engines for other vessels.

In the course of a conversation with the manager of Walkers Ltd., Mr. Goldsmith, I suspected that Maryborough was not getting its just dues because essential work was not being carried out in the river and I should like to know from the Treasurer exactly what is to be inferred from the statements published in the "Maryborough Chronicle" that I propose to read. It is only natural that the workers in the industrial unions of Maryborough should be interested in the matter too. In an interview between the workshop jobs committee at Walkers Ltd. and Mr. Goldsmith, the manager, the members of the

committee were told just what I have outlined to the Committee as to the work to be carried out by Walkers Limited. This report of a discussion that followed the interview appeared in the "Maryborough Chronicle"—

"Alderman Matthies said that Mr. Goldsmith, in reply to a question, said that the condition of the river had something to do with the type of ship ordered. He also definitely stated that considerable risk was involved in taking out of the river the present type of vessel being constructed.

"That, said Alderman Matthies, lent emphasis to the argument that something should be done in the way of having the river dredged. The Council and other public bodies should pursue this matter further, in order to prevent any hold-up as far as the work was concerned.

"Mr. Goldsmith's statement, he added, suggested that if the river was in a fit state to take larger boats, the firm might get bigger ships to build."

The point that I desire to bring under the notice of the Treasurer is that if that is the actual position, it is the responsibility of the Government, together with the Commonwealth Government, to do something to remove the present difficulties. We have even appealed to the naval authorities to help by providing dredges for the work, but so far without success. If, as it is suggested in the published report, it is true that because there are not adequate facilities in the river, we are not getting the type of vessel to construct in Queensland that we are capable of building, then it is high time the Harbours and Marine Department did something to help us to get the benefit of whatever shipbuilding work is given out by the Commonwealth Government.

There is another matter to which I think I must refer, and it concerns the magnificent job that has been carried out voluntarily in the public interests by those people who have constructed a retaining wall at Buxton Ville in the Burrum River, about five miles from Isis Junction. These people have turned out a job equal to any retaining wall in the State and the most important feature of it all is that it was done voluntarily, so that a public benefit could be conferred. These people have constructed an excellent harbour for boats that are able to ply their trade on excellent fishing grounds. I made representation to the Treasurer some time ago that these people should receive proper recognition for their work, say, in the form of a grant of money so that they might continue this noble work that they have begun and have almost completed. I desire to pay a glowing tribute to the chairman of the Isis Shire Council, Councillor Noakes, who has guided the residents in the development of this little seaside place. I suggest that the Treasurer himself pay a visit to Buxton Ville to see something of the work that has been carried out voluntarily and so gain some idea of its value to the district.

Mr. KERR (Oxley) (5.37 p.m.): I suggest to the Government that they should consider a proposal to extend the activities of

the Fisheries Department with the object of expanding the industry, which appears today to be in a more or less primitive state. Its potentialities, I should say, are almost unlimited. There is an abundant supply of fish in the far northern waters extending from Cape York to Townsville. I speak particularly of sea fish such as mackerel and bonito. Incidentally, I should like to mention that I have on occasions myself caught one and a half tons of sea fish, mostly mackerel, in about half-an-hour.

I impress on the Government the fact that this field is entirely unexploited and unexplored. Just prior to the war the Japanese had fishing fleets there, which were canning factories at the same time. The mackerel, or king fish as it is better known, lends itself to canning. It has a good hard flesh and it makes a very fine canned fish. The bonito is another fish that can be canned and would be very acceptable in that form to our people. Another industry requiring a great deal of consideration is the pearling industry. Operations in it have come to a standstill owing to the war. Still another industry is the trochus-shell industry and the beche-de-mer or trepang industry. There is an enormous field and much wealth in those industries and I suggest that the Minister give greater consideration in fostering them in the years to come.

Mr. LUCKINS (Maree) (5.41 p.m.): I am very pleased that the Minister has taken control of this department because, like many others, I expect big things from him. One can trace the operations of this department from Tweed Heads along the coast to Thursday Island and then down to the Gulf of Carpentaria. The Minister has a very long coastline to control. There is one part that will require special consideration from him in the near future. That is Moreton Bay and the beauty spots surrounding it. The Government by the expenditure of a little money could make them attractive for the people of Brisbane so that they could see the beauties of their own State in preference to going further afield. Such islands as Stradbroke are very beautiful. By the expenditure of some money the Government could make them better known and attract tourists as well as local citizens. These beauty spots have been neglected by past Governments and to a very large extent are unknown.

Another part of the coast requiring attention is the Great Barrier Reef. It would be useless for me to extol its beauties from the point of view of the tourist. The Government would be well advised to expend money in developing such resorts. They would attract not only tourists from the world over but many of our own citizens; they could not spend their leisure or money better than at such a place. It is high time we advertised Queensland's unrivalled scenic and tourist attractions. We hear much of the beauty of North and South America and South Africa but I have yet to find places more attractive to the tourist than the coast of Queensland. I visualise the time when it will contain the largest naval and flying bases

on our coast, and that being so we should be prepared for the future and play our part in developing our coast not only from a defence but from a tourist point of view.

I also ask the Government to protect the banks of the Brisbane River from erosion by spending a little money on retaining walls, thus adding to the beauty of the river and even particularly in the vicinity of Kangaroo Point and down towards the bay, and preserving for all time the land on the banks of the river.

Mr. L. J. BARNES (Cairns) (5.45 p.m.): I desire to place a suggestion before the Treasurer and let hon. members know exactly what has happened in the Cairns harbour during the war. Approximately £750,000 has been expended there. I believe it was the intention of our Allies, the Americans, in co-operation with the Australian Government and Cairns Harbour Board, to spend a huge amount of money on the Cairns harbour. Unfortunately, after an enormous amount of this money was partly wasted—

Mr. Walsh: It was necessary expenditure.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: At that time I do not think it was necessary expenditure. Its location is wrong. Unfortunately they did not take out a full blue-print. Somebody rushed into it and the job is only half completed. This Government have an asset there if they will but realise it. A dredge was brought from Western Australia—I am not sure of the cost—and it was lying idle for eight or 10 weeks at an enormous loss. The Americans changed their minds.

Mr. Bruce: They drove the Japs back.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I am quite aware of that. I am not protesting about the walking off and leaving it; I am reminding the Government they have walked off and left it and therefore the Government can use it.

Mr. Walsh: Nothing much has been done there of any permanent value.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I differ from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Walsh: You ask your own harbour board.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I have talked to the harbour board. The members of the board know a great deal of money has to be spent. I believe if the case is properly put to the Federal Government Cairns can be the Singapore after this war. (Laughter.) Much as hon. members may laugh at the idea, that is the opinion of engineers, and they are the men I take notice of. Marconi was laughed at.

There is approximately 100 feet of water in the inlet. The dredge went away and apparently the piping was leaking, it silted up, probably for no more than five or six chains, which some day will have to be dredged out. I think where there was 60 or 70 feet, it is now only 32 feet. Once that is cleared out we shall have a good depth. I will not mention the number of ships that

have been up the inlet at the one time, but there is nowhere in North Queensland where you have a natural harbour like Cairns, on which £750,000 has been spent. I urge the Government to utilise it. It has possibilities, and according to the engineers in North Queensland it may be the Singapore in the post-war period.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (5.49 p.m.): I was sorry to see the fisheries vote stagnant; over the years it has remained almost at the same level. I hope when the Minister really gets into the department we shall see it bouncing ahead. I assure the Treasurer there are tremendous possibilities in sea wealth if it is properly investigated. We have an opportunity to build up a new industry in this State that will give permanent employment and profit over many years, if it is carefully handled. The Premier, who was then Treasurer, said that I did not know what the Government were doing when I charged them with neglecting this part of the post-war development plans. Looking up the Budget, I wonder if this matter is going to be handed over to the Commonwealth Government. We know the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research have been busy prospecting fisheries. Recently it finished an investigation of Moreton Bay, testing the commercial properties of seaweed and according to preliminary reports has high hopes of developing an industry to exploit it.

I will not go into the many aspects of sea wealth—money can be made out of sea products because they are many and varied—but we in this Parliament should know if there is an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government to hand over the whole of the fisheries to the Commonwealth as its concern or whether the State handle its own affairs. From time to time we hear of the Commonwealth Government's making plans, particularly post-war plans, and there is talk of their bringing vessels here and the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research is probing the possibilities of developing the sea wealth of the Commonwealth. I was wondering if some arrangement had not been made secretly with the Commonwealth or whether we are to take our share of the responsibility of developing this important branch of industry in our own State.

It is all right to make suggestions as to what can be done to improve the fishing industry, but I know very well that if we rely on the professional fishermen for advice as to why our fish supplies are each year becoming less we shall be told simply that the Government are granting licences to part-time fishermen and that they are doing untold injury to the fishing industry by using nets of small mesh and killing the fry. If we approach the semi-professional fisherman as to the cause of the fish shortage he tells us that it is because amateur fishermen are allowed to take undersized fish from any part of our coast. I repeat what I said previously in this Chamber, that the real damage is allowing the professional fishermen to attack schools of mullet off the ocean beaches. There is no question about that.

There are different opinions as to the life cycle of the mullet. Some scientists tell us migration takes place annually at a certain date along our coast, whereas others have an entirely different view. The cycle has never been scientifically proved to any degree of certainty, but we do know that at regular periods the shoals move north along the coast. But we allow a few large professional combines—and I call them that because they are such—to continue to operate. They have obtained a monopoly of the shoals, particularly at Tweed Heads. They have scouts on headlands and as the shoal comes into sight it is attacked with nets. Perhaps a thousand cases of fish are obtained in one day. Not only so, but the mature fish, instead of being allowed to trickle into the rivers as they move northwards, there to spawn, are caught in the nets on the ocean beaches. At every entrance on our coast the professional fishermen operate. It does not require scientific knowledge but merely a little thought to see that if fishing on ocean beaches in this way was prohibited, these shoals would send off numbers into the rivers to spawn in the protection of the logs, debris, and rocks on the beds of the rivers. It is in these places that they breed.

That would give an opportunity for the roe—and there are millions of eggs in one roe—to be spawned, for it to grow into the fry, and for the fry to develop into mature mullet. We are losing all this wealth by allowing fishermen to dictate their own terms. What a howl there would be from the main professional fishermen—I suppose there are only half a dozen—if we stopped fishing on the ocean beaches, but in my opinion until we do that we shall see less and less fish each year until the deep-sea mullet are almost exterminated.

Mr. Farrell: Do you mean prohibit it on all ocean beaches?

Mr. DECKER: On those ocean beaches adjacent to openings into rivers and estuaries.

We have very good officers in the Fisheries Department. There are skilled inspectors, in charge of a man who is scientifically minded. He could do much if he was asked by the Government to make recommendations. I must say that this Government will not get very far if they allow the Fishermen's Association to dictate terms to them. I know that in the past the Government would not open new banks or close existing banks without the consent of the Fishermen's Association. Apparently that was a gentleman's agreement and I suppose it still exists. If we are going to allow these men to run the industry for their own profit, we are heading for disaster. I urge the Minister to go into this matter and seek the advice of the men we have in the Fisheries Department. I impress upon him the need for being strong and for not paying too much heed to suggestions by the professional fishermen, otherwise we shall get nowhere in protecting our fisheries.

If the Government intend to develop their own fisheries we should have some intimation to that effect. If it intended to hand this

work over to the Commonwealth still we should be advised. We want to be sure that this industry is not going to be lost to the State whether it is controlled by the State or the Commonwealth. We should know what takes place at such gatherings as the recent Premiers' Conference. We should have some report giving us an idea as to what it is proposed the State shall do and what is likely to be handed over to the Commonwealth. If we had that information we could confine our discussion to those matters that will concern the State.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (7.15 p.m.): Some of the matters that have been raised on this vote have been very interesting and a note has been taken of them. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that there should be more investigation into the problems associated with the fishing industry. It is an important industry and I think it is generally realised that some investigation into it will have to be carried out if it is to be conserved and developed. However, there seems to be a tendency for one section of those engaged in the fishing industry to blame another section, and vice versa. For instance, the hon. member for Sandgate complained that the professional fishermen were to blame for what was happening in the industry, but if the professional fishermen had made Sandgate their depot we should not have heard that story. Then someone else blamed some other party in the fishing industry for what is happening, and so it goes on. Some little progress has been made towards getting an investigation at a later period, but I think every hon. member realises that it is not much use expecting a big development in this respect at the present time. We are planning for development and investigation after the war.

I have with me the report of the Harbours and Rivers Department for this year. This report has not been published since Japan came into the war, its publication having been withheld at the request of the Commonwealth authorities because the information contained in it would have been of value to the enemy. There has been plenty of information in the reports and they have been available at the department for any hon. member who wished to see them. I now propose to put a copy of the report on the table in the library for the use of hon. members who are seeking information from it. Although that information will be available to hon. members it will not be available to the Press or for publication. It will be seen from the remarks of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries that we have established a working relationship with the C.S.I.R. in connection with the fishing industry. The Chief Inspectors of Fisheries in all the States are now the local officers of the C.S.I.R. While not much has been done in the way of research up to the present the way has been opened for development in that direction as soon as staff is available and the war position becomes clear. We have a very good man on the scientific side of the industry in Mr. Marshall, the Assistant Chief Inspector, a very competent

officer, who will be available for the research side of the industry, which we propose to develop. As time goes on hon. members will see the big improvements we have worked out but there is no use in expecting these things to be done until the war position clears because the staff is not yet available and we should not be justified in relaxing our war effort until we were positively sure of victory.

Mention was made of the fact that modern plant should be obtained. Today all our plant is under the control of the Commonwealth authorities and is working all the time in the service of the Navy, both in Brisbane and in northern ports. At the present time all the plant in Brisbane is tied up in work with the Navy and we have no chance of getting it for any other purpose. In the funds that are available for post-war development substantial provision is made for acquiring modern plant and we should also be able to get plant that is now being used by the Navy. A large sum of money has been earmarked and when the war is over we hope to have modern plant capable of meeting the requirements of all the ports on the coast.

The hon. member for Wynnum suggested that more care should be given to Moreton Bay and in this connection I admit quite frankly that of recent years Moreton Bay has been neglected. As a matter of fact, it has been deteriorating over a long period of years owing to the silting of the various channels in the Bay, and since the outbreak of war, as the hon. member for Wynnum says, a number of beacons have been destroyed, some having been broken off in storms and not replaced.

Others have been destroyed by the mischief that is in the boys of the fighting services, which makes them pick out beacons as targets for machine-gun fire and so on—it is not long before they are completely destroyed. Buoys have drifted from their positions and the present staff is endeavouring to keep these matters right. A couple of beacons recently broke off below high-water mark and no doubt impaired navigation. Arrangements have been made to have these beacons restored.

The dredging of Moreton Bay, particularly the approaches to Wynnum, Manly, Lota, Deception Bay jetty and so on, is a job for a very shallow-draught dredge, which cannot be easily provided until after the war. We cannot do it now as such a vessel is not available. Greater use could be made of Moreton Bay, particularly the southern end, which is one of the most beautiful stretches of water in the world. I have not seen a more beautiful holiday place than the southern end of the bay. Its beauty is enhanced by its multitude of channels and islands. The growth in the number of motor boats that we may expect after the war would justify the Government in putting a tax on them in the same way as we do on motor-cars, the whole of the money to be used for the maintenance of the bay in proper condition. All our beacons and lights in the bay, even as they were before the war, did not fulfil requirements and improvements can be effected in both respects. Navigation could be undertaken in certain parts with safety only if you knew the

channels personally. I think myself people who could afford to keep a motor boat for pleasure could afford to pay a small fee for making the bay safe for navigation. That is a direction in which a great deal can be done when the war is over.

Mr. Decker: That is in addition to the present registration fee?

Mr. HANLON: The registration fee now is merely a nominal one. The registration of private launches at present is 5s. per annum for vessels up to 20 feet; 10s. for launches from 20 to 40 feet, and £1 for launches over 40 feet. A launch 40 feet and over is a pretty formidable vessel. The fees are nominal and hardly pay the cost of keeping the registration.

Mr. Sparkes: There would not be many launches over 40 feet.

Mr. HANLON: No, there are not many over 40 feet. These fees were imposed at a time when action was taken to have some control over vessels going down the bay and carrying passengers. People who owned boats of that kind would not find it any hardship to pay a licence of a few pounds a year to keep the channels and buoys in order. It would not cost a great deal to the community or the Crown either to do that work.

The hon. member for Maryborough drew attention to the necessity of dredging work at Maryborough, but that cannot be done at the present time. The department realises the difficulty of shipping people at Maryborough and the earliest opportunity will be taken to correct the position. I do say that with the money that will be available for the purpose when the war position clears up we shall, when we have a modern plant, be capable of giving excellent service to all parts of the coast, not merely to some parts.

Mr. JESSON (Kennedy) (7.26 p.m.): I was rather struck by the daring speech of the hon. member for Sandgate, in which he advocated the socialisation of the fishing industry.

Mr. Decker: That is a bit of imagination.

Mr. JESSON: He said: why should not the Government spend hundreds of thousands of pounds on fishing and so on?

Mr. Decker: I do not think I did.

Mr. JESSON: Let the hon. member read his speech tomorrow and see whether he said it or not. He cannot remember what he said half an hour ago. The hon. member advocated the expenditure of huge sums of money, I think for trawling for fish, and then he mentioned that fish had not been preserved along the coast because fishermen in a big way monopolised the industry and not being content to trawl followed the fish into the rivers. If that were so we should not get any fish at all. Every few miles along our coast we have rivers and creeks emptying into the sea.

If they were barred to the big fishermen we should not get any other fish. The hon. member's argument has not much merit

except that he made a very daring speech, for which the hon. member for Windsor will cane him. (Government laughter.)

Trawling for fish on the coast would be uneconomic because of the Barrier Reef. The Commonwealth Government have in years gone by had surveys made of the whole of the coast in Australia. In Western Australia there was a canning works for the canning of fish but it was unsuccessful. The plant was there until the war broke out when they removed it. Down on the South Coast of New South Wales below Sydney there was a canning works and it was idle for part of the year because of the lack of suitable fish. Because of the long distances they have to go in comparison with Alaska and the British Isles, where most of the herrings come from, I do not think we can compete successfully in that field.

Another matter I wish to refer to is the silting up of the rivers along our coast. As I have mentioned on innumerable occasions, there have in the past been rivers that have been navigable for miles inland, but for a number of years, owing to the continual silting up—particularly because violent tropical storms carry down big trees and other debris to the sandbanks at the mouths of the rivers and stop there—you can now hardly get into them. Many years ago sugar was loaded at Halifax and Macknade on the Herbert River, but now it is impossible for a boat of any size to get over the bar.

Another matter I wish to bring under the notice of the Government, although I believe it comes within the province of the Commonwealth Government, is the matter of handling aviation. I believe that if we are to participate in post-war planning of overseas routes to America and England and other nations we have to start now. In Townsville the flying-boat facilities are appalling and much worse than those in Brisbane, where the hazard for a flying boat coming down on the river is very great. I have travelled from Townsville to Brisbane on a flying boat on a number of occasions and sometimes we have had to circle three times before the river was cleared to permit the boat to come down. The recent accident in Sydney Harbour may have occurred because the plane had to circle and lost its speed and then something went wrong and it crashed. If the weather is bad in the North the flying boat that goes to Townsville sometimes has to go back to Bowen and land there and continue the journey to Townsville in the early hours of next morning, thus increasing the hazard. In the north of Townsville at the mouth of the Bohle River—I do not think the enemy would be listening now; they are too far away—there is an ideal flying-boat base.

Any hon. member who has been in that area knows that that river flows for many months of the year, and with the protection of Cape Pallarenda and Magnetic Island in the south and Palm Island in the north forms a natural all-weather flying-boat base. Everything required for such a base can be found there, and if North Queensland is to be placed on the map as regards flying-boat travel that would be an ideal base.

Mr. Maher: How far is it from Townsville?

Mr. JESSON: From five to six miles. The great advantage is that within half a mile or a mile at the outside is the Garbutt field aerodrome, with its large workshops and mechanics. Flying boats could be taken there by truck and be completely overhauled right on the spot. It took this war to bring about the establishment of the Garbutt field. As I have pointed out, within a small circle there would be landing bases for land and water planes, and the whole could be an ideal commercial airport. The mouth of the river could be widened.

The strange part of travelling by plane today is that the traveller spends more time at either end of the journey than in actual travelling. After arriving at the airport an hour to an hour and a half is taken up with checking of luggage and other formalities, and then one has to travel by boat down the river or the bay to the base. The same things occurs at the other end. If the river was widened facilities similar to those used by Transpacific Airways could be installed. Passengers could walk on and off a plane on a gangway like walking off a steamer or a train.

When visiting the South recently I spoke to Mr. Drakeford, the Minister for Air, about the matter, and to Captain Brain of Qantas, pointing out the lack of facilities and the hazard of landing facilities in the open bay at Townsville, where a submerged stick could tear the bottom out of the fuselage, and easily cause another tragedy. In the tropics there is always the hazard caused by floating debris. The Government should have the matter investigated and bring it under the notice of the Commonwealth Government if we wish to be put on the map in air travel.

Although I disagree to some extent with the hon. member for Cairns that Cairns could be the Singapore of Australia, I suggest that the only part of the North Queensland coast for a decent port from a commercial or naval point of view is between the mainland at Cardwell and Hinchinbrook Island, at Oyster Point. I have repeatedly brought under the notice of this Parliament how facilities at Oyster Point, which is within 70 miles of Townsville, would help in the loading of sugar from Tully and the vast resources at the back of the Tableland, the Kirrima Range and associated country. Moreover, electrification could be provided by the damming of the river at the Herbert Gorge. This would provide cheap power, and great industries could be started in the North if such port facilities were established.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough as to ship-building. Although Walkers Ltd., Maryborough, and the Maryborough workmen have done a man-sized job in building ships for the Australian Navy and the mercantile marine, without unduly upsetting the hon. member, I say that it is purely a war measure and it will take a large amount of dredging to open and widen the Mary River to accommodate ships of large dimensions. The small

rivers were never intended for huge ship-building yards.

Mr. Morris: What about the Clyde?

Mr. JESSON: The Clyde is a river. The fact is that building ships in such places can be likened to building a huge box inside a room and then having to take one wall out of the room to get the box out. My friend the former hon. member for Bowen referred repeatedly to the advisability of establishing an iron and steel works at Bowen. In my opinion Bowen with those steel works would be an ideal place for building big ships. It must be remembered, too, that it was as a result of the Labour Government's policy of decentralisation, embarked upon years ago, that Queensland has so many ports along her coast. Had it not been for that policy such towns as Bundaberg, Gladstone, Maryborough, Rockhampton, Bowen, Mackay and other beautiful cities up the coast as far as Cooktown would never have been developed as they are. The money expended on those harbours has been money well spent in that it has meant the opening up of the whole of the Queensland coast.

My suggestion in connection with Oyster Point merits investigation. As I have stated on a previous occasion, it is possible to throw a stone from the bank into 20 or 30 fathoms of water. The surrounding area is eminently suited to the construction of shipyards and the provision of railway facilities. Most of the timber in North Queensland is situated at the back of the Kirrima Range. When that timber has been taken out thousands upon thousands of acres of fertile land will be made available for settlement in dairying and other primary production.

I suggest to the Minister that he and the Government take steps to ensure that we are not left behind when aviation plans are being made after the war. My personal opinion is that Australia will have very little say in those plans.

Mr. Aikens: Thanks to the "No" vote.

Mr. JESSON: That is certainly one of the reasons. I believe that the big powers of America, England and perhaps even our enemies will have a big say about the future of aviation.

Reverting to the Bohle River scheme, I would point out that any man with common sense, even the hon. member for Windsor, will see its possibilities immediately if he cares to inspect the place. Being just alongside the Garbutt airfield, and being protected by the two islands I have mentioned, it would make an ideal base for any flying boat in the world.

Again, if we are to develop the North, harbour facilities must be created there. About 12 months ago I referred to the shocking spectacle of about 12 ships at the wharves in Townsville while 20 or 30 others were lying in the lee of Magnetic Island waiting their turn to be unloaded. I suggested then that the Commonwealth Government would be well advised to spend about £2,000,000 to make a harbour at Oyster Point where ships

would be safe, where they would not have to shift position with every change in the wind.

Mr. Maher: Has any competent authority ever reported on Oyster Point?

Mr. JESSON: Yes. I have files that would almost choke even the hon. member for West Moreton.

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. JESSON: I take no notice of the hon. member for flannel shirts and cotton singlets. He knows nothing about it. He is merely a flannel-shirt politician.

I referred to the shocking spectacle of 30 to 40 ships anchored off the shore waiting to unload. But look at the damage that would have been incurred if the Japs had been lucky enough to come over and bomb the ships at a time when Townsville had nothing more than a few pop guns for its defence. It would have been a tragedy. Luckily, we escaped it thanks to the American air force, our own boys in New Guinea in Milne Bay, and our Navy, but it was more by good luck than good management. Townsville has not what you would call a really good port and neither has Cairns. Cairns harbour is not a real harbour, not a land-locked place but only a mangrove swamp that has been built up. At Oyster Point—

Mr. Muller: Whose electorate is that in?

Mr. JESSON: It is in the Herbert electorate. That was a dirty one by the hon. member for Fassifern. He thinks that we cannot discuss the State of Queensland without working the parish pump but we on this side are big Queenslanders not little Queen street politicians such as there are on the other side of the Chamber. I am talking about something that is not in my electorate but is of great concern to Queensland as a whole and North Queensland in particular. When I raised this matter on a previous occasion, it was Mr. Menzies, Mr. Fadden and Dr. Page who were the alleged leaders of Australia, but they let us down in our hour of need.

Mr. Yeates: It was Mr. Scullin.

Mr. JESSON: That remark makes me laugh. The hon. member appears to have just awakened, having arrived on the 240 Up he begins to talk about something he knows nothing about. He has been asleep ever since Mr. Scullin was put out of office, because he said Mr. Scullin was Prime Minister of Australia when the Japs came into the war. It is no wonder that hon. members opposite are permanently in opposition. It was Artful Arty and Boastful Bob who were responsible. When Boastful Bob was over in England talking with Lady Astor Artful Arty was back in Australia stabbing him in the back but the people of Australia woke up to them and chucked them out very severely. All jokes apart, I put those two proposals to the Government in all earnestness—that we should make arrangements for sea-plane accommodation in Queensland for post-war purposes, and we must have a port,

a Singapore of Australia, big enough to accommodate the entire British Navy. We have such a place in Northern Queensland, a natural harbour, not a tidal river. There are only two such places in Queensland and they are Bowen Harbour and Oyster Point, two natural roadsteads where the whole of the British Navy could ride at anchor in safety at any time.

Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) (7.49 p.m.): I propose to draw pointed attention to the very serious erosion that is taking place in North Queensland and of course I shall endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Kennedy concerning port facilities in the North, as he has on previous occasions supported me in similar proposals that I have advanced in this Chamber. There is another very fine harbour in North Queensland, Mourilyan Harbour, whose claim for consideration in this respect cannot be overlooked by any public-minded person.

Mr. Maher: I thought you were going to back the claim for Oyster Point.

Mr. THEODORE: I endorse everything the hon. member for Kennedy has said about Oyster Point.

Mr. Maher: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. THEODORE: Queensland requires all the natural ports it can get after the war to meet the demands that will be made upon them as development takes place in this State.

I want specially to make reference to the considerable damage caused from time to time by erosion of the river banks in North Queensland. The Herbert River, the Tully River, and the Johnstone River are all subject to considerable erosion, but the worst evidence is on the Johnstone River at East Innisfail where the erosion has virtually taken away the road for many chains along the river front, endangering the houses in close proximity.

Mr. Walsh: It is very serious.

Mr. THEODORE: The Minister for Transport inspected the erosion of these rivers in my company on the occasion of his last visit to the North. He also inspected the erosion taking place on other rivers, including the Hull River. It will give the Government considerable concern, and it will not be easy to arrest it. The position is becoming alarming. Certain reports have already been made to the Government on erosion, particularly with respect to the Johnstone River. Considerable expenditure will be necessary to arrest the damage, but the job must be done. The longer it is left the more costly it will be. Erosion on many places on the Tully River is gradually washing away good cane land.

Erosion has assumed its present proportions because the banks of these rivers have been cleared of vegetation. I believe this erosion can be arrested by driving piles into the river where they would be effective but the expense would be too great for the farmer

or small landholder to undertake. It is work with which the Government must concern itself.

Mr. Walsh: It is a national problem.

Mr. THEODORE: That is so and it is the Government's duty to make some endeavour to arrest the damage.

Mr. Maher: What sort of a job is the trust accomplishing along the Burdekin?

Mr. THEODORE: Effective measures are being taken to overcome the problem wherever practicable. It is very necessary that some steps be taken in that place and in this the Minister for Transport will bear me out. A report was made that the erosion could be arrested by the construction of a barricade from the island to the mainland, which would cost about £30,000. I do not know whether it would be effective. Before undertaking the expenditure of a large sum of money to arrest erosion, we must consider whether erosion would not thereby be caused elsewhere. Had the work been tackled years ago the erosion might have been arrested; it certainly would not have reached its present dimensions.

Had a harbour been constructed at Oyster Point in pre-war days, I believe, as the hon. member for Kennedy pointed out, that it would have been a wonderful asset not only to Queensland but to the nation. Today we find the sugar mills in North Queensland are being stacked with sugar. In fact, today I was informed that the Tully mill has only a fortnight's storage capacity left and unless some relief is obtained in the meantime operations there will have to cease. That position is due to transport troubles. Ships come in to load sugar, and a number of others are lying outside the harbour waiting for a berth but when a vessel with an essential cargo arrives the ship loading sugar must vacate the berth. The congestion in Townsville is due to that.

Mr. Maher: Have you not a Federal member there who might be able to do something?

Mr. THEODORE: All the Federal members and Federal Cabinet Ministers cannot alter it, because it is due to the heavy war demand on our harbour facilities. Common sense dictates that we must make the most use of our harbour facilities in order to be prepared to meet an occasion such as the one the country has experienced during the last few years. We get up and talk of the necessity for using all our natural undeveloped resources and say that it is essential for us to have vision in regard to such development but we do nothing.

I talked with the harbour master at Mourilyan during the last 12 months and I asked him what he thought was necessary to bring about a greater use of that harbour. He said all that was necessary was to extend the harbour facilities. It would not require much work on the entrance. He said he was prepared to take any ship into that harbour at any time. We find the resistance to the

utilisation of that harbour does not come from the Government or the people but from the shipping companies; they are the cause of the delay in the utilisation and development of those natural facilities. I believe the same thing applies as far as Oyster Point jetty is concerned. I saw reports on the Oyster Point jetty and they said the possibilities of development of the surrounding district at the present time did not warrant the expenditure that would be involved in the development of that harbour. I maintain we have to look further than tomorrow or next year; we have to look years ahead, particularly now when we know this country is under an obligation to defend itself from future aggression. In order to do our duty to our people we have to incur extraordinary expenditure, and we should make it our business to finance such undertakings as those for the benefit of the country. I believe those things will receive consideration in the near future, and that they have not received consideration in the past for the reasons I have stated. I believe we shall see a great development in those virgin forests and the surrounding areas of North Queensland in the post-war period. I believe Mr. Curtin, the Prime Minister, was sincere when he said that he expected to see a great deal of development in the northern part of Queensland, particularly the coast areas, and that they will be very much more thickly populated than many people expect. I think that is sound and it is consistent with the desire of this Government to aid in the development of this State and ensure the safety of the people of this country.

Mr. J. F. BARNES (Bundaberg) (8.2 p.m.): I rise to support the previous speakers in reference to soil erosion and the developing of our natural harbours. I also support a harbour for Bundaberg—an artificial one. We have there the necessary depth of water and it would be simplicity itself to put in an artificial harbour similar to the one put in at Mackay. The Mackay harbour was made economical by virtue of the excessive lighterage dues users have to pay, whereas Bundaberg is not taxed with lighterage dues. After all, thousands have been spent on destruction.

A plan could be evolved by which a harbour could be constructed at Bundaberg when the other essential jobs of the post-war period have been completed at perhaps $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest. It would give to the sugar industry there a port that it badly needs.

In my maiden speech in this Chamber I pointed out that there were 1,200 varieties of fish in Australian waters and 900 of those were to be found in Queensland waters but we were doing nothing to develop this industry. Perhaps I should withdraw that statement and say that we are doing virtually nothing. We import fish from all parts of the world whereas on our Barrier Reef are to be found great quantities of herrings or hardyheads, as we call them, and with modern machinery it would be simplicity itself to scale these hardyheads and tin our own sardines, apart from numerous other varieties of fish that could be treated.

Outside Bundaberg is to be found perhaps one of the only natural harbours on the Barrier Reef, Lady Musgrave Island. The fishing industry could be developed in that locality. It is comparatively close to Brisbane and we must prepare to make use of modern transport facilities. The Navy now has small boats capable of 30 to 40 knots an hour and a boat of that speed is necessary for the development of the fishing industry of the Barrier Reef, apart altogether from the need for an air service. The natural harbour at Lady Musgrave Island is protected from all winds, particularly the prevailing south-east winds in the worst season of the year. I venture the opinion that if the Government spent £100,000 on subsidising a fishing industry on the Barrier Reef they would have their money returned 10-fold.

There is another aspect of the fishing industry of which I do not remember hearing anything in this Chamber. We should endeavour to eliminate the shark as we tried to get rid of the dingo. Hon. members must remember that I said, "tried to eliminate the dingo." The shark is a menace to fishing. Any fisherman knows that once a bait is taken by a shark one may as well pull in the anchor and go elsewhere. But the shark has also a commercial value. I suggest that a reward of 10s. be offered for every shark caught. I should be pleased to see in one financial year £1,000,000 paid out for the elimination of the shark. In the following year there would be scarcely a shark left on which to pay the reward. The doing of these things costs money and for private industry to embark on an industry like this it must have some kind of protection. The sugar industry is protected by the 2d. a lb. extra that the consuming public pay. The fishing industry should be protected likewise.

Mr. Walsh: They do not pay any extra for sugar in Australia compared with other parts of the world.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: Today the people in Australia are paying 2½d. a lb. extra.

Mr. Walsh: That is not true.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: True or not, they are still paying it. I could tell the Committee how to finance this subsidy but on this vote I should not be allowed to do so. The fact remains that in Queensland waters are to be found 900 varieties of fish and virtually nothing has been done about it, and judging by the reception of my few remarks it is quite obvious nothing will be done until we have a progressive Government.

Mr. SMITH (Carpentaria) (8.8 p.m.): I really think we are not taking this vote as seriously as we should, for the simple reason that the harbours of Australia, including those of Queensland, will play an important part in the future. Having listened to the debate, I really believe in all sincerity that we should at the earliest possible moment get away from the eastern coast of Queensland in regard to the shipping of our produce overseas that is produced in the north-western parts of the State; I have heard

a great deal today about the Brisbane and a few other rivers along the coast. We know there is a great decentralisation of railways but we cannot give any credit to the early engineers or others who created our harbours. Every harbour that we have on the coast now has been artificially created; they overlooked every natural harbour on the coast.

Mr. Theodore: What about Bowen?

Mr. SMITH: Bowen has been overlooked. At that time it would not have made any difference to the people in the West whether the railway line came from either Bowen or Townsville, but the engineers of the past blundered in overlooking the natural harbours of Gladstone, Bowen and Mourilyan.

Mr. Walsh: The political white elephants before Labour Governments.

Mr. SMITH: I am talking now of the days before Labour legislation, of the days before Federation when Queensland was a colony and not a State. It certainly would have been a great asset if a line had been built west from Bowen. Cattlemen, mining men, and industrialists in the West would have been brought much closer to the overseas markets than they are today. Do hon. members realise that Mt. Isa and Cloncurry are as far south as Bloomsbury? At the present time it is necessary to travel 600 miles north-east to go from Mt. Isa to Townsville whereas a line could have been built directly east from Mt. Isa to Bloomsbury. The Mt. Isa products of silver, lead and copper go all the way to Townsville and are then unloaded. The railway trucks then travel empty to Collinsville to be loaded with coke and coal. What a difference it would have made to the people of the West if that railway line had been built from the natural port of Bowen, instead of Townsville! In those days the people of Townsville would not have been greatly concerned, but now that the city is established all sorts of opposition is raised by the chamber of commerce, A.L.P. branches, the Townsville City Council and others, if the Government even mention any suggestion of transferring the port to Bowen, the place where it should have been established in the first instance.

Going further north, there is an artificial harbour at Cairns that is costing thousands upon thousands of pounds each year in dredging. This heavy dredging cost means heavy harbour dues. This in turn means heavy costs for the man who is sending his wool, meat or any other product overseas or elsewhere by boat. If the port had been established at a natural harbour like Mourilyan in which anything from 20,000 to 40,000 ton ships could have berthed with ease, what a great asset it would have been to North Queensland!

It is time we got away from the eastern coast for reasons I have already stated. When immigrants come here to settle on the land the cheaper we produce our goods

and the more cheaply and quickly we get them to overseas markets the better it will be for the working man. Whenever the working man approaches the Industrial Court for an increase in wages the cost of production is a factor for consideration by the court. That being so, it follows naturally that the cheaper production is the better it will be for him, and costs will be cheapened if goods are put on to the overseas markets more quickly.

Again, it is time something was done to open up our ports in the Gulf country, at Normanton, Point Parker, and Borroloola. Instead of having to walk his cattle, 3, 4 or 5 months from the Gulf down to Dajarra and Kajabbi and then truck them 604 miles to the meatworks in Townsville, the cattleman could take them to these closer ports. I should have liked to have seen something included in the Estimates to cover a survey of the harbours with a view to bringing such men as these closer to their markets. The Norman River is as good as the Brisbane River for 30 miles. There is a bar at its mouth, but that is no obstacle with modern dredging facilities.

Then there is Borroloola. It is not long since the chairman of directors of Mt. Isa Mines, Mr. Blaikie Webster, wanted to construct a railway from Mt. Isa to this port. I agree with the Government's refusal to help, because, as in most overseas proposals, he wanted land grants for constructing the railway to this natural harbour. Again, we have the spectacle of cattle being taken thousands of miles overland to New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria from the Gulf. Why should they not be killed where they are bred? These cattlemen now are forced to breed types of cattle that will stand a long trip overland, and then a long trip in the railways but even so they depreciate in value by sometimes as much as 50 per cent. by the time they reach the works. It is time we forgot the eastern coast for a while and developed our northern ports in order to bring these industries closer to the market. Hon. members may not know it but those ports at Normanton, Point Parker and Borroloola are 2,000 miles closer to overseas markets than any other port in Queensland.

Look at the saving in time that would be made for the big boats doing 15 to 20 knots an hour carrying our meat, wool and other produce to the oversea markets and landing it in splendid condition! We may talk about the fishing industry at Sandgate, &c., but that is insignificant in comparison although it will receive its due consideration in the course of time; we must see now that the natural harbours of the State are developed. They have been sorely neglected in the past. Every time the suggestion is made that these neglected natural ports should receive close attention the matter is resisted by vested interests at other places and pressure is brought to bear on Governments. The political control that has prevailed in respect of the artificial harbours in the past will have to cease and the good natural ports that bring our produce closer to the oversea markets will have to be

developed as soon as possible. I should have liked to hear more discussion of the proposal to convey our export produce more speedily to the oversea markets and improve the quality of them.

Mr. Sparkes: Then why did you not let the Mount Isa Company build that railway line?

Mr. SMITH: If I had been agreeable to their being given large tracts of land in this State I might have agreed but I could never bring myself to do that. This company wanted to build the railway line on the condition that it got grants of certain areas of land and had it in mind too that it would bring its coal and coke supplies from other countries. I commend the Government for refusing the proposal submitted to them by Mr. Blaikie Webster on behalf of the Mount Isa company.

I am surprised, too, that there is not more agitation in favour of the improvement of the natural ports in the Gulf of Carpentaria so that we could bring our produce nearer to the oversea markets, especially as there will be heavy trade commitments in them after the war with China and Asia, Europe and England. If we sit idly by and do not attempt to do something in this connection we shall again be ousted from these markets by Argentina and other South American republics.

Mr. COLLINS (Cook) (8.18 p.m.) I commend the hon. member for Carpentaria for his advocacy of the development of northern ports and shipping routes, because if there is one subject on which we should be very insistent it is the establishment of a Torres Strait overseas shipping service, particularly for chilled beef.

Mr. L. J. Barnes: It would mean a saving of a little over 16 days in transport.

Mr. COLLINS: It would mean a saving of a little over a fortnight, as the hon. member says, which is a very important factor when we bear in mind the fact that 50 days is the maximum for which beef may be held chilled and so a saving of 14 to 16 days in transport from other ports as against Townsville and Cairns would help the beef-cattle industry very greatly. It is from the North that most of our beef can be exported and there is no reason why the cattle should be brought to Brisbane to be slaughtered and chilled and sent into the export trade. There are meatworks at Townsville, Bowen, and Cairns, but 50 years ago we had a more direct overseas service from northern ports via Torres Strait than we have today, which is a matter for great regret. The same facilities at least should be available to us today and anything that can be done to re-establish a proper transport service for chilled meat will be of considerable help to the industry.

I regret very much that there has been some considerable misunderstanding about the alleged poor artificial port of Cairns. The next time the hon. member for Kennedy is in Cairns I shall take him by the hand and prove

to him that Cairns is not a poor port, nor is it an artificial one but on the contrary one of the best natural harbours on the coast of Queensland. It has no breakwater and no breakwater is required. Contrary to the ideas of many people, the Cairns inlet right up past the wharves has about 40 feet of water, sufficient to accommodate the whole British fleet. Cairns is a natural port and during the war it was regarded as one of the best shipping bases for oversea operations.

The Department of the Navy recognised that Cairns was a suitable port for all its shipping, including warships. Before Japan was driven back from the islands adjacent to our continent the Americans decided to spend £3,000,000 on developing the port of Cairns to accommodate their shipping. That £3,000,000 was not spent in building breakwaters or dredging but in the construction of wharves, sheds, and reclamation work. That is what the Americans thought of the port of Cairns! I will not argue that every little inlet or river should be made a first-class port—we have to spend the State's money wisely—but in saying this I do not wish to deny the hon. member for Kennedy his deep-sea port on the Bohle River.

Mr. Jesson: That is not a deep-sea port; it is an airport.

Mr. COLLINS: I thought the hon. member advocated a deep-sea port there. In any case I do not want any misapprehension to exist about the shipping facilities at Cairns. Cairns is one of the few ports controlled by a board that has managed it, together with shipping requirements, capably and efficiently. It has in the course of time borrowed over £300,000 from the Treasury, but not on one occasion has it ever defaulted in its commitments. The board consists of members representative of local authorities of the district, including the hinterland, and has for many years been considered to be one of the best managed boards on the coast. We have heard statements that the Harbours and Marine Department should take over the control of all ports. That may be advisable in some cases, particularly those that have been extravagant in borrowing from the Treasury. Some boards have not been able to meet their commitments and never will be able to do so. That is not the fault of the board but is the fault of the administration in allowing ports to be constructed where they were not warranted or could be made. Where a harbour facility is managed as well as it is at Cairns and has been able to meet every commitment to the Treasury without any difficulty or delay, as well as provide all shipping facilities necessary for the export of raw sugar, overseas shipments of meat and facilities for refuelling, re-equipment and refitting warships, some record should be made of the fact. With very little dredging it is capable of accommodating any ship that can enter any other port in Australia. Dredging work has to be carried out at Melbourne, one of the biggest ports in Australia. It is true that Sydney Harbour does not need to be dredged, but dredging is done on the foreshores. The amount of dredging at Cairns is not great,

but even there the board looked after that part of its work just as similar work has been done at ports further down the coast. Cairns possesses one of the finest workshops along the coast for repairing shipping. If a sea-plane base is required Cairns has all the facilities for it.

All I want to see is the Cairns Harbour Board left alone to continue the excellent work it has done in the past. I want to see it left alone to manage its own affairs, as it has done in the past very efficiently, and that it receive the same assistance it has had from this Government at any time it has asked for it, and to allow the port to be developed as the natural requirements of the North demand. In doing that I think you will not only be doing a service to the people who have managed the affairs of Cairns, but to North Queensland in general. If anything can be done by this Government to help in insuring a northern shipping service via Torres Strait to British or continental ports that will help a very great industry.

I commend the hon. member for Carpentaria for wanting to develop Normanton as a port. It has possibilities and it is close to the overseas and the markets of Asia; but it must be remembered that the port of Normanton would have been developed over 40 years ago had it not been for the hostile Tory Upper House in this Parliament. The Upper House on two occasions turned down a proposal that not only was recommended in this House, but actually legislation was passed on two occasions to build a railway inland from Port Norman and develop Port Norman as a deep-sea port, and that was turned down by the Upper House, on two occasions in the last century. To have a good port you need a good many other facilities besides a bit of water. Cairns has a natural harbour capable of accommodating all the shipping likely to come to Cairns for the next 50 or 100 years, and the little bit of additional accommodation that is needed can be built from time to time as it is required.

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (8.30 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer on the discussion he has had on this vote. His predecessor, the Premier, was a very keen man in regard to any business that could be found round any of the ports of Queensland, and I think he did a very good job as far as ports were concerned. I know the Under Secretary for the Treasury, Mr. Crosser, is a very keen business man. During the crisis we passed through in the last five years—particularly the extreme crisis in the last three years—transport generally has been overloaded, and the ports of Queensland have served an excellent purpose in getting our produce away.

I thank the Treasurer for the expenditure on the Urangan wharf. Urangan, or Port Maryborough, is an excellent port and during the crisis it took away a considerable quantity of materials and foodstuffs needed throughout the State, and as a result we find the accounts of the port of Maryborough have made substantial progress. I know there are other ports in Queensland that do not think

the small expenditure of £2,000 at Urangan a very wise act on the part of the Treasurer. Let me say it was during the period when rail transport was most difficult that this port provided for the transport of sugar interstate and overseas. Of the whole of the production of the Bundaberg area, some 70,000 tons of sugar, must find a market interstate or overseas, and the ordinary river ports cannot take the sugar to its destination. I recognise that the port of Gladstone is a long way away, and it has not welcomed the opening of the Urangan port, which has been very useful to the sugar industry, because of its proximity to the cane areas, and because it provided an outlet for the Maryborough and Bundaberg districts for interstate and overseas trade.

Mr. Walsh: Saving a tremendous lot in railway transport.

Mr. BRAND: That is so, and at the same time alleviating that scourge of the sugar industry, double handling of sugar that has to be transported any distance, and that is a very necessary thing today when bags are a pressing item to this great industry. The Treasurer has charge of the purse-strings and I commend to him the example set to him by his predecessor in office of first of all ascertaining whether there was any business to be obtained by a port. The sugar industry in Bundaberg and Maryborough appreciate the action of the Government in opening Urangan for the transport of sugar.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: Only for overseas. Bundaberg is quite capable of handling all its interstate sugar.

Mr. BRAND: At all events, let me tell the Treasurer that because of the action of his predecessor that port is now paying and if one turns to the report of the Auditor-General handed to us today he will find that with the aid rendered by the Treasurer to that port it is paying off its debt and I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that although regarded many years ago as a white elephant it will now be very useful. The ports of Queensland have rendered excellent service not only to Queensland but to Australia and I wonder at times what we should have done but for them.

Mr. Moore: Labour's policy of decentralisation.

Mr. BRAND: I do not know which port Labour established.

Mr. Moore: The lot.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member knows that is not true. The Labour Government have given all the help possible for a Government to give in the development of the ports but I will not say which Government opened the ports. There may be wisdom in closing some ports and opening others, but from the experience gained during the past three years no citizen could say that we can afford to close any port on the Queensland coast. They have proved wonderful havens of refuge to our Navy and those ships from America conveying troops and produce. The ports of

Queensland rendered yeoman service to this nation and I feel the expenditure made was very wise. It is true that some harbour boards have found difficulty in meeting their loan commitments, but one has merely to look at the development that has taken place in the Mackay outer harbour to ascertain how these ports can make useful contributions not only to the development of industry but in reducing indebtedness on the cost of construction. In addition, the construction of the Mackay outer harbour meant a saving of 1s. 8d. a ton to the sugar industry on all sugar transported through that harbour.

Mr. Walsh: It pays its way too.

Mr. BRAND: According to the report of the Auditor-General, it not only pays its way but its loan indebtedness is now only £199,172. That is a splendid position for a harbour that cost over £1,000,000. Of course, I recognise it has an indebtedness to other financial institutions. Furthermore, since its construction it has added considerably to its wharf facilities, thus making Mackay an outstanding port.

Mr. Walsh: Despite the opposition of monopolistic shipping companies, including the Adelaide Steamship Company.

Mr. BRAND: I believe the Minister is stating the facts. We know that by its success the Mackay harbour was confounded those critics who said it was not practical to make a port there. That is one harbour that has been built by the Labour Government and like the rest it has been a success.

In the early days the population did not settle round the natural harbours, with the result that other areas received preferential treatment. Money was expended on such places as Townsville and Rockhampton, while the natural ports of Gladstone and Bowen were neglected. It is a pity that that should have happened, but we cannot get away from the fact that the artificial harbour at Townsville is a good one. There is also an excellent harbour at Cairns. I believe that it is capable of handling the whole of the sugar produced north of Tully and after our experience of the last few years the Government would be ill-advised to close any port. Rather should they encourage all ports in an effort to build round them more industries than they have now. Mourilyan too is an excellent port despite certain disabilities, which should be removed to allow overseas vessels to come in and take sugar from adjacent areas. The lighterage on sugar from that district to Cairns has proved a heavy burden on the industry, but whatever the cost experience has shown that in the long run it pays to keep all ports open. There is no doubt that all our Queensland ports will play a material part in the development of the State. Both primary and secondary industries need ready transport at all times if they are to be successful and ports always play a great part in their development.

I rose to pay a tribute to the Treasury for the expenditure of that small sum on Port Urangan. It has been money well spent, and

I have nothing but praise for the business acumen of the Under Secretary to the Treasury in helping the establishment of these ports. The extra facility at Port Urangan will be of great help to the many industries in the surrounding districts.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (8.45 p.m.): I have come to the conclusion that the day of Stonewall Jackson is not yet past.

Mr. Walsh: Have you taken the number of speakers on your side as compared with the number on this side? If you have you will see where the stonewalling is taking place.

Mr. PIE: I have. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on harbours in general and, with the Treasurer, my only regret is that in the Windsor electorate as in the Ithaca electorate there is no port that we can extol.

I am glad that the hon. member for Cook publicly gave the cane tonight to the hon. member for Kennedy. I think the hon. member for Kennedy contradicted the hon. member for Cairns and suggested that certain hon. members on this side would get the cane, but I can assure him that according to the papers he will find that the cane was applied on the other side of the Chamber.

I was very pleased to hear the Treasurer say that C.S.I.R. had really co-opted the services of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries in Queensland because I know that that council is doing excellent work in the industrial field in the matter of the canning and processing of fish in Australia. We have been very unfortunate in Queensland in that we have not been able to participate in the development of the fish-canning industry that has taken place in Australia even at the present time. Before the war many millions of pounds of salmon, herring, sardines, and similar fish were imported into this country from Norway, Alaska, Canada and Newcastle-Tyne.

Mr. Jesson: And from Japan.

Mr. PIE: Yes, crab and other fish-meats from Japan, whereas we have made very little progress in that respect in Australia. However, because of the war and the impossibility of getting such canned goods from America and Canada an industry has developed in Tasmania for the canning of white tunny that will develop considerably. Considerable quantities of edible fish are being canned and marketed especially in the South and large quantities are being distributed to the fighting services and I hope will be distributed to the civilian population later on. In South Australia Marine Foods has developed the fish-processing industry in the way of snap-freezing. It has made marvellous progress and is sending the fish to the various country towns of South Australia. It has also sent a trawler up the Queensland coast to test the deep-sea fishing grounds, but as it was pointed out by the hon. member for Kennedy—I pay him a compliment now and again—it was proved that our seabed was

not satisfactory for deep-sea trawling. However, I should like to remind hon. members that most of the big run of fish in Australian waters is on the surface. In England in particular, the run of fish come down the coast just as they do in Queensland at certain times of the year, the herrings starting at Aberdeen in July or August and proceeding down the coast as far as Lowestoft. At certain points, particularly at Newcastle-on-Tyne—I have been there when they were canning fish—they get a run of fish for about six weeks, and the trawlers, with girl employees, go out night and day and so the canning for the whole year is done in about a six-week period. The employees follow the fish from Aberdeen as far down as Lowestoft over a period of about five or six months, but as the fish go further south they become poorer in quality until at Lowestoft, where they are canned, they have spawned and the fish are only of poor quality. That is a lower grade of herring, some of which is sent to Australia.

Mr. Gair: You know something about smoked fish too.

Mr. PIE: I do, and I am glad that the hon. gentleman made that interjection. I propose to talk to him later about the matter and to point out that under the present system no-one in the fish trade today has any chance of buying fish to smoke on an economic basis so that he can compete with the smoked New Zealand blue cod and similar fish.

All those things are possible in Queensland today. There is no question that our mullet smokes beautifully. Another industry that could be developed if one had the initiative is smoked mackerel cutlets. There is nothing more delicious than mackerel cutlets, which slices perfectly. Then we have our whiting. We have many fish in Queensland that could be smoked in the glut periods. Hon. members know as well as I do that at certain times of the year mackerel is obtained outside Townsville in huge quantities. If the hon. member for Kennedy had any initiative whatever he could immediately start an industry in Townsville to smoke this mackerel. If he cares to come to me I can tell him where he can sell every lb. if he likes to produce it. He will in this way in time become one of those bloated capitalists he so delights in decrying.

There is no question that the fishing industry can be developed in Queensland. Our coastal waters abound in fish. The hon. member for Bundaberg has stated that they contain 932 types of fish—many ideal for smoking or canning. I am delighted to know that the C.S.I.R. intends to make a survey of Queensland's fishing possibilities. A few years ago a concern at Rockhampton began canning turtle soup. It sent 1,000 cases of soup to England to get rid of it but immediately it arrived in England it created a great demand. We have great quantities of a shell fish called eugarie along the coast. There are possibilities of developing that industry for canning. Take our oysters, for instance,

there are wonderful possibilities there. We have a great quantity of high-quality oysters in Moreton Bay. When I was in Bergen, Norway, I asked for a dozen oysters, as I thought I could get oysters to burn there. Judge my surprise when I was brought six black little things on a little shell and they cost my host 10s.

Mr. Walsh: What port will you ship oysters from?

Mr. PIE: Brisbane. I have an idea that if oysters were shipped from Brisbane in an even flow of water and temperature they could be landed in England in their natural condition. There is an unlimited market for oysters there if they were maintained in their fresh state. In Singapore just before the war I saw in a hotel oysters that had been brought in the flying boat from Brisbane. The people there could not get enough of them. After the war when we shall probably have big transport planes these markets will be open for us.

I appreciate the viewpoint of the hon. member for Isis in regard to the Mackay Harbour. I was up there during the referendum campaign—as you know, Mr. Mann, we were instrumental in getting a majority for "No" there—and I thought it was a perfect harbour. I was amazed. I saw the first breakwater being constructed and I did not think it possible for such a harbour to be constructed. I saw facilities for handling sugar and saw the product being handled and again I was amazed. I was amazed still further to know that the Mackay Harbour Board had spent £1,000,000 or £1,500,000 in constructing the harbour and that nevertheless it was in a wonderful financial position. Its chairman, Mr. Bagley, explained the whole position to me and said the board was perfectly solvent. In a few years the Mackay Harbour Board completed a splendid job, and now has an indebtedness of only £120,000.

Mr. Walsh: The people are very fortunate in having such a chairman.

Mr. PIE: That is so. Mackay should be gratified at having such a type of man with initiative and ability as chairman of the board.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. PIE: I have not been to Windorah but I have been to Karumba. I expected to see the meatworks there, and all I saw was a tin shed where I think they did can meat once. There are possibilities however, as suggested by the hon. member for Carpentaria. It is an ideal port. The meatworks are right on the harbour, and there are possibilities of developing that northern territory.

Mr. Bruce: Have you been to Lake Barrine?

Mr. PIE: I have been there too. I have not been to Mt. Isa but the hon. member for Carpentaria has promised to take me out there.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Order! Many hon. members have made statements in this Assembly regarding the dignity and decorum of this Assembly. If any hon. member had to sit and listen to the noise that is going on he would agree with me that hon. members are not giving the practical service they spoke about earlier in the session.

Mr. PIE: I agree with you entirely, Mr. Mann.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) (8.59 p.m.): I do not intend to take up much of the time of the Committee. It is obvious that if we all get up and talk about the ports we represent, or we should like to represent, the position will be much as one hon. member apparently described it by way of interjection—there would be more ports than ships. I do, however, think I am fully justified in speaking on behalf of the port of Bowen, because, irrespective of whether hon. members are interested in Bowen or not I think they will all agree that Bowen, like Gladstone, is one of the finest ports in the whole of the Commonwealth. It has a natural harbour; it has a harbour upon which very little money needs to be spent at any time to enable even the biggest ships to come up and berth at the wharf. But we have to realise that other harbours now exist. It is no good bemoaning the fact. It is true, for instance, that Rockhampton ousted Gladstone on account of political influence in the early days, and Townsville ousted Bowen because of strong political influence in the early days. We have to face facts as they are now. It seems the development of Bowen as a harbour will depend ultimately on the development of industry in the Bowen district and the hinterland. I do not intend to speak on that now because we had a fairly full discussion about it on the vote for the Bureau of Industry.

There is one point connected with the history of Bowen harbour I should like to bring before hon. members, particularly before the Government, and that is that the man who discovered the Bowen harbour, Mr. Sinclair, was offered a reward by the then New South Wales Government. At that time Queensland did not exist as a separate colony; the whole of what we now call Queensland was under the jurisdiction of the New South Wales Government. The New South Wales Government in the year 1859 offered a reward to anyone who discovered a suitable harbour above a certain line of latitude. Mr. Sinclair and his party discovered Port Denison on which the town of Bowen is now situated; but, unfortunately for him, by the time he had discovered it, the State of Queensland was established, and the New South Wales Government repudiated their offer, because they said, "We no longer have any jurisdiction over Queensland." And the Queensland Government said "We won't pay the reward because we did not offer it to you." The result was that Mr. Sinclair and his party, who had endured great hardships in order to discover this port, which has been of great benefit to Queensland, have never received one single penny from that day to this. I understand this matter has been

raised on several occasions since the Queensland Parliament was first established, and I do think it is high time that the Government—

A Government Member: Is he still alive?

Mr. PATERSON: No, but he has a large number of descendants who have done a vast amount of work in the development of the Bowen district. I do suggest, apart from legal rights altogether, that it will be a very gracious act on the part of the Government if they were actually to pay that reward over to the descendants of the Sinclair family.

Mr. Hanlon: It is a new one on me.

Mr. PATERSON: I am not blaming the Treasurer; I am not blaming this Government. Maybe they know nothing about it.

Mr. Jesson: What is the amount of the reward?

Mr. PATERSON: I think it was about £1000. I do say, in view of the fact that this man and his party endured great hardships to discover that port, his descendants should not be deprived of their rightful reward because the New South Wales Government had ceased to have jurisdiction over Queensland, and the new Government took control. The Government that should have paid the reward was obviously the New South Wales Government, or the first Queensland Government in this State. The present Government, I want to say quite clearly, are not responsible for the position; but I do say it would be in keeping with our deepest feelings of natural justice, if not legal justice, if this Government were to pay out the reward to the descendants of the family, notwithstanding the fact they are not legally obliged to do so.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (9.3 p.m.): I really thought when I went home to tea that this debate was on the point of collapse and after I heard the Treasurer reply I thought it had actually collapsed. However, I had forgotten that members had gone into the refreshment room for dinner and I think that the Hon. the Speaker as Chairman of the Refreshment Rooms Committee might well look through the menu, because since hon. members have returned to the Chamber they have jumped up and made a remarkable world tour. I have fished off the banks of Nova Scotia with the member for Cairns and followed the herring down the North Sea from Aberdeen to Newcastle-on-Tyne with the member for Windsor. I have landed sharks outside Bundaberg with the Hon. the Bombshell. I have been in virtually every port in the world, but without unduly prolonging the debate, I wish to say that Queensland is probably the most favourably situated of all the Australian States inasmuch as its natural and its artificial ports are concerned. On the eastern coast ports have not been neglected. One need only remember the tragedy of Albany in Western Australia and Port Stephens in New South Wales to visualise what might happen to a State when all its trade and seaborne commerce are concentrated in one port. I

sincerely hope this and any successive Government will continue the wise policy followed over the years. No particular Government can take credit for the establishment of the various ports on the Queensland coast because they were there almost from the beginning of the establishment of the State.

I, as a representative or one of the representatives of what was the transport nerve centre of the Australian war effort for 18 months, the Townsville jetty, desire to pay my small tribute to the men who controlled that port in the troublous years of war. We have to realise the tremendous amount of work done. One had to be there to do that and to realise the mental and physical strain cast on the men who controlled the Townsville port. I know that the war meant the ending of a rather progressive scheme of expansion in the Townsville harbour, the blocking off of the mouth of the Ross Creek, at the mouth of which the Townsville artificial harbour is formed, and the diversion of the flow onto the Strand and making the inner harbour one series of piers. As a matter of fact, much reclamation work had been done.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Herbert had any justification for planting in my mind the suspicion that the Government intend to take over control of harbour boards throughout the State purely as State instrumentalities. In view of the excellent work done by the many harbour boards in Queensland that would be a national tragedy. The hon. member for Carpentaria mentioned the fact that when any suggestion was made various chambers of commerce, branches of A.L.P. and city councils rose up in arms, and I pay tribute to those men because it is their initiative and their sense of civic responsibility for their own district, and their urge to have their districts progress, which have been responsible for such excellent ports at Townsville, Mackay, Cairns, Bowen, and others on the eastern seaboard of Australia. I hope to see the day when the Gulf of Carpentaria also will receive its due reward in port facilities.

I rose first of all to comment on the remarkable variety of speeches made in this debate, and secondly to pay my humble tribute to the excellent work of the Townsville Harbour Board, which perhaps successfully did the hardest job in connection with transport that this State has ever witnessed.

Mr. J. F. BARNES (Bundaberg) (9.8 p.m.): I rise to oppose the statement made by the hon. member for Isis, who made the general statement that Urangan is the natural port for the Bundaberg canefields. That is not true. It has temporarily suited Bundaberg to ship sugar from Urangan because of the shortage of sugar ships. Because of this Bundaberg sugar had to be transported by rail from the sugar shed approximately 60 to 80 miles to Urangan, but I would point out that in the sugar sheds at Bundaberg there is an automatic loader for the handling of sugar.

Owing to the shortage of dredges the river at Bundaberg has not been dredged properly, but if there were a sufficient number of smaller boats trading to it it would be absurd to bring Bundaberg sugar to Urangan. Of course, if the sugar is to be shipped overseas Urangan is nearer than Gladstone, but that would be economic only if Gladstone costs were higher than those at Urangan. Gladstone is a natural harbour.

Vote (Harbours and Marine) agreed to.

MARINE BOARD.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (9.10 p.m.): I move—

“That £1,832 be granted for ‘Marine Board.’”

There is very little difference in the vote this year.

Vote agreed to.

PRINTING OFFICE.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (9.11 p.m.): I move—

“That £193,045 be granted for ‘Printing Office.’”

The total provision is £7,298 less than the amount appropriated last financial year, and £7,744 less than the actual expenditure. The amount required for salaries is £452 more than the provision for last year. In contingencies we have provided £7,750 less than last financial year. The increase in salaries is due to the employment of additional clerks. The wages of overseers, compositors, &c., are £5,000 less than the amount voted last financial year and £3,433 less than the actual expenditure for that year. This is due to the fact that in this current year there are 26 pay-days as compared with 27 last year. It is not due to a reduction of staff, but merely to the extra working day last year. The amount required for paper, machines, type, fuel, light, &c., is £2,500 less than the provision for these services in 1943-44, and expenditure last financial year amounted to £69,590, but it is expected that a further sum of £10,000 will be required during the current year to meet payments to commercial printing establishments for work to be executed by them for the State office on account of work done for the Commonwealth Government and the U.S. Army and Air Force.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (9.13 p.m.): I had not proposed speaking on this vote had it not been for the fact that, frankly, I was astonished at the attitude adopted by the Government Printing Office in connection with the request I made for the printing of my speech on the Address in Reply. When I entered the House I was informed by several hon. members that it was the custom for one to have his speech on the Address in Reply printed by the Government Printer for circulation in one's electorate. When I have read the correspondence that I propose to quote hon. members will be surprised at the vacillation, or what might be vulgarly

termed the backing and filling of the Government Printer in this respect. I do not suppose there has emanated from any Government department such a strange set of documents as these.

I wrote asking the Government Printer to print 10,000 copies of my speech on the Address in Reply. I delivered that speech on 8 August, and I wrote on my return from the referendum campaign, which would be about 24 August. The Government Printer wrote over his personal signature on 31 August, three weeks after I had delivered my speech, saying—

“Referring to your letter of 28th instant intimating that you require 10,000 copies of the speech delivered by you on the Address in Reply, I desire to inform you that on account of the existing position in regard to staff and supplies of paper, it will not be possible to print more than 2,500 copies of your speech to be contained in a six page pamphlet.

“Delivery of these copies could be made to you within a week after the receipt of your order.

“Will you please advise whether you desire me to proceed with the printing of 2,500 copies of your speech.”

I realise that there was considerable foundation for his statement that shortage of staff and supplies of paper would not allow of the printing of 10,000 copies, so I wrote him next day, on 1 September, and I said—

“Your offer to print 2,500 copies of my speech is accepted. Please let me know when I can expect delivery.”

On 5 September, nearly one month after I had delivered my speech and after he had offered to print 2,500 copies, he said—

“Referring to previous correspondence for the supply to you in pamphlet form of 2,500 copies of your speech in the Legislative Assembly on the Address in Reply—I desire to inform you that my attention has been drawn to the fact that portion of the speech referred to appears to be of a defamatory nature. As publication of this matter in the manner proposed would probably expose me to an action for defamation, I regret being unable to proceed any further with the printing of the pamphlets ordered by you.”

One month after I had made my speech his attention had been drawn to the fact that my speech was probably of a defamatory nature. I have consulted my legal advisers, who by the way are not the hon. member for Bowen or the hon. member for Toowong, and they tell me that only a crass idiot would attempt to launch an action for defamation against the Government Printer for reprinting a speech that had already appeared in “Hansard.”

So as not to give the Government Printer any loop-hole and in order that I might expose the pressure that had been put upon him by an outside body and perhaps some

interested member of the Government, I wrote the next day, 6 September—

“Re yours of 5th September. I would be glad to have your advice re what portion or portions of my speech appear to be defamatory. We may thus reach a common basis on which you could undertake the printing.”

I was prepared to eliminate the part or parts that he considered to be defamatory. No-one could be fairer than that. I did not want him to print anything that I had said that he considered to be defamatory or that any grand panjandrum in the Labour movement would consider to be defamatory. I only wanted the gist of my speech printed.

This is what he said in reply to my letter on 8 September—

“Referring to your letter of 6th instant I desire to inform you that I am not agreeable to supply reprints of any portion of the speech delivered by you in the Legislative Assembly on the Address in Reply.”

He was not prepared to print any part of it, not even that part where I said, “Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment,” and so on. That will give you an indication of the persecution that is exercised upon individual hon. members in this Parliament by interested members in the Labour Party or outside the party. This is a very remarkable statement and I am going to table these letters in this Chamber after I have finished reading them. Unlike the Minister for Transport, I am willing to table any document from which I quote in this Chamber. I am going to table them voluntarily so that hon. members can see and read for themselves the most remarkable series of documents that have ever been tabled in the House.

Mr. Walsh: Why did you not get “The Guardian” to reprint them?

Mr. AIKENS: The interjection by the Minister for Transport merely strengthens the opinion that I have long since held of him, that anatomically he has been rather loosely slung together, that he uses his laryngeal cavity not only for the purpose of transmitting his voice but for the function which in normal people is performed by the posterior vent hole. It is to be deplored that in a debate such as this, when hon. members have so much to say and so little time in which to say it, they should be impeded by irrelevant and excretory interjections that one could reasonably expect from a moron but never from a Minister.

Mr. Walsh: That seems to have touched you on a sore spot.

Mr. AIKENS: If I am to take the letters from the Government Printer and the interjections that I continually receive from the Minister for Transport as an indication of how I am to be treated and that I am not to fight the Government on the rules laid down by the Marquis of Queensberry, I say that I regret it but nevertheless I welcome it, because there is no man in this Chamber

more fitted than I to fight a political fight on dog and goanna rules. My diplomas for this particular style of political fighting were presented to me by Mr. Rafferty himself. I came to this House asking no quarter, I have received none, and you cannot blame me if I give none.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (9.19 p.m.): If hon. members have forgotten the speech delivered by the hon. member for Mundingburra on the Address in Reply their attention will have been drawn sharply to it by the type of speech that he has delivered in this debate. It was a speech that was a very unusual one, even for this Chamber. We have cases here in which some hon. members have gone over what we consider to be the bounds of decency, as the hon. member for Mundingburra has done.

The hon. member applied for 10,000 copies of his speech to be printed but the Government Printer pointed out that if he was going to provide 10,000 copies of the speeches of hon. members of an hour or 40 minutes he would run out of paper in no time, and he recommended that any member should be limited in this respect to one ream of paper. He suggested that any hon. member could get a limited number of the whole of his speech printed or the proportionate number of a part of a speech.

But he further drew attention to the fact that certain parts of the hon. member for Mundingburra's speech were of a highly defamatory nature and the matter was submitted to the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor's advice was that under the Criminal Code publication in "Hansard" was protected but protection of any further publication did not exist.

Mr. Aikens: That is mere moonshine. I offered to excise any defamatory matter.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member will have to learn to behave himself sooner or later. I am not going to allow any exhibition of buffoonery while I am speaking.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. HANLON: I ask you, Mr. Mann, to keep the hon. member in order. The Crown Solicitor's advice was that the publication of defamatory matter uttered in this Chamber is protected so far as a report of Parliamentary debates in "Hansard" is concerned but any further publication of it has not the protection that is given to "Hansard." I think the hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Bowen will agree that that is right. That was the Crown Solicitor's advice; I do not know who the legal adviser of the hon. member for Mundingburra is but the Government's legal adviser is the Solicitor-General and naturally we have to take the advice of the Solicitor-General on that matter. The Government Printer, when he received the letter from the hon. member for Mundingburra asking him to say what part of his speech was defamatory, consulted the Under Secretary and me on the matter. I do not

think it is a fair thing for the Government Printer to be asked to point out what was defamatory in the speech. That is a matter for the hon. member himself or his own legal adviser.

Mr. Brand: If he was to excise it from the speech he could have done it.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member's job is to submit the matter he wants published and then if the Government Printer is satisfied he would not be risking an action for defamation it is all right. I did not know that the hon. member got that letter stating that he was not printing any part of it, and I should not uphold the Government Printer in saying that.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HANLON: I do not think it is quite right, but the onus is on the hon. member to submit to his printer the matter he wants published; then the printer, whether the Government Printer or any other publisher, has to decide whether any matter he wants published is defamatory. That is as far as the Government Printer is authorised to go. I take full responsibility for following the advice of the Government's legal adviser, the Solicitor-General of this State. His minute back to the office was that outside the parliamentary reports we had not protection. I do not think we should be justified in allowing the Government Printer to print matter that would involve the Crown in an action of defamation. With regard to that further letter of the Government Printer, neither the Under Secretary nor I know anything about it and I should not uphold his decision.

The hon. member for West Moreton asked for the publication of a speech that would have required over one ream of paper. He was informed of the decision and he was quite satisfied. We could not allow some members of Parliament to use up all the available paper in the Printing Office and leave other hon. members with none. One ream of paper will give 4,000 pamphlets containing two pages of "Hansard." That is a very reasonable amount of printing to allocate per member. There are 62 members in this Assembly and in these days, when paper is not easily procurable, this was the only decision we could arrive at so that all hon. members will get their share of any printing they may require of their speeches.

Mr. Wanstall: They are charged for it?

Mr. HANLON: Oh yes. Naturally, it would be done a bit cheaper than if set up by another printer. That is the milk in the cocoanut. Hon. members will realise that when paper was short the only thing to do was to see that every hon. member had the same opportunity of getting any printing done. With regard to the other matter—of defamation—I am not going in the face of the advice of the Solicitor-General and publishing a speech except in the journal that is protected. The other matter the hon. member spoke of I had no knowledge of.

I had no knowledge the hon. member received the letter, and had he done me the courtesy of showing it to me—I have been here every day—I should probably have inquired into the matter and seen that it was corrected. If we pass remarks in this Chamber that are defamatory, I do not think the Government Printer is justified in aiding and spreading that defamation in the community, particularly if it might involve the Government in litigation for damages.

Mr. Maher: Who is to say whether the thing is defamatory or not?

Mr. HANLON: Somebody has to say it in every controversy. Every publishing house and every printing house has to decide whether in its opinion a thing is defamatory or not.

Mr. Pie: Some things are considered defamatory by one and not by the other.

Mr. HANLON: Yes. Sometimes journals take a risk. I think certain journals here take a grave risk. Those are things that the publishers or printers have to decide for themselves. I should not like to take it upon myself to say what was defamatory and what was not defamatory. The printer says, and it is a responsibility that rests upon him.

Mr. Pie: Even the "Worker" takes some risks now and again.

Mr. HANLON: It does and when it takes risks it cannot very well complain. With regard to the other matter I want to say definitely that every member in this Committee, no matter who he is, has the same rights of getting his printing done at the Government Printing Office. If the hon. member mentioned the matter to me or an officer of the department the matter could have been corrected. I would not tolerate any decision to publish nothing for any member. If one member has the right to the services of the Government Printer for the publication of his speech, every member has the right.

Mr. Maher: Will you give him an instruction accordingly?

Mr. HANLON: Certainly I will.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (9.30 p.m.): I thank the Treasurer for his explanation. I did not acquaint him with the last letter, not from any desire to score off him or the Government. As I told you, I got the first and second letters and I guessed that what had happened was that the Government Printer had gone to the Minister responsible or to the Crown Law Office. Naturally, when I got the third letter, it was reasonable for me to presume that that letter emanated from the same source. It was not only through my ignorance of parliamentary procedure that I did not go straight to the Treasurer: I did not feel like appealing from Caesar unto Caesar. That was the impression I gathered. If it is not too late now, if the type has not been broken up, I should be particularly pleased to go to the Printer and excise any

parts he thinks defamatory. I will excise any as long as I get the remainder printed.

Mr. SMITH (Carpentaria) (9.31 p.m.): The matter brought up by the hon. member for Mundingburra is not new in this Parliament. The same thing happened to me in the speech I made in 1942 in reference to pillaging by high military officers of civilian property in Thursday Island. It is known that Thursday Island people were evacuated by the Federal Government soon after the Japanese came into the war. They were told by the commander of the garrison on Thursday Island to take all the belongings they needed on the coast, such as wearing apparel. They were told to lock up everything of the nature of private property, such as furniture, wedding presents and the things that go to make a home. During the interim, when these people were evacuated from Thursday Island, the House met in August 1942 and I alleged that men of high military rank, not the privates of the army but men of high military rank, captains, majors and colonels, who had the facilities and power, took furniture, wedding presents, refrigerators, wireless sets and many other things that went to make up the women's homes in Thursday Island, and they were shipped by John Burke's steamer from Thursday Island down the coast even as far as Victoria. I divulged those things in the House extensively, and the Thursday Island people, who were scattered all over the Commonwealth, wrote to me for copies of my speech. I asked to have a few hundred or a thousand printed, and information was sent to me by the Government Printer that certain things in this speech were defamatory and he could not reprint them. I let that go. I thought he had been advised by some solicitor or barrister. I made application to a weekly newspaper, "Truth," to have my speech reprinted. Naturally, this was matter for the censor, and the censor cut the speech down to about 50 words, although I spoke for 25 minutes. So you can see that what the hon. member for Mundingburra has mentioned is nothing new. As to the Government Printer's printing a speech that might be defamatory, the censor decided to eliminate my speech from the daily and weekly Press. As to the Government Printer's printing only extracts, they would not print certain parts of the speech, and I knew it was because I mentioned that high military officials had been pillaging and thieving articles from Thursday Island and sending them to their homes in the mainland. It is only lately that the Federal member for Kennedy, Mr. Riordan, again took up the matter to have someone sent there to investigate these matters.

Again sabotage is being perpetrated. The mayor of Thursday Island, Mr. Vowles, and two highly placed officials of the Federal Government were to go to Thursday Island by aeroplane on the 15th of this month to investigate this sabotage. They travelled a few miles but had engine trouble and had to return to Cairns. It was then discovered that they had to be vaccinated before they could land on Thursday Island.

Whatever the Government Printer might have done, he did it in his wisdom and on the opinion of his legal adviser. It is not something new that the Government Printer has begun since the hon. member for Mundingburra came into Parliament. It happened to me in 1942, 12 months after I came to this Assembly. I accepted the advice of the Government Printer. When I arranged for my speech to be printed in the local weekly newspaper, the "Truth," the Commonwealth Censor decided to eliminate it except about 50 words. As I have stated, Thursday Island is in the Federal electorate of Kennedy, and when the hon. member representing that electorate was sent by the Minister for the Army to Thursday Island, the mayor of Thursday Island, Mr. Vowles, and two high government officials of the War Damage Commission had to return to Cairns because of engine trouble and then found that before they could go to Thursday Island they had to be vaccinated. It is nothing new for a member of this Parliament who exposes things to be sabotaged by some official.

Mr. J. F. BARNES (Bundaberg) (9.35 p.m.): I have had considerable experience with the Government Printer. The Treasurer may console himself with the fact that the little paper available will be equally distributed amongst members of Parliament. That is perfectly correct, but although the Government Printer has not the supply of paper I have been able to get paper from outside firms. Who are the Government when they are not able to get supplies of paper, especially when fiction such as was mentioned by the Treasurer last week of a filthy nature is sold by thousands of copies throughout Queensland? On the other hand, parliamentary speeches, most important of all, cannot be distributed because of the shortage of the supply of paper to the Government Printer. There is something wrong.

This afternoon I received a letter from the Government Printer to the effect that although I ordered 20,000 copies of my Budget speech I could get only 1,600. I am not blaming the Government Printer. There is only a small amount of paper, but if some new law operates, the Government Printer or his agents should tell members of Parliament that they are entitled to only such a quantity of paper and not have hon. members finding it out at the eleventh hour. The principle is wrong. There can be found in Queensland communistic speeches covering paper space that would allow of 10,000,000 copies of the speeches of every member, but we cannot get paper. I ask why? Why should I be able to obtain paper after being turned down by the Government Printer? Who governs this State? Do they know of these things, the things they are supposed to know? They are the highest authority in Queensland.

On another occasion the Government Printer could supply me with only 6,000 copies but in courtesy he lent me the type so that I could have the work done outside. He could not handle the 6,000 booklets I had ordered. The obtaining of the type cut down the expense of the printing considerably and this is most

important, particularly in these days of austerity. I ask the Treasurer if it would not be possible to make arrangements for the Government Printer to lend the type for the work to be done privately. Of course, he would have it returned. It would make the job so much cheaper for the hon. member concerned.

Mr. TURNER (Kelvin Grove) (9.38 p.m.): I wish to pay tribute to the Government Printer and all his staff for the high standard of efficiency they have attained. There are several factors that impel me to say that. I have been in the office and have seen the wonderful job done for the war generally. But there are other things they have done. They have produced the first, second, third and fourth school primers, which are coloured jobs.

I sent a number of those books to different parts of the world and received some very complimentary remarks about them. I sent some to America and received word to the effect that they had nothing to compare with them there.

The Government Printing Office did another job that was amazing and one that I doubt whether any other organisation in the State could have done better. Nominations for the last State elections closed on the Saturday. The names were returned on the Tuesday, and on the Thursday, two days later, 1,000,000 ballot papers had been printed for the 62 electorates in the State, and every one was numbered, from 1 to the required number for each electorate. I repeat that I know of no other organisation in the State that could have done that job in that time, and for that reason I rise to compliment the officers on their very high standard of efficiency.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (9.41 p.m.): I agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. The work of the Government Printing Office has been of a high standard but I call attention to what I said when moving the vote. I said that provision is made for £10,000 for payments to outside printers for work to be done. The Government Printing Office is working at very great pressure. Any hon. member who visits the office and sees the work that is being done for the Armed Forces, and for both Commonwealth and State Governments will realise that. The office is not in a position to do all the work the two Governments require to be done and we are paying to have printing done outside. The Government Printer has put himself and his staff to extra pressure to meet the requests by hon. members for printing and they should appreciate that. It is unfortunate that his misunderstanding about the printing of hon. members' speeches has arisen, but I know that Mr. Tucker was not deliberately discourteous to any hon. member, and there is no need to bear any ill will if he has misunderstood the position. If there have been any misunderstandings they can be cleared up. I want hon. members to realise that, work as hard as they will, they are not in a position to do all that is required of them

and they are paying private printers to do the work that cannot be handled in the office. Hon. members should appreciate too that their staff has suffered from the war, just as that of any other enterprise has. The amount of work they have to do under those circumstances is immense. They have a tremendous amount of security work that has to be kept strictly guarded and treated as confidential. They have to print ration books and stamps, and with all these things the conditions under which the Government Printer and his staff have been working in the last couple of years have been very onerous indeed and we can all express our appreciation of the very satisfactory way on the whole in which the work has been done.

Mr. MAHER (West Moreton) (9.44 p.m.): I do not blame the Government Printer for adopting the attitude that he may be liable to an action for defamation by some aggrieved party whose name is mentioned in the course of a debate, but the whole issue goes much deeper than that. It involves the whole question of Parliamentary privilege. It is generally recognised that an hon. member has the right to say what he wishes. Clearly that right has been abused during my time in this Parliament. I have heard one hon. member make statements against another hon. member that were clearly damaging and wholly libellous, but that is wrong. All the same, it is important that hon. members of this Parliament should be protected. In order to deal with matters of public importance, and to deal with them fully, they should have the utmost privilege for any utterance they make in this Parliament, whether it is construed by people outside as defamatory or not.

Mr. Cooper: He has full protection. There is no question about that.

Mr. MAHER: We admit that. I go further and admit that the verbatim report of speeches delivered by an hon. member of this Assembly in "Hansard" are also privileged, that "Hansard" is a privileged publication.

Mr. Cooper: Certainly.

Mr. MAHER: We go one step further. An hon. member has made a speech in the House, clearly in the public interests, his desire being to attack some interest that is powerful and is using its power wrongfully, and against the public interest. He takes a stand and makes a statement that he believes to be right, but in the opinion of the powerful interest concerned it is libellous and damaging, and the hon. member concerned wishes to circulate the speech to give the public whom he represents help and advice—a lead, if I may put it that way—by giving them some information concerning what he has said in Parliament.

Mr. Cooper: Outside his duties.

Mr. MAHER: Not outside his duties. His duty is to give a lead to the public and advice to his constituents.

Mr. Moore: Propaganda.

Mr. MAHER: Not propaganda at all. When the hon. member says propaganda he is clearly prepared to barter away his greatest privilege and that is his right to say what he wishes. An hon. member who has a proper understanding of his duty to avoid libellous and false utterances will, nevertheless, sometimes in the course of his duty have to make a statement that in the opinion of certain people outside is defamatory or libellous or slanderous. Why should he not make such a statement?

Mr. Cooper: Because he makes it in Parliament for a particular purpose and that is to influence the decision of Parliament, and he having done that that is the end of it.

Mr. MAHER: That is a narrow interpretation of it.

Mr. Cooper: It is the correct interpretation.

Mr. MAHER: So far as I can see, Parliament lays down no rule governing the question of privilege. So far as my research goes, we are governed loosely by certain ancient cases reported in "May." I have this case that occurred in 1795—

"In 1795, an information was filed against Lord Abingdon for a libel. He had accused his attorney of improper professional conduct, in a speech delivered in the House of Lords, which he afterwards published in several newspapers at his own expense. Lord Abingdon pleaded his own case in the Court of King's Bench, and contended he had a right to print what he had by the law of Parliament, a right to speak."

That is the important principle—the principle which Lord Abingdon upheld in 1795 I uphold in this Parliament tonight, and that is that every member should have the right to print what he had by the law of Parliament the right to speak. Lord Kenyon, who apparently was a member of the Court of King's Bench, and probably the presiding judge, said—

"A member of Parliament had certainly a right to publish his speech, but that speech should not be made a vehicle of slander against any individual; if it was, it was a libel."

"The court gave judgment that His Lordship should be imprisoned for three months, pay a fine of £100, and find security for his good behaviour."

This is a case that occurred in a period of English history when they were transporting convicts to Botany Bay for poaching on the lord's domain. Times have changed very substantially since then. Of course it is a very good power for those who wish to exercise it—to hold it over a member of Parliament to restrain him and cause him to be moderate in the use of terms he employs so as not to be too hard on those whom he feels it necessary in the public interest to attack. That is the point. I say we are being ruled by the dead hand of the past.

Mr. Cooper: Fancy that!

Mr. MAHER: I repeat we are being ruled by the dead hand of the past because if any member was sued for defamation for circulating his speech obviously the legal gentleman involved in the case would quote these ancient precepts and the court would give ear to these cases, which occurred 150 years ago.

Mr. Cooper: He would also quote 78 cases that have occurred since in which eminent judges had given the same decision.

Mr. MAHER: All based on this original case and all dating back to the far-distant past of English history. I believe in the principles as enunciated by Lord Abingdon in 1795, that a member of Parliament should have the right to print what he had the right to speak in Parliament.

Mr. Collins: He has to take the risk of libel if he does.

Mr. MAHER: I disagree with you. I hold to the principle that the privileges of Parliament should extend to the printed word that if a member circulates a copy of a "Hansard" report that should be equally treated as "Hansard." The statement is made in the House and is published in "Hansard" and why should not the verbatim report, "Hansard's" record of the speech, be circulated if the hon. member thinks it necessary to do so?

Mr. Sparkes: He can send out as many copies of "Hansard" as he likes.

Mr. MAHER: Admittedly he can. That is the point of the whole business. Anybody is then protected against the nature of a speech in the House, because if there was an abundance of paper and if the Government of the day will instruct the Government Printer to produce sufficient copies of "Hansard," you could circulate it in "Hansard." I want to stress this, in the interests of our democracy, so that no member can live in fear or dread that he is going to be attacked by any interest that he thought it necessary to criticise, condemn or state a case that he submits in good faith to Parliament believing it to be correct—

Mr. Cooper: He cannot be prosecuted for anything he says in this House. That is the point.

Mr. MAHER: I recognise that. Why should he be exposed to the risk of attack when he circulates a verbatim copy of what appeared in "Hansard?"

Mr. Cooper: There are men who would use this House to circulate by that means base and vicious slander.

Mr. MAHER: There are men who have done that already. I have heard members' characters ripped away from them like calico torn into shreds, but fortunately that is limited to infrequent occasions. So it would be that he who would publish that deliberately would be limited too. What of the Press?

Mr. Cooper: The Press did not publish it.

Mr. MAHER: Does the Premier suggest the Press is not privileged to publish what is stated in this Parliament?

Mr. Cooper: They are not.

A Government Member: They do not publish it.

Mr. MAHER: The Press do. I say the Press should have the same privilege as applies to "Hansard." Why the hush-hush?

Mr. Cooper: There is no hush-hush about it. It is in "Hansard."

Mr. MAHER: If it is in "Hansard," why restrict it to "Hansard?" Why not allow a copy to be circulated if the Press wishes to do so?

At 9.55 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order, progress was reported.

The House adjourned at 9.57 p.m.