

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 1945

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER, 1945.

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

QUESTIONS.

SECONDARY INDUSTRIES FROM BRITAIN.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) asked the Premier—

“Whilst he was in Great Britain, did he receive requests seeking information on conditions in Queensland from responsible British industrialists, contemplating the establishment of their industries abroad, and was such information furnished to them?”

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer) replied—

“Yes—fully, fairly, and freely. Such requests came from many individual industrialists and from combinations of industrialists (Chambers of Commerce, Chambers of Manufactures, and similar organisations). In certain centres, after addresses had been delivered, conferences

were requested, and in all cases I readily conferred. The questions raised covered industrial policy in Queensland; anticipated demand for capital goods; marketing of manufactured goods by Australia; Australia's possible post-war tariff policy; double taxation; demand for British manufactured goods; and many others, in addition to questions purely personal and private. It may interest the hon. member to know that I am in receipt of private advice to the effect that one firm operating in a large way in England is sending a director and technician to investigate the possibilities of establishing a branch of their important industry in this State. This may be taken as an indication of a movement which will cover many phases of industrial activity so soon as transport is more generally available."

FEMALE EMPLOYMENT, CLOTHING AND TEXTILE INDUSTRIES.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. Is he aware that a visit to several schools in the Brisbane area is contemplated by the Federal Deputy Controller of Clothing, with the object of recruiting girls for employment in the clothing and textile industries?"

"2. If so, will he take action so that, in view of the allegations of sweating and unhygienic conditions in several of these establishments, a responsible officer of his department accompany the Federal Deputy Controller of Clothing on his visit to all schools so as to ensure that all facts concerning the employment of girls in the clothing and textile industries, including wages and conditions, are given to the school girls?"

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. The Federal Deputy Controller of Clothing interviews girls in the presence of the head teacher or a senior assistant. All the facts concerning award wages and conditions of employment in the clothing and textile industries are disclosed to the girls. Only those girls, who, it is known, are about to leave school are interviewed."

QUEENSLAND SECONDARY INDUSTRIES, POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) asked the Treasurer—

"1. What quantity of bitumen, cement, and iron and steel, respectively, is estimated to be required for (a) North Queensland and (b) the rest of Queensland for (i.) the two years' programme of post-war reconstruction work set out on page 20 of the Financial Statement; (ii.) the State plan of works set out on page 18 of the Financial Statement; and (iii.) the ten-year plan of post-war reconstruction work set out in the preceding Financial Statement?"

"2. What is the comparative costs per mile according to estimates of the Main Roads Commission of the various classes of roads made with (a) bitumen and (b) concrete?"

"3. What investigations, if any, have been made by the Bureau of Industry for the establishment in North Queensland of (a) the iron and steel industry, (b) the cement industry, and (c) the fruit and vegetable canning industry?"

"4. What plans, if any, has the Government for the establishment of any of these industries?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"1. (i.) Owing to the shortage of technical officers for planning, it has not been possible to compile schedules of quantities required for bitumen and iron and steel. Cement requirements are estimated to be—Ayr and north of Ayr, 15,900 tons; Rockhampton and south of Ayr, 14,500 tons; rest of State, 55,400 tons. (ii.) Quantities dissected as requested are not available at such short notice. Departmental estimates for the whole State are:—Bitumen, 11,500 tons; cement, 24,400 tons; iron and steel, 19,500 tons. (iii.) See answer to (i.) This applies to cement as well as other items for the ten-year post-war period.

"2. The comparable costs, all conditions being equal, of roads constructed with bitumen and concrete having a road pavement of 20 feet wide, are estimated at approximate figures of £4,000 and £10,000 per mile, respectively. Costs naturally are affected by such varying factors as locality of job, type of country, quantity of earthworks and drainage, nature and cost of available materials and existing pavement (if any).

"3. (a), (b), (c). The prospects of the economic establishment of these and other industries in North Queensland have been the subject of investigation by the Bureau of Industry. The Secondary Industries Development Committee and the Marketing Branch of the Department of Agriculture and Stock have also examined the question of the establishment of canneries.

"4. Many projects submitted by northern members of the Labour Party as well as by private organisations have been investigated, but I am not yet in a position to make known the results. The outlook is, however, regarded as very promising."

STORM DAMAGE, SUNNYBANK.

Mr. KERR (Oxley), without notice, asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"In view of the practically complete destruction of the crops of papaws, figs, tomatoes, &c., by the severe hailstorm in the Sunnybank district yesterday afternoon, will he send out inspectors without delay to inspect the damage; also will he give consideration to affording relief to those growers who have suffered such a severe loss?"

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

“While this may not be a matter for the Chamber, I shall be pleased to do what the hon. member suggests. I sympathise very deeply with those who have suffered such losses.”

QUESTION DISALLOWED.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor gave notice of another question last sitting day. I disallowed that question for the reason that it had already been asked and answered earlier in the session.

FORM OF QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) having given notice of two questions—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor in the first question is seeking an expression of opinion. I suggest to him that that is not in accordance with parliamentary practice.

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, Queensland, for the year 1944-1945.

Report on the Health and Medical Services of Queensland for the year 1944-1945.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Order in Council under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Acts, 1938 to 1940 (1 November, 1945).

Order in Council under the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1941 (1 November, 1945).

SUPPLY.

SEVENTEENTH ALLOTTED DAY—RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply on Thursday, 13 November, were presented and, on motion of Mr. Hanlon, received.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The Resolutions being taken as read—

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

“That the resolutions be now agreed to.”

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall now proceed to discover the formal resolutions. (Whereupon Mr. Speaker called the resolutions by number.) Do hon. members wish Resolution No. 2 to be formal?

Mr. Pie: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the least hon. members can do is to call clearly.

Hon. members intimating a desire to discuss certain resolutions—

Resolution 1—Executive and Legislative—agreed to.

Resolution 2—Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (11.15 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, the Premier has returned from abroad, with, I think, a much broadened and enlightened outlook in relation to immigration, a subject that comes under this resolution. The hon. gentleman's eyes apparently have been opened by travel and he has developed away from the idea of imagining that we can hold this country indefinitely with a mere handful of people. To judge by his utterances we can conclude that he has virtually abandoned Labour's old-fashioned parochial policy, which provided that if there ever remained the barest possibility that our own people would be unemployed Labour would bitterly oppose any imaginative migration plan. I am sure that by travel he has realised that the future of Queensland and the future of our nation depends, among other things, upon an active immigration policy. Parochial Mr. Calwell, who perhaps has never been much outside Canberra, says in all his wisdom that nothing can be done in relation to immigration for two years. I am sure that Mr. Calwell, in expressing this opinion as Minister in charge of immigration, is carrying out the old Labour parochial policy that we will not bring out any immigrants whilst there is any chance that our own people may be unemployed. Our recently returned Premier replies to this criticism by saying that although transport is a problem, it is not a problem that will hold up the beginning of immigration for a year. Whom are we to believe, Mr. Cooper or Mr. Calwell? I back the Premier, because I believe that the shipping problem, if properly tackled with imagination and purpose, is not a real problem for men of proficiency and ability. During the war America moved more than several million men across the sea to every part of the world. In peace she has returned over 50,000 men by air in a few weeks from Europe to America. I believe this excuse—this transport-problem difficulty—can be overcome if the Commonwealth Government are sincere in their utterances in relation to immigration, but I believe they are more concerned with wanting to put off full-scale immigration until after the next election. Their political procrastination will not promote migration, and the Premier will bear me out when I say that our lack of migrants to this country is a menace to its future, because one of the most valuable lessons that Australia has learnt from this war is that it is dangerous to live in a half-empty continent such as ours, virtually teeming with natural resources awaiting development.

There is no excuse for delay in migration. At least 50,000 people have asked Australia

House during the past six months for particulars about immigration to Australia. Many of them, because of their contact with our Australian troops abroad, and because they see very little future in living in England on the edge of the volcano of Europe, have decided already that their future home will be in Australia; but it is impossible to tell these potential new citizens of the Commonwealth under what conditions they can come to Australia. No-one in London at the present time knows the answer. Australia House says, "We can give the people no specific information because no plan has yet been announced. All we can do is what we have been doing for months—try to keep them interested," but that is not satisfactory to us in Australia, nor is it satisfactory to the officials of Australia House or the British people who want to come to this country. They are gradually losing interest and the land that they thought was to be the land of their opportunity is now fading in the dim distance.

The Premier knows I am right about this. He must have seen the letter written to prospective immigrants by Australia House officials not encouraging migrants but actually giving them many reasons why the time for migration for Australia is not yet ripe. They are told that transport is impossible for two years. The Premier contradicts. They are told that Australia is not an easy place to live in, that Australia is not as empty as she is painted, that we are no longer in the roaring 40's in Australia. I know the letter disgusted our officials at Queensland House. We have the hypocritical Commonwealth Government on the one hand, for publicity purposes, telling the people of Australia that we need migrants, we need population, and on the other hand raising every obstacle to prevent them from coming to this country. I do not believe that the Commonwealth Government are sincere in their immigration policy. I believe that their attitude of procrastination is deliberately planned and any person who has been to London recently could not believe otherwise.

In May 1940 Mr. Curtin said, "Immigration into Australia is the set policy of the Government. We want to encourage a rapid addition to our numbers." In November 1944, over 4 years later, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Forde, made this announcement—

"The British and Australian Governments are working out an immigration agreement."

It is now another year and nothing has been finalised.

Mr. Cooper: You know that is not true.

Mr. PIE: It is true.

Mr. Cooper: It was finalised before you went over there.

Mr. PIE: It was not finalised. There are two matters outstanding. One is the question of preference to returned soldiers and the other is the question of the moneys available to the working people in England, and the Premier knows that is correct. The Premier knows that no agreement between the two countries has been signed. The people of

Great Britain are becoming heartily sick of the pep talks similar to those given by the Premier when he was in Great Britain and they are now looking for other dominions to which they can migrate. They are heartily sick of having their interest stimulated by Australia House propaganda, which tells them nothing that they do not know already, and then suffering disappointment when they inquire further.

On a previous occasion I showed here how ill-equipped our immigration facilities are. The Australian organisation for immigration, for handling prospective immigrants throughout the world, is appalling and compares very unfavourably with that of any other nation. I do not attach any blame to the High Commissioner or to our people in Queensland House, but I do attach blame to the Commonwealth of Australia who for years failed to sign a migration agreement.

Five years ago the late Mr. John Curtin said that the policy would be defined. Mr. Forde went to England and said that the policy would be defined, but 12 months later we have no definite or concrete policy whatsoever. These matters are very important.

Members of the armed forces in England were terribly disappointed with the way in which they were being treated when they sought to bring their wives to this country. They had to come back to Australia and then make applications for their wives to be brought here and the applications were referred to Canberra and then back to England. I pointed out in this House how difficult it was for any married member of the services to bring his wife to this country. I spoke to one who came back the other day. He told me that the matter had now been adjusted and that applications were being received in England. These potential immigrants, these English wives, will not come out to this country if we do not make proper provision for them. We must set up an organisation in London and in every industrial city in Great Britain, with a central committee composed of all the State Agents-General with the High Commissioner as chairman. If we do not do that, the Commonwealth Government will be able to direct the immigrants wherever they desire them to go, and where they think the need is greatest, but I know and the Premier knows that there are many people who want to come to Queensland and do not want to be directed to the other States.

It was made clear in this State the other day that the map that was taken by the Premier to England contained wrong information. The map was distributed all over Great Britain and hon. members on this side now find that the map contained wrong and misleading information on the subject. We must act immediately to clear up this muddle in Australian immigration. The State Government must be firm. I know that the arrangements are that the Commonwealth Government shall act in co-operation with State Governments, but the Premier knows that in London there is no such co-operation. We must not treat the subject lightly. We

must grasp this opportunity with both hands. We must demand from the Commonwealth Government prompt and immediate action.

We dare not lose this opportunity to strengthen our ties with Great Britain, to transfuse into the blood of Australia more British blood. I believe that the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards the Indonesians savours of preparing us for a breaking down of the White Australia Policy, but we on this side of the House want British or Nordic blood. Migration of the many thousands of British wanting to come to this country will solve our problems and will strengthen our Empire ties against the menace of foreign doctrines that today are undermining our very existence.

I ask the State Government to take this important matter up quickly with the Commonwealth Government. The Premier has just returned from overseas and he has a knowledge that those in the Commonwealth sphere have not got. I suggest that the matter be taken up immediately, so that there may be a working arrangement between the British and Commonwealth Governments designed to bring out immigrants to this State not in two years' time but, as the Premier suggests, in a much shorter period.

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremer—Premier) (11.27 a.m.): I should like to make one or two comments on the matters mentioned by the hon. member for Windsor. His statement that the Labour Party's policy at any time was anti-migration is not true. The Labour Party has always stood for a policy of migration, but there were times when it would have been foolish to bring more people to Australia. It would have been foolish to bring more people to Australia, for instance, during the severe depression, when thousands of our own people were lined up waiting for work. How absurd it would have been to bring more people to Australia while others here were looking for work! If the Labour Party had an anti-migration policy in those days, why did the hon. member for Windsor want to be the Labour candidate and contest the constituency of Hamilton? He should have known Labour's policy and therefore, if he did know Labour's policy then, he should have known whether we were in favour of migration or against it. If we were not in favour of migration then he was not in favour of migration when he wanted to be the Labour candidate for Hamilton. He was not accepted by this party as the Labour candidate for Hamilton for two reasons, the first being that he was not a member of any branch of the Labour Party, and the second that we had the gravest doubt about his sincerity. And events have shown that we were perfectly right in that respect.

Let me mention something concerning the hon. member's charges about procrastination by the Commonwealth Government. I am not here to defend the Commonwealth Government, and I am sure that they do not need my defence. The present Commonwealth Government came into power, I think, in 1941, when the war was at its height, and some weeks prior to Japan's entry into the

war. How would it have been possible for the present Commonwealth Government to do anything in the matter of migration right in the very midst of war?

The people who were in charge of Australia for 10 years prior to that time were the anti-Labour parties of the Commonwealth. The leader of those parties was Mr. Menzies, the greatest procrastinator Australia has ever known, and the procrastinator whom the hon. member for Windsor is now following right up to his adenoids.

Let me give the hon. member for Windsor another illustration of a magnificent gentleman whom he is following and is associated with in politics. While I was in England an article appeared in the "Daily Mail" earnestly entreating the British people in no case to ever think of coming to Australia. That article was written by a gentleman known as Sir Keith Murdoch, who is at the head and forefront of the party that holds up Mr. Menzies as the leading light of its politics in Australia. That article was the most defamatory article ever written of Australia, and particularly of Queensland. It denounced Australia, it denounced Queensland from the beginning to the end. That gentleman is closely associated with the hon. member for Windsor in the formation of a new political party that desires to keep control of Australia and professes to be anxious to bring people from England. The thing is so absurd, Mr. Speaker, that one wonders that the hon. member for Windsor has the temerity to stand up here and make any statement about migration.

The hon. member for Windsor knows that while he was in England and America he himself made statements derogatory to the Queensland Government. He knows he was not honest or fair even in a political sense to the Premier of Queensland. He knows that. He knows quite well that he belittled me, that he belittled Queensland whenever the opportunity came for him to belittle Queensland and to belittle Queensland's Ministry. He did that for two reasons. The main reason was that he was not receiving the reception that he thought he should get in England.

Mr. PIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier said that I belittled Queensland. I say definitely that is not correct. I do not like it and I ask that the Premier should withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! On the question of a point of order may I say that every hon. member is entitled to express his opinion. I rule that there is no actual point of order in this case.

Mr. Pie: The Premier made the statement that I belittled Queensland, which is incorrect. I deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that there is no point of order. At the same time I ask the Premier if he will accept the hon. member's assurance on the point.

Mr. COOPER: I accept the hon. member's assurance that he made no such statement and I now ask the hon. member to accept my assurance that I know he did. (Laughter.)

Mr. Pie: You should not make a statement without substantiating it.

Mr. COOPER: One of the things that prompted me to go to England was to place before the people of England to the best of my ability the advantages of Queensland as a place for the future home of many people who I know would be looking for a future home. I did that because I believe we have a great and a big opportunity. I know that while I was in England the Commonwealth and British Governments were in consultation on the matter of making arrangements to get people to Australia. I know that a question was answered in the House of Commons while I was in England and while the hon. member for Windsor was in England to the effect that the whole of those arrangements were completed. The hon. member, I know, asked the High Commissioner what those arrangements were. The High Commissioner told him the arrangement already agreed to was that service personnel should be brought to Australia free of charge to themselves. That assurance had already been given. He knew that the only matter for finality was how much Australia should pay, how much England should pay and how much the migrant should pay.

Mr. Pie: What about the preference of employment?

Mr. COOPER: Preference of employment did not enter into it. It was not part of the conference at all.

Mr. Pie: He told me it did.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COOPER: As a matter of fact, the hon. member should know that Britain would not attempt to interfere with the internal policy of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth is an integral part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and has the right of self-government and self-determination; and no British Government would attempt to dictate the internal policy of the Commonwealth. The only stumbling-block was the matter of the £5, how much of that £5 should be borne by Britain and how much by Australia. A few days after the answering of the question I was informed the matter had been amicably settled and the arrangements were complete.

I believe there is a good deal of misconception as to the time when migrants might come to Australia. I heard the tail-end of the debate that took place from the Australian Broadcasting Commission's station between a major-general—I think it was a major-general—

An Opposition Member: Gordon Bennett.

Mr. COOPER: No, and Mr. Calwell.

Mr. Pie: General Knox.

Mr. COOPER: General Knox and Mr. Calwell. It has been asserted that Mr. Calwell made some foolish statements. I did not hear his speech, but I did hear some remarkably foolish statements by General Knox. He said, "Why cannot you bring people to Australia as troops were taken across the Atlantic to war?" Fancy putting 15,000 migrants upon the "Queen Mary," herded upon the decks without baths for weeks, and having to carry about a small bottle of water, which is the allowance for the day, and causing women and children to do a five weeks' trip from England to Australia under those conditions! Major-General Knox was simply absurd. I understand he is to be a candidate in the interests of the new Liberal Party at the forthcoming general elections.

I believe migration can begin in much less than two years' time. I was astonished at the magnificent job performed by Britain in getting prisoners of war back from Germany and getting many of the armed forces back from Germany. Hundreds of thousands of them were brought back to Britain, and inside a month the prisoner-of-war position had been cleared. A magnificent job! I know, too, that two years after the last war shipping was a drug on the market. Two years after the last war ships were laid up in many ports of Britain, there being no work for them to do, and I believe that is a possibility after this war. I believe, too, that shipping will be available much more quickly than the average man thinks.

I know, too, that there will be people in Britain ready and eager to come to Australia so soon as the opportunity arises. I met a gentleman this morning in the Chief Secretary's office who is a member of the British Forces. He is getting his discharge here and he is staying here. He said, "I think that I shall possibly be starting in the spring"—he meant the British spring—"and I am expecting my brother and his wife and their children as migrants to Australia towards the end of next May."

Mr. Pie: That is different from Calwell's two years.

Mr. COOPER: I think some people have a misconception about the period. It does not follow that because Mr. Calwell has said it will be two years that it will be two years. I believe we shall have the pleasure of seeing many good British stock landing in this State ready to take up their responsibilities and become good Australians in much less than two years.

Mr. Plunkett: Have they to bring their houses with them?

Mr. COOPER: The hon. member for Albert raises the question that so many people raise. There are people who say, "You cannot bring people to Australia until there are houses, until there are motor-cars for them, until there are roads for them." If we had had to pursue that policy over the years that have gone there would be nobody in Australia today. I believe the migrants should not have to wait until we are ready to receive them,

but that our job and duty is to be ready to receive them when they come. We can make all the arrangements for housing and receiving all the people that will be coming over the period. It would be absurd to attempt to land 500,000 in a month or to do anything of that kind. I believe we can so regulate migration that as soon as people arrive here there will be homes for them, and work for them, and that above all there will be a particularly wide welcome for them. I am sure that we are all prepared to give a welcome to people who want to come and be with us in this country to make it an infinitely better country than it has been, to see that it remains one of the bulwarks that will maintain the Empire built up over the years.

I am a great Federalist. I stood for Federation at the beginning of the century and before the beginning of the century. I stand for the cohesion of all the people within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

I stand for that broader federation that will bring together all the democratic peoples of the earth, that will see to it that we shall not be disturbed in the future, as we have been disturbed in the past by wars and rumours of wars. All these things are within our grasp and if we each play our little part, no matter how small it may be, we shall as a big body play a part that will be to the everlasting credit of Queensland in the years to come and a proof that we stood valiantly for a greater Queensland, a greater Australia and a greater Commonwealth of nations.

Resolution 2—Premier and Chief Secretary's Department—agreed to.

Resolution 3—Department of Health and Home Affairs—

Mr. J. F. BARNES (Bundaberg) (11.43 a.m.): In the original debate I spoke to the full limit of my time on the case of the Medical Board versus Dr. Max Michel. The hon. member for Baroona attempted to reply to me and when doing so made several statements that are absolutely incorrect. I will repeat his exact words. The hon. member said—

“My point is this: the Medical Assessment Tribunal found Dr. Max Michel guilty of professional misconduct and the Full Court on the hearing of the evidence said there was sufficient evidence and the findings of the tribunal were in order and Dr. Michel had been guilty of professional misconduct.”

Mr. Speaker, the Full Court in reality upset the decision and in its findings said that Dr. Max Michel had to be treated as though he had never been struck off the roll. That was its finding. The Full Court also found that Dr. Max Michel by not being allowed the depositions in the lower court, i.e., of the evidence before the Medical Board, was denied natural justice: that Dr. Michel did not have the opportunity to know his full position in the court, in other words, he was sent into the ring to fight another man with his hands tied behind his back. Exactly the same thing applies in this particular instance. The hon. member for Baroona made that

statement about the findings of the Full Court. On the contrary, the Full Court found that everything in the previous proceedings were in reality as though they had never been in existence. That was a deliberate attempt by the hon. member for Baroona to mislead hon. members of this Assembly and those who are interested in the case. The hon. member further quoted—

“The reason Dr. Michel was restored to the registrar was that the board was wrongly constituted.”

Confirmation of that is to be found further on in his speech when he says—

“The Full Court found on the evidence submitted that the tribunal was justified in coming to its decision that Dr. Michel had been guilty of professional misconduct in treating a woman for cancer she did not have, which was the charge before the tribunal. It was only because a member of the Medical Board that charged this man was also a member of the Medical Assessment Tribunal that heard the case that the Full Court reversed the decision. The decision was upset on that ground.”

Mr. Foley: Is that correct?

Mr. J. F. BARNES: At the time the hon. member made that statement the Minister said—and these are his exact words when interrupting the member, “Purely on a technical point.” The hon. member for Baroona followed that up by repeating, “Purely on a technical point.” This is either done deliberately or ignorantly and is a rotten and disgraceful use of this Chamber. It is either done ignorantly or deliberately. I could be merciful and say that it was done in ignorance and that the hon. member when making this speech did not know anything of his brief and did not know what he was talking about from start to finish. Perhaps I can be charitable and say he was ignorant.

The Minister concerned at the particular time when I was making my points asked who had briefed me. Of course Dr. Max Michel had briefed me. How could I or for that matter any other man come into this Chamber and put up a medical case as well as a legal case before hon. members? The hon. members for Bowen and Toowong, both being legal men, could put a legal matter before the House but they could not put a medical question before hon. members unless they were briefed. I am neither a medical man nor a solicitor but I am forced to come into this Chamber to expose the rotten injustice done to Dr. Max Michel.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the hon. member that it would be in the best interests of Parliament if he used more moderate language.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I have to bow to your ruling, but the unseemly language used in this case was putrid. It stinks.

Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas said that Dr. Max Michel had a proper legal objection to Dr. Cilento's sitting on the Medical Tribunal because Dr. Cilento was the president of the

Medical Board. In other words, Dr. Cilento was the referee, judge, starter, all the stewards, and everything else. He was the one who framed the case against Dr. Max Michel. He did that as president of the Medical Board, and then he sat in judgment on Dr. Michel. Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas ruled that the Medical Tribunal was wrongly constituted in having as one of its members Dr. Cilento. He also said that because Dr. Michel had not raised the objection in the lower court he waived his rights. When the matter was before the Full Court the Chief Justice agreed with Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas but Mr. Justice Philp said that as the whole case was built on the fact that evidence was wrongly denied to Dr. Michel—the evidence before the Medical Board—Dr. Michel did not know what rights he had, and therefore was entitled to a ruling that Sir Raphael Cilento wrongly sat as a member of the Medical Assessment Tribunal. In other words, Dr. Max Michel did not know what part Sir Raphael Cilento played on the Medical Board because he did not have the depositions, and as he did not have the depositions he could not have waived his rights.

That was the case the hon. member for Baroona put before the Chamber, and in reality it is true, but according to law it is wrong, because two judges ruled against it, both of them agreeing that as he had not exercised the objection he had waived his rights. In reality, the case was won on a decision of a majority of the judges when Mr. Justice Philp and Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas said that Dr. Max Michel was denied natural justice by not receiving the lower-court depositions.

The hon. member for Baroona made the statement also that the Full Court found that Dr. Max Michel had been rightly found guilty before the Medical Assessment Tribunal of professional misconduct. The Full Court found that Dr. Max Michel's case never occurred; in other words, the Full Court ordered that he was to be reinstated to his original position and was to be treated as though he had never been struck off the roll. These ignoramuses get briefs and they are not capable of bringing them before the Assembly. They misconstrue them, because they have not the power to conceive what is told to them.

Before the Full Court of Queensland there is no appeal on evidence in this case, despite the statement made by the hon. member for Baroona, and there is no appeal on evidence from the Magistrates Court, and this is a disgraceful state of affairs. There should be an appeal on evidence in both courts. There is no appeal on evidence from the Magistrates Court or the Medical Board. This is disgraceful, and particularly so in this case, when an unscrupulous woman, an endocrinist, definitely was used.

The hon. member for Baroona says that the judges upheld the decision on the facts. For the information of the hon. member for Baroona I read Section 43 of the Medical Act as amended in 1939. It says—

“Appeal from Tribunal.

“43. (1) Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Tribunal, who desires to appeal therefrom on the ground that the decision is erroneous in point of law, or is in excess of jurisdiction, may, within six weeks after the pronouncing of the decision or such further time as the Tribunal may allow, apply in writing to the judge to state and sign a case setting forth the facts and the grounds of decision for appeal thereon to the Full Court of the Supreme Court.”

Mr. Foley: That is a point of law.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: It does not say anything about evidence, but it does give the appeal on the point of law, as stated by the Minister. In other words, if a prima-facie case is established before the Medical Assessment Tribunal; that is, that Mrs. Easton said so-and-so and Dr. So-and-so said so-and-so and Dr. So-and-so said this, that is a prima-facie case.

The point to be determined in this case was: was there a prima-facie case? That is the only matter that the Full Court in the circumstances could determine. The question could be asked: did this woman, Mrs. Easton, live at such-and-such a street? Was she attended at such-and-such times and was she attended by Dr. So-and-so, but whether the evidence was true or not didn't matter for the purpose of the question to be considered and that is: was there a prima-facie case? That was the only point for the Full Court to decide.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is reflecting on the Full Court.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I am not reflecting on the Full Court. I am merely explaining what is the power of the Full Court, as I am entitled to do. Dr. Max Michel went to the Full Court and this is what happened. So that you will not have to take my word for it I propose to quote from the “Queensland Law Journal” of 31 January 1942. Inter alia, Mr. Justice Philp says—

“Upon the third question—‘Was the said decision erroneous in point of law by reason of my refusal to make the order referred to in paragraph 2 of this case’—I agree also with what has been said by my brother Douglas. The learned Trial Judge thought that the rule in question gave him a discretion to grant or withhold the proceedings.”

He goes on to say—

“I am unable to understand the board's attitude in objecting to the production of the record if it had nothing to hide. Its duty as a public body is to assist the administration of justice. Its very objection to produce the record without assigning any reason therefor would raise suspicion that it had something to hide, and would be alone good ground for forcing the production.”

He goes on further to say—

“It is fair to the appellant to add that the evidence might have borne an entirely different aspect had the proceedings before the board been made available to him. For all we know, the evidence given by the principal witnesses before the tribunal may have differed materially from their statements, if any, given to the board. Nor do we know what would have been the effect on the tribunal had both assessors been unbiassed persons.”

The hon. member had the audacity to get up in this Chamber and say that the Full Court found that Dr. Max Michel was guilty of misconduct, whereas the Full Court wiped the whole hearing right out. Mr. Justice Philp had this to say—

“As Sir Raphael Cilento was, in my opinion, unable to sit, then until a proper substitute had been appointed the court was not legally constituted.”

On the Estimates for Government medical officers I tried to argue that a proper substitute should have been appointed and as that was not done the tribunal was not legally constituted. I also tried to argue that Dr. Cilento was wrongly appointed to the Medical Assessment Tribunal and that he, Dr. Cilento, had the power to appoint another officer from amongst those members referred to in the Estimates that we discussed a few days ago. I tried to draw attention to that matter then but I was ruled out. However, that is by the way.

Mr. Justice Philp further says—

“It was next argued that the appellant waived this objection. No direct question is asked on waiver, but I think it is implicit in the first question. In the special case it is found as a fact that at all material times the appellant and his counsel knew that Sir Raphael Cilento was President of the Medical Board and that no objection was taken to either of the assessors sitting as an assessor on the hearing and determination of the charges. There is no direct finding in the special case that the appellant waived Sir Raphael Cilento's participation in the hearing. Waiver in this connection consists of an express or implied consent to abandon a right, but the consent is inoperative unless it be made with full knowledge of the facts.”

In other words, he had not abandoned his rights because he did not have a complete knowledge of the facts. He did not see the evidence that was taken before the Medical Board; therefore he did not know what part Sir Raphael Cilento had played in the case.

Here are the facts that were placed before the Medical Assessment Board, and before the Medical Assessment Tribunal. Sir Raphael Cilento had the case under consideration in January 1940. The Medical Act became law in 1939. The principal witness consulted Dr. Michel on 7 December

1939. It was obvious therefore that the order in council dated 27 April 1940 was inspired to protect the Medical Board from any unscrupulous witness, such a witness as a woman suffering from endocrinal disturbance. This woman consulted Dr. Max Michel on 7 December 1939. The Medical Act became law in November 1939. Therefore it is patent that the law was amended to protect the Medical Board against the use of an unscrupulous witness. It was amended to stop a doctor charged under this or any other section, from getting a copy of the record of proceedings before the Medical Board, other than the deliberations of the board. Therefore, this particular amendment of the Act gave protection to the Medical Board using an unscrupulous witness. The order in council issued on 27 April 1940, as I quoted in the last speech, in short stated that the Medical Assessment Tribunal should not use any evidence produced before the Medical Board. In other words, the evidence taken in the lower court should not be used in a higher court. Why was that? It was to condemn Dr. Max Michel's chances. I see no other reason why the Medical Board should be given protection for the use of an unscrupulous witness.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is in order in discussing administration, not legislation.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: Here is an Act that is an amendment of the Health Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already suggested to the hon. member that he can discuss only administration, not legislation.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I will read the Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. F. BARNES: The order in council says—

“On the application of the registered practitioner the registrar of the board shall, if so directed by that tribunal, make available to such registered practitioner, at his own expense, a copy of the record of proceedings before the Medical Board other than the deliberations of the board.”

That is an amendment of the Health Act, not an amendment of the Criminal Code or any other Act.

I want to give a further instance of how this persecution went on. I have the Medical Register before me. It shows how the persecution was furthered, despite the ruling of the Full Court. That ruling was that Dr. Max Michel should be treated as if he had never been struck off the roll. The register is dated 30 May 1944 and states the doctor's name and why qualified to specialise, namely:—“Experience and skill to the satisfaction of the Board,” whereas in Dr. Max Michel's case it states:—“In virtue of section 24 of the Acts,” whereas it should have stated:—“Experience and skill, &c.,” the same as the other doctors, but for further spleen they put:—“by virtue of section 24 of the Act—in other

words, by virtue of the fact that he won his case. Yet the Supreme Court said that Dr. Max Michel should be treated as if he had never been struck off the roll.

The charges I have made are very serious. One doctor whose attention had been drawn to this matter said, on reading it, "I thought that Dr. Max Michel was a terrible man, but after reading your last speech I say it was hot." That is, it burnt. Dr. Max Michel has for years been trying to defend his good name. I will defend anybody, whoever he may be, who suffers an injustice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a challenge that Dr. Max Michel has given me to issue to anybody, including the hon. member for Baroona.

Mr. Power: I will give you a challenge from that woman's husband.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: The hon. member for Baroona is not satisfied to have it proved that he does not know what he is speaking about. He is sufficiently ignorant to get up and get another flogging. This is the challenge—

"Find one medical expert of high scientific achievements anywhere in the world, who denies, that:

1. A woman of approximate age of 30 to 40 years, having been fully curetted twice, an interval of approximately 3 weeks being between curette one and curette two, is definitely for months, or even years after, endocrinologically disturbed with particular reference to the ovarian hormones primarily or secondarily, that is, by way of the pituitary gland.

2. If in such case no normal pregnancy existed during the preceding eleven years, but only miscarriages followed by curettes, even made technically perfect, the ovary function can under no circumstances be regarded as normal or even getting normal at any time except by medical treatment directed to the cause, in this case endocrine trouble. Even if the miscarriages or one of the miscarriages which preceded the last one, were originally the consequence of a previous local or general disease or interruptive intervention, this would still hold good.

3. If in such case an extensive and careful examination and observation, including Wassermann test, X-ray diagnostics, &c., fails to reveal any such local or general disease of importance, the fact of these habitual abortions alone must necessarily conduce any medical man to the diagnosis of an endocrine disturbance.

4. If in addition to this the patient concerned exhibits a fat accumulation round the hips the diagnosis Hypo-ovarianism is obvious.

5. If moreover such accumulation of fat is noticeable round the pelvis-girdle, the endocrine disturbance is characterised as an ovarian hypo-function, namely,

Hypoovarianism, being accompanied or having been preceded by a disturbance of the pituitary gland.

6. Under such circumstances a history of menstrual disorder can be expected, namely, no flow, scanty flow, copious bleeding, or menstrual pain.

7. If, least not last, the patient complains about symptoms as shown even in the deposition of herself and the witnesses for the Medical Board of Queensland in the Dr. Michel case and shows such behaviour as illustrated in the depositions, it is difficult to see, how a party in this case could come with a diagnosis that she was suffering from a nervous disease.

8. Medical literature including modern publications of the latest date proves the rationale and recognition of low dosage X-ray therapy for Hypoovarianism by medical men experienced in this particular specialty."

You will remember that when I was speaking about this the other day I said that Dr. Max Michel said she was suffering from endocrine-gland disturbance and that he was treating her with X-ray therapy. There are more than one endocrine gland; there are several; there are two relating to sex, and I have been specifically referring to the sexual endocrine glands. There is the thyroid gland, which is an endocrine gland, and the gland above the kidneys is an endocrine gland and there are others. Medical science in the past knew nothing about the endocrine disturbance of the human system, and medical science had certain practices for certain symptoms. Now endocrinology has upset the whole of the past practices in the medical world. It has been proved that in endocrine-gland disturbance of the kidney we have the main cause of blood pressure. It is proved that endocrine-gland disturbance in the female is the cause of cancer in the breast. It is further proved that endocrine-gland trouble in men is the cause of prostate trouble. Up to a stage in the development of the foetus the sex is neither male nor female, but in three or four months the sex develops. The female organ dies away and the male predominates, and it is from that organ that you get prostate-gland trouble. Then later in life when you get prostate-gland trouble the reverse happens, the original female portion of the prostate gland comes back and takes prominence, hence an operation to remove it. All these things are new to medical science. In the last three years people suffering like Mrs. Easton would have been going to the chemist getting hormone tablets which have been on the market to replace in the endocrine gland the substances the gland lacks. They are a temporary relief only. They temporarily make up for the lack of the substance the endocrine glands are not secreting, but this case happened in 1939 before hormone tablets were available. The point is that Dr. Max Michel wanted to get to the cause of the trouble when he diagnosed her as suffering from sexual endocrine gland disturbance. He wanted to give her deep

X-ray therapy. Dr. Michel's treatment consisted of weak doses at long intervals, and she on her own evidence admitted that she was on treatment of small dosages of long duration, which would have cured her, not relieved her, as hormone tablets would do. The contention was that she was suffering from cancer of the cervix. She said that Dr. Max Michel said she had that complaint, but if she had been suffering from cancer of the cervix she would have received very much heavier dosages and of shorter duration.

The whole thing stinks and proves the woman to be wrong. Furthermore, the particular woman admitted in her evidence on this criminal charge—a charge sufficient to have a doctor struck off the medical roll—that she did not know how much she paid Dr. Max Michel. The charge was that he had fraudulently treated this woman to receive money from her. Dr. Michel said she paid three guineas. That evidence was undenied and therefore that evidence stands in a court of law. If Dr. Michel was going to treat this woman fraudulently to obtain money fraudulently—I have the depositions here, in fact, I have them all here—why did this woman in her evidence say that Dr. Michel sent her to the Brisbane General Hospital to get her complaint diagnosed—that Dr. Michel later sent her to the Brisbane Hospital to have treatment because she was poor?

She also said in her evidence that Dr. Michel treated her for costs only. It is the facts and the evidence before the court I am concerned mostly with.

Mr. Foley: The doctor did not appeal on the evidence. He appealed on certain points of law.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: One cannot appeal on evidence at all. One can appeal only on law. There is no appeal on evidence. I quoted the Act to show that there was no appeal on the evidence, but there is an appeal on the facts in relation to law, as far as the evidence is concerned. For instance, take the law in reference to the Statute of Frauds and Limitations, which lays down that a man must specifically state in writing particulars of his contract. If I said to you that I would sell you my house for £500, although you had six witnesses to say that I said I would sell it for that amount and that I was not sticking to my word, you could not compel me to sell that house, because I could refuse to sell, as the contract was not in writing. If I said, "I will sell you my house for £500 and I give it to you in writing before six witnesses, you still could not force me to sell my house because that does not comply with the Statute of Frauds, which states that the contract must be specifically in writing. But if I say to you, in writing, "You can buy my house situated in Bourbong street, Bundaberg, subdivision so and so, county and parish so and so, for £500," you can demand of me that I sell my house to you, as that complies with the statute. Likewise, this evidence has to

comply with the law. When she, as a witness, specifically gives her name as Mrs. Easton and states that she resides at so and so, etc., whether what she is saying is right or wrong does not enter into the question. It is only the evidence on a point of law that counts; that is what I am trying to explain.

Mr. Foley: On the evidence given, a prima-facie case had been made out against Dr. Michel definitely, and they should be in a position to adjudicate on a medical question.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: It is strange how you ever became a Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I have been telling you all the morning I am not disputing that there was a prima-facie case. If there was no prima-facie case they could not have won the first case.

Mr. Foley: I am trying to bring you back to earth.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: How are you trying to bring me back to earth? You are merely repeating what I have already told you: that there was a prima-facie case, and that means only that so far as the evidence goes, the case was suitable to convict a person if the evidence was undenied. I could go into court tomorrow morning and say that I, John Francis Barnes, etc., saw the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs do so and so, and if the Minister did not come into court and contradict that, the court could convict the hon. gentleman. That is a prima-facie case. But if you come into court and bring forward evidence to knock me out, I lose. That is what I am trying to point out. What I have told you is that what is said in court might be quite wrong but it can set up a prima-facie case. In this particular case Mrs. Easton's evidence constituted a prima-facie case and therefore the facts in relation to the law were O.K. The case was won because the board wrongly refused to give Dr. Max Michel the evidence in the lower court. That was the reason why and not on any other point of law.

How much more time have I, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Less than five minutes.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: Let me quote a few of the things Mrs. Easton said in the evidence. On page 9, line 8, she said—

"I just had terrible pains."

On page 21, line 32 she said—

"There are lots of things he might have told me. I was sick at the time."

On page 24, line 30, she said—

"I had pains everywhere and he knew I had them everywhere because he told me it had gone right through my system."

Dr. Max Michel told her it was affecting her whole system. That is true. The endocrine gland does affect the whole system. On page 25 of the depositions, at line 20, she said—

"I had pains everywhere, even in my knees."

On page 26, line 7 and line 23, she said—

“Terrible pains, pains all over the body. I don’t know whether it was my internals I was worried about, but I used to fall over sometimes, etc. Yes, and about my head.”

Then, on page 27, line 6, she said—

“There was much bleeding. There are a lot of things I don’t remember.”

On line 30 of the same page she said—

“About the menstruations I told him I might not be able to come to him the next month because I had to lie up in bed.”

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust the hon. member will not indulge in tedious repetition.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: This is not tedious repetition. I am giving the evidence. Seven doctors had treated her before she reached Dr. Michel. On page 30, line 10, she said—

“My memory is not the best.”

She was craving for treatment. If you go further in the depositions you will find Dr. Crouch had said that she complained bitterly of suffering headaches, coming up the back of her neck to the centre of the head. Anyone who knows anything about endocrinology will know that every one of the symptoms that this woman had was typical of sexual endocrinology.

Mr. Foley: When did you become an authority on this question?

Mr. J. F. BARNES: One of my authorities is “Endocrinology, Clinical Application and Treatment” by Werner. In reply to my previous speech the hon. member for Baroona said that Dr. Moran had not mentioned anything about endocrine-gland disturbances. He may not have used the specific words but he did say that these disturbances were effected by the creative forces. The creative forces are the sexual organs, therefore the doctor has specifically referred to endocrinology because the two are the same thing. I tried to point that out to the hon. member for Baroona the other day but he could not understand it because the specific words were not used. He was given a brief to bring down here and he was not capable of doing that.

There is another important reason why I mention this case. Here in the Legislative Council Chamber a Sex Offences Commission heard evidence and during the course of the whole inquiry not one doctor mentioned endocrine disturbances as being one of the causes of sex abnormality. Dr. Rowe, in the British Medical Journal—I think it was on 31 December 1938; I have previously quoted the correct date—said that of 68 criminal cases he had treated 53 were caused by endocrinal disturbances. When I attended a Rotary luncheon in Perth in Western Australia a parson who was there said that most of the cases that had led to confinement in reformatories were caused by endocrine disturbances.

(Time expired).

Mr. SPEAKER: In connection with the closing of the debate, I rule that as the Treasurer has moved the reception of the resolutions he has moved a substantive motion and by speaking he will close the debate.

Mr. POWER (Baroona) (12.25 p.m.): I wish to reply to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Bundaberg and to give this House the facts in the case of Dr. Max Michel and the Medical Assessment Tribunal.

The tribunal found Dr. Max Michel guilty of professional misconduct and ordered that he be struck off the medical register. Dr. Michel appealed to the Full Court against that decision. He lodged an appeal on the ground that the tribunal had exceeded its jurisdiction and that its decision was wrong in law. At no time did I say that he had appealed on the evidence. He also lodged an appeal on the ground that he had been refused a copy of the evidence in the original case.

I am taking as my authority the State Law Reports, Queensland, 1942. I think that hon. members and the public would be more ready to accept the authority from which I am about to quote than rely on the drivel of the hon. member for Bundaberg. I quote this from the State Reports—

“1. Was the decision of the Medical Assessment Tribunal herein in excess of jurisdiction by reason of the fact that one of the assessors, namely the said Sir Raphael Cilento, was at all material times the president of the respondent?”

“2. Was the decision erroneous in point of law because I did not administer an oath to the assessors?”

“3. Was it erroneous in point of law by reason of my refusal to order the registrar to make available to the appellant a copy of the record of proceedings before the board?”

“4. Was there evidence to support the several findings of fact made by me?”

“5. Was the decision erroneous in point of law because of the wrongful admission or rejection of evidence?”

“6. What should be done or ordered by the Full Court of the Supreme Court of Queensland or by the Medical Assessment Tribunal in the premises?”

The matter was first heard by the Medical Board, which decided that a prima-facie case had been established, and it referred the matter to the Medical Assessment Tribunal who ordered the removal of Dr. Max Michel's name from the medical register. Then Dr. Max Michel appealed to the Full Court on a question of law, not a question of fact.

Now, the hon. member for Bundaberg takes the opportunity of slandering a very decent woman in this Chamber. I want to tell the hon. member, who has thrown out a challenge to me, that the husband of that woman has advised me to tell the hon. member for Bundaberg that he is prepared to meet him outside to hear him repeat the statements that he has made in this House in regard to this woman's having been aborted, and he will give him an opportunity to prove the statement. It ill becomes the hon. member for Bundaberg, in his usual cowardly manner, to get up and attack the wife of a very honourable man who has done much for his country,

and attack also a very decent honourable woman. The husband of this woman has been out of Queensland, but as soon as he heard of the remarks that the hon. member for Bundaberg made about his wife, he took all possible steps to enable him to return to Queensland as soon as possible, and I can assure the hon. member that it will not be very long before he takes the opportunity of meeting the hon. member and dealing with him in connection with that statement. If he makes the statement outside, then despite the fact that he has a brief from Dr. Max Michel, Dr. Max Michel may be called upon by the hon. member to pay heavy damages that may be awarded against the hon. member for Bundaberg. The hon. member for Bundaberg made the statement in this House that the woman had been aborted. In fact he said that she had been aborted several times.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: On two occasions.

Mr. POWER: Let me repeat what happened in connection with Dr. Max Michel. It was only because a member of the Medical Board that charged this man was also a member of the Medical Assessment Tribunal that heard the case that the Full Court reversed the decision. The decision was upset on that ground, not on the evidence, not on the facts, not on the information, not on the charge, but purely on a point of law.

Although the hon. member for Bundaberg has been endeavouring to stand up for the actions of Dr. Max Michel, we have the clear and positive opinion of three judges of the Full Court in answer to Question 4, that there was evidence to support the findings of the Medical Assessment Tribunal. They were the opinions of Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas, Mr. Justice Philp and the Chief Justice, Sir William Webb. The hon. member for Bundaberg need not think that he can side-track me. I am prepared to accept the opinions of those three judges in preference to that of the hon. member for Bundaberg.

The hon. member dealt with many matters in connection with endocrinal trouble. When did he become an authority on endocrinal glands? He also referred to that book by Dr. Moran "Viewless Winds." On a previous occasion I pointed out that in not one instance in that book was the word "endocrine" used in connection with the case to which the author referred.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: That is right.

Mr. POWER: I challenged him to produce it. Then what statement did he make in this Chamber? He said it was implied. Whose implication? The hon. member for Bundaberg's implication, not anyone else's.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: That is the type of individual who comes into this House and defames honest people.

I have no desire to deal with this matter at any length, but I came back to the point for this reason: I stated at the time that Dr. Max Michel was restored to the medical register because the Medical Assessment

Tribunal was wrongly constituted because Dr. Sir Raphael Cilento was a member of that board. Had Dr. Raphael Cilento not been a member of that board Question 4 as submitted and answered by the Full Court shows that there was sufficient evidence for the tribunal to arrive at the decision it did, namely, that Dr. Max Michel had been guilty of professional misconduct.

Let me come to another point.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: Come outside and I will show you what I am talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Bundaberg will not obey my call to order. I shall not ask him to do so again.

Mr. POWER: The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that the evidence was that the lady concerned did not know what money she had paid to Dr. Michel. As a matter of fact, the lady stated in evidence that she did not know on what date the money had been paid to Dr. Michel, as she had never got a receipt for it. That was the evidence given. Evidently no record was made by Dr. Michel of the money he received from her because, the inference is, it was done to defeat the Commissioner of Taxes. I do not know Dr. Michel but I am not going to allow him or the hon. member for Bundaberg to defame an honest and decent citizen without defending her. I will do that while I am a member of this House.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not defame any honest citizen.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member please state his point of order?

Mr. J. F. Barnes: My point of order is that the statement made by the hon. member for Baroona is incorrect, that is, that I did not have the evidence, and I ask him to accept my denial.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Baroona to accept the denial of the hon. member for Bundaberg.

Mr. POWER: According to parliamentary procedure I accept his denial but I will quote the words of the hon. member. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that this woman had been aborted. Is that not defaming an honourable woman? In fact, he said this woman had several abortions.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: You should bring evidence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: As a matter of fact, Dr. Michel said the woman had had three abortions in a fortnight. That is what he said. Whilst I must accept the denial of the hon. member for Bundaberg that he did not attempt to defame this woman I must say that if that is not defamation I do not know what is.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I deliberately said these abortions were not criminal abortions.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will obey the direction of the Chair. He will state his point of order clearly or resume his seat.

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I demand a withdrawal of that statement by the hon. member for Barooka. I said the woman was aborted; I did not say she was criminally aborted.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: You cannot understand it either.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I name the hon. member for Bundaberg for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. J. F. Barnes: You can name where you please. You are a lot of gangsters, the lot of you.

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Bremers—Premier) (12.34 p.m.): I regret this difficulty that has arisen. I will say in deference to you, Sir, that you have borne with great fortitude the interruptions that have taken place during the debate, and the insinuations that have been made about the Chair. The reflections on the Chair made by the hon. member for Bundaberg are unpardonable. He has emphasised the insult to you by his subsequent remark. I move—

“That the hon. member for Bundaberg be suspended from the service of the House for two weeks without pay.”

Question—That the motion (Mr. Cooper) be agreed to—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 46.

Mr. Barnes, L. J.	Mr. Jones
“ Bruce	“ Kerr
“ Chandler	“ Keyatta
“ Clark	“ Larcombe
“ Collins	“ Luckins
“ Cooper	“ Macdonald
“ Davis	“ Maher
“ Decker	“ Mann
“ Devries	“ Morris
“ Duggan	“ Nicklin
“ Dunstan	“ Pie
“ Farrell	“ Plunkett
“ Foley	“ Power
“ Gair	“ Slessar
“ Gledson	“ Smith
“ Graham	“ Taylor
“ Gunn	“ Theodore
“ Hanlon	“ Turner
“ Hanson	“ Walsh
“ Hayes	“ Williams
“ Healy	
“ Hiley	<i>Tellers:</i>
“ Hilton	“ Moore
“ Ingram	“ Wanstall

NOES, 3.

Mr. Barnes, J. F.	<i>Tellers:</i>
	Mr. Aikens
	“ Paterson

Resolved in the affirmative.

(In division.)

Mr. J. F. BARNES: I will show you. You are a lot of mugs. You have no chance of taking my pay. There has never been any order. You are a Ned Kelly. The Speaker, the Chairman and the Acting Premier are three of the biggest crooks in the State. Work that out. That is how the

place is constituted. I am not wound up. You cannot tell the difference between a dill and an ignoramus. I will show you this time how wrong the lot of you are. You cannot constitutionally take my pay from me. I was explaining and pointing out the difference between abortion and criminal abortion. You cannot stand up to actual facts. That goes for you, too, Mr. Premier. You are not game to stand up to actual facts.

Hon. F. A. COOPER (Ipswich—Premier) (12.46 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw your attention to certain remarks made by the hon. member for Bundaberg during the division, remarks that I take it were insulting to you, the Chairman of Committees, the Treasurer and other hon. members of this House. I take it that we shall see to it that the hon. member apologises to the satisfaction of this House before he is readmitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform hon. members that I also took exception to certain remarks made by the hon. member for Bundaberg and due consideration will be given to them.

At 12.47 p.m.,

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. POWER (Barooka) (12.47 p.m.): In the course of the debate the hon. member for Bundaberg made the statement that this woman had been aborted; no evidence was brought in connection with that statement and it is quite wrong for the hon. member or any other hon. member to make a charge of that kind against anybody without evidence.

The hon. member admitted that he came into this House purely with a brief prepared for him by Dr. Max Michel. We know that Dr. Max Michel for a long while ran about endeavouring to get someone to state his case in this House and no doubt he got in touch with the hon. member for Bundaberg. A number of the statements contained in that brief are absolutely without foundation and without fact, but rather than that I should be accused of attempting to deliberately mislead the House or the public with regard to the full facts of the case of the Medical Board v. Dr. Max Michel I refer hon. members to what I stated on a previous occasion. I also desire to repeat before resuming my seat that on the evidence submitted three learned judges of the Supreme Court agreed that there was sufficient evidence on which the tribunal could base its finding and order the removal of the name of Dr. Max Michel from the medical register, and that the only reason why Dr. Max Michel's name was restored to the register was that the Medical Assessment Tribunal was not properly constituted, because Sir Raphael Cilento, a member of that board, was an assessor. Had Sir Raphael Cilento not been a member of the board, Dr. Max Michel today would be Max Michel.

I am rather sorry that the board was constituted in the way it was at the time, because I believe that if we have medical men in this

country who are willing to adopt the tactics and methods that Dr. Max Michel adopted in this case—to tell a woman she was suffering from a cancer that she did not have, then later go into court and allege that she was suffering from endocrine trouble—they should be denied the right of besmirching the good name of the medical men of the State. The medical men of Queensland have done an excellent job.

I might point out also that the woman concerned did not lay any charge. The charge was laid by Dr. Crouch. In the debate previously, the name of Dr. Stark was mentioned, and the hon. member for Mundingburra said, "The gentleman who has just been mixed up in a divorce case." As a matter of fact, Dr. Stark had nothing whatever to do with this case. That incident merely goes to show the extent to which the hon. member for Bundaberg will go in an endeavour to involve other members of the medical profession so that he might bolster up the case of a man who has been found by the Medical Assessment Tribunal to be guilty of professional misconduct.

I might point out also that this tribunal is comprised of a judge of the Supreme Court—I understand it was Mr. Justice Macrossan on this occasion—and two assessors. Those two assessors are there purely to advise the judge. They cannot give a decision. The decision is given by the Supreme Court judge. If the judge requires any information he asks the assessors for it, but he is not bound to accept their information. Would anyone in this Chamber suggest that Mr. Justice Macrossan is not an honourable man? Would anyone suggest for one moment that Mr. Justice Macrossan would be a party to removing the name of Dr. Max Michel, or that of any other member of the medical profession, from the medical register without proper grounds? The actions and remarks of the hon. member for Bundaberg in this Chamber are also a reflection upon the Senior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland.

I believe I have proved my case. I submit that the Queensland State Law Reports will be accepted by hon. members and the public in preference to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Bundaberg without any foundation in fact, but merely to submit a badly-prepared brief on behalf of Dr. Max Michel.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (12.52 p.m.): I propose to conclude the remarks I made when dealing with the Bill that set up the Queensland Institute of Medical Research and with that part of the Estimates for the Department of Health and Home Affairs which relates to Sir Raphael Cilento. I know that reference to a Bill is not germane to the debate today, but reference to the part of the Estimates dealing with the salary of the Director-General of Health and Medical Services is well within the scope of the matter before the House. On the second occasion, when on the vote for medical officers, I was prevented from dealing with Sir Raphael Cilento by the Chairman and I

have accepted that ruling. Since then I have been attacked in the "Sydney Bulletin" in an article written by a scribbling scavenger under the nom-de-plume of "Norther," who I am informed—and I believe my information is correct—was interned during this war. I want to state in all fairness to myself that I have replied to that article in the Sydney "Bulletin" and I posted my reply by registered post in order to ensure that the paper would get it. It remains to be seen whether the "Bulletin" will have the courage to publish any or all of my reply, or whether the "Bulletin" will have the courage to deal with the reply in any other way. I mention that in passing because I know that some hon. members of this Assembly were quite elated, quite jubilant, when they read this attack made upon me in the "Bulletin" over a non-de-plume.

On the occasion to which I have referred I laid upon the table of the House two photographs. One was a photograph of the Fascist judicial committee. We have heard the Director-General of Health and Medical Services extolled as a good Australian, as a man who was born in Australia and all of whose interests were Australian. Let me say that if I had been photographed in this group I should not object to what anyone said about me so far as Fascism and alienism are concerned. Let me read the names of the gentlemen with whom Sir Raphael Cilento so proudly poses. Hon. members can then draw their own conclusions as to why Sir Raphael Cilento was proud to sit in the front seat of this group.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to be clear and I want to know if the hon. member is in order in discussing what might be the private affairs of a public officer as distinct from the administration of a department with which he is concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order involved. The Standing Orders of the House extend protection to the Governor, the members of the judiciary and to hon. members of this House. Therefore, it will be necessary for the hon. member to make his remarks germane to the resolution relating to the Department of Health and Home Affairs. He will have to connect his remarks with the administration of the Chief Office of that department.

Mr. AIKENS: I intend to do that, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I intend to tie up my remarks not only with the Department of Health and Home Affairs but in a much more serious way, with the Government's administration of public hospitals in this State. First of all let me give the names of the persons with whom Sir Raphael Cilento proudly sits in this group. They are Mangioni, Battaglia, Donato, Quaglia, Gatteno, Vattione, Luciano, Cervetto, Chieffi, Bianchi, Cilento and Bancia. I have already tabled exact replicas of these photographs and it will be noticed that Cilento, as the senior vice-president of the Fascist judicial council, is seated on the left of Bianchi, the

president. In the front row on the right of the president is Chieffi, the junior vice-president. Cilento was the senior vice-president. Chieffi, the junior vice-president, was later the Fascist Italian consul in Townsville.

In the other photograph you will see the Fascist local committee, with all members dressed in black shirts and their Fascist regalia. I am sure that all hon. members who have examined the photographs that I laid on the table were quite surprised to see these fine Australians dressed in their Fascist black shirts in Fascist regalia posing before a large Italian Fascist flag with the photograph of the King and Queen of Italy.

Let me show the connection between the two photographs. First of all, take Battaglia, who is in the centre of the back row of the Fascist Judicial Council. He is the president of the Fascist local committee and sits in the centre front row of the photograph of the Fascist local committee. These are the fine Australians that Sir Raphael Cilento associated with while he was receiving a munificent salary from this Government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member will need to show an association between these groups and the control of the Department of Health and Home Affairs.

Mr. AIKENS: That is what we are dealing with.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The mere fact of his association with these people does not imply a criticism of the administration of the Department of Health and Home Affairs.

Mr. AIKENS: I intend to tie up my remarks right now. The Deputy Premier, who was then Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, told of certain circumstances that occurred in the Townsville general hospital. He blamed Dr. Roundtree for being responsible for the set of circumstances that resulted in the death of a child, that child having swallowed a safety pin. I believe that the hon. gentleman did not do it deliberately but he did pin on to Dr. Roundtree the sin of another doctor, I am satisfied quite unintentionally, because he was so flustered and confused in his defence of Cilento. The doctor referred to was Dr. Jackson. She gave evidence at the inquest into the death of the child and astonished not only the people of Townsville but also the Deputy Premier, then the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs. She gave evidence that the child had been brought into the casualty ward one morning and that the sister in charge of the casualty ward had rung her up and said that the child had been brought in with an open safety pin stuck in its throat. She admitted that she did not know what to do. She gave that in evidence on oath at the inquest. She also said that she told the sister to give the kid a piece of dry bread to swallow in the hope that it would swallow the safety pin too. She then admitted in evidence that she went back

to her quarters and looked up the medical textbook dealing with obstructions in the throat. If the Deputy Premier likes he can check up on what I am saying; he need only get the records relating to the coronial inquiry. She admitted all this.

At 2.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. AIKENS: That was a remarkable admission, made by the doctor herself. Quite rightly, certain people in Townsville got in touch with the then Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, Mr. Hanlon, and as a result Mr. Hanlon instituted inquiries, which he detailed in this Chamber some time ago. I only want to say that Dr. Tonkin, despite all the things said about him—and many hard things have been said about him—made a gallant but ineffectual attempt to save the child's life by an abdominal operation. The operation was not successful. Dr. Tonkin gave evidence that because of the physical condition of the child, the child collapsed under the operation and died.

So I think that we in Townsville were quite right in asking the pertinent question—how a woman like Dr. Jackson came to get such a position as resident medical officer of the Townsville General Hospital? We found out that she had been brought from New Zealand, and that she had been strongly recommended for the position by Sir Raphael Cilento, Director-General of Health and Medical Services. While several people in Townsville were following the line of inquiry concerning her lack of medical qualifications other people took an interest in Dr. Jackson in other ways. They found to their astonishment that this Dr. Jackson, resident medical officer of the Townsville General Hospital, who was sent there recommended by Sir Raphael Cilento, was having secret assignments with Dr. Chieffi. Dr. Chieffi was the Italian consul-general in Townsville—the Italian Fascist consul in Townsville. As the photograph shows, he was a vice-president of the Fascist judicial league.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I should like to know whether this has anything to do with the question of health and how the hon. member is going to connect the matter up with the resolution before the House.

Mr. AIKENS: I am attempting to prove that Sir Raphael Cilento used his position as Director-General of Health in Queensland in order to set up a Fascist spy-ring. If that has not to do with the Department of Health and Home Affairs, I stand corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that if the charge made against Sir Raphael Cilento is a very serious one, why not discuss it under the proper Estimates—Department of Justice?

Mr. AIKENS: I am at liberty to use certain avenues in order to make this charge. I am quite within my right as a member of this Assembly in making the charge in this manner.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member can make the charge at the right time and right place. We are discussing the question of health.

Mr. AIKENS: This has to do with the Department of Health and Home Affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are discussing the question of health, not matters that come under the Department of Justice.

Mr. AIKENS: Very well, then. This Dr. Jackson, this lady doctor, sent to the Townsville General Hospital by Sir Raphael Cilento, contacted, the moment she came there, Dr. Chieffi, Fascist consul in Townsville. Later, prior to the outbreak of war, she left Townsville with Dr. Chieffi on a Japanese boat bound for Japan. So I think I am entitled to draw the irresistible inference that Sir Raphael Cilento sent Dr. Jackson to Townsville with instructions to get in touch with Dr. Chieffi and when things got hot she left Townsville with Chieffi, fled the country, and moved to Japan.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the hon. member discuss matters of health on this resolution, otherwise I shall be compelled to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: I do not want to suffer the fate of the hon. member for Bundaberg.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: So I will have to bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

However, if the defenders of Sir Raphael Cilento are so eager to defend him in fact, and not just by generalities and personal insults at me, then let them investigate the whole of the circumstances of Dr. Jackson's being appointed resident medical officer at the Townsville General Hospital.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: I also intend to say one final word in connection with the photographs I laid on the table.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member persists I will ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: It is just too bad; but never mind, it is a long road that has no turning. I will now deal with something which Cilento signed as Director-General of Health and Medical Services. I will bow to your ruling if you rule it out of order because I do not intend to allow myself to be placed in a position today that might be very favourable to the Government.

I have said that Dr. Cilento in more ways than one abused that trust and confidence reposed in him by the Government. Here is a copy of a letter he sent to Matron R. M. Leworthy of the private hospital, Home Hill, and he sent it on official Department of Health and Home Affairs paper; and he signed it—and I want you to take particular notice of the signature—“Yours faithfully, R. W. Cilento (Sir Raphael Cilento, Kt., M.D.,

Director-General of Health and Medical Services).” I do not think that if you searched the records of any Government you will find a document more unfair, more unjust or more Gestapo-like in its implications than this copy which was taken from the original by a member of the Parliamentary secretarial staff, and therefore there can be no doubt as to its being a bona-fide copy. If there is any doubt, after I have read from it I will lay the document on the table of the House, because I am quoting facts. I am not going to rely upon generalities.

Listen to this most contemptible Gestapo-like document. It is headed—

“Section 15 of the Health Acts 1937-1939.

“Dear Madam,”

That is the heading and it is underlined. It goes on—

“Information has been brought to my notice that suggests that you recently made charges against Dr. W. H. Golding, Home Hill, of a very serious nature, and you subsequently admitted that these were absolutely false, and made because you bore a grudge towards Dr. Golding. In my opinion this is a very grave matter and suggests that you are not temperamentally a suitable person to conduct a nursing home licensed by the Government. I should be glad therefore if you would reply immediately under confidential cover to me showing cause why your licence should not be terminated at an early convenient date.”

That letter merely suggests that Matron Leworthy and Dr. Golding had an argument about something or other. I do not even know if they had an argument; if they did, I do not even know—and neither do I care—who was right and who was wrong in the argument. Dr. Cilento abused his powers under section 15 of the Health Act, which gives him the right to “inspect, investigate or inquire,” and it also gives him the same right as a Supreme Court judge under the Official Inquiries Evidence Acts, 1910-1929. He abused his power in order to blackmail that woman to write him something confidential on which he could possibly take action against her. And the letter, I might point out, is headed, “Confidential.” Dr. Cilento used departmental note paper and used his full title of “Sir Raphael Cilento, Kt., M.D., and Director-General of Health and Medical Services.” He sent it in the hope that she would reply in writing confidentially and give him something on which he could make a charge. I will read the last paragraph again—

Mr. Foley: Does the letter indicate that she admitted the charges were false?

Mr. AIKENS: I am surprised at the obtuseness of the Minister. The letter does not indicate that Matron Leworthy had done anything against the Medical Act. Cilento, being a barrister, was very careful not to charge Matron Leworthy with anything. I

will read it again for the Minister's information—

"Information has been brought to my notice that suggests you recently made charges—"

He does not even say she made charges because if he did he might leave himself open for a first-class legal action. He writes and says that information had been brought to his notice that suggested she and Dr. Golding had differences of an important nature. It may have been a difference about a motor-car. It may have been a difference about anything; it may have been purely a personal quarrel about anything at all between Matron Leworthy and Dr. Golding. This is the important point: a difference of opinion might never have occurred. The whole of the circumstances might have been fictitious from the start or might have been a figment of Cilento's imagination.

Mr. Dunstan interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: Listen to the defenders of Cilento. I wonder how many free diagnoses he has given them. I could diagnose their illness and I am not a doctor.

He used it in an endeavour to blackmail some statements from her that might give him something to act upon. He says—

"In my opinion this is a very serious matter and suggests you are not temperamentally a suitable person to conduct a nursing home."

Since when do people who conduct nursing homes have to be temperamentally suitable if temperamental suitability depends entirely on whether they can have an argument or fall out or be friends with some other person in the community? I know this is the first the Minister has ever seen of this letter; it is obvious this letter came from the confidential file of Cilento. Incidentally, I did not get it from Matron Leworthy. I challenge the Minister to hold inquiries into the whole of the circumstances surrounding that letter, because Cilento has used his official position in order to blackmail an unfortunate woman in Home Hill to say something on which he might lay a charge. If that is not an abuse of his power, then tell me what is.

Now let us deal with a matter agitating the minds of everyone in Queensland today, that of infantile paralysis. Consequent on a series of questions asked by the hon. member for Bowen of the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, we all know the Gestapo tactics that were employed by this same Cilento in respect of a royal commission or commission that was appointed to inquire into the efficacy of the Kenny method of treatment. We know now, because the Minister has admitted it, to our astonishment and surprise—and this should be blazoned forth in headlines in every newspaper in Australia—that under Cilento that commission sat in camera. Although it was sitting to determine whether Sister Kenny's treatment was efficacious or not it sat in camera and denied Sister Kenny the right to be present while her witnesses were being heard or any other

witnesses were being heard, and it also denied her the right to cross-examine those witnesses against her. If anything more Gestapo-like than that has ever been done in Queensland I should like to hear of it. The only bright spot in the whole of the sordid business was the Government's refusal to accept the decision of the commission. Had they accepted the decision of a commission that sat in such unsavoury and sordid circumstances as that, they would stand branded as Gestapo agents themselves before the whole of the people.

It is well-known that, although the cause of paralysis is unknown and although the manner in which it is transmitted is unknown and although its incidence is unpredictable, paralysis first strikes a patient as a type of virulent fever. Strangely enough, under this man Cilento, when patients are afflicted and as they are in the height of their fever, they are isolated for 14 days, and, Mr. Speaker, no-one is allowed to get at them for 14 days except to give them the ordinary febrifuges that any fever patient gets. Sister Kenny's treatment relies entirely on getting the patient the moment it is struck down. Sister Kenny states that if her treatment is to be efficacious at all, if it is to be successful at all, she must get the patient then and then alone has she any hope of a complete recovery; but under the archaic, antediluvian and mediaeval system as practised by Cilento, the patient is shut away from Sister Kenny and from every other person who wants to rehabilitate and revitalize the muscles, for 14 days until the muscles have become stiff and rigid, and then only when the damage is done is the unfortunate child handed over to some of those who are prepared to do the job of the rejuvenation of the muscles and of bringing back to them their full functional qualities. That is the real danger.

The whole opposition to the Kenny treatment is that the Kenny method might be incorporated in the public hospitals and be made free to all who may desire to avail themselves of it. The opposition to the Kenny treatment is caused by the ignorance and avarice of the great mass of the medical profession in this State and the country. I know of my own knowledge of a child who was struck down and attended by the family doctor for months on end until the whole of the family resources had been exhausted. Then the doctor suggested to the parent that he mortgage the home in order that he might go on paying him the guinea or half-guinea fee for visiting the patient but doing nothing. After he had all the money he could get out of the parents he then tied up the unfortunate child in splints, bandages and leg-irons, which he probably got from the dungeons of the Inquisition, and turned the unfortunate child loose on the street. That is why the great mass—fortunately not all—of the medical profession are opposed to the Kenny treatment, because that treatment stops up a fund of fees for them that once was available to them for doing nothing at all except turning the unfortunate child out on the street in leg-irons and splints.

In view of your previous ruling, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that you have chopped me off although I was dealing with the resident medical officer of the Townsville General Hospital, I shall have to resume my seat.

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Normanby—Secretary for Health and Home Affairs) (2.34 p.m.): I do not understand the reason for the hon. member's attitude towards Sir Raphael Cilento. Whether Sir Raphael has done him some injury at one time or other I do not know, but I cannot understand the reason why he insists, upon every possible occasion during Sir Raphael's absence from Queensland, upon maligning him in the eyes of the public. All I can say is that I understand that the photographs referred to were taken during peace-time, when not only Sir Raphael Cilento but many other eminent citizens in this State were friendly with many of those to whom he referred as Fascists and who were not taken seriously in Queensland. The point I wish to emphasise is that in every speech he has made on this subject the hon. member has endeavoured to lead the House and the public to believe that Sir Raphael Cilento has Fascist sympathies and used his position as Director-General of Health and Medical Services in a way detrimental to the people of the State.

Mr. Aikens: I would have proved it if I had been let go.

Mr. FOLEY: I have sufficient confidence in the ability of the Intelligence Section—

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. In view of the fact that you prevented me from dealing with a certain aspect of Sir Raphael Cilento's activities, is the Minister in order in replying to something that you prevented me from dealing with?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am prepared to allow the Minister to make some reference to the speech made by the hon. member but I suggest to the Minister that he help the Chair by keeping to the resolution.

Mr. FOLEY: I propose linking my remarks to the question before the Chair—the administration of that section of the Department of Health and Home Affairs that comes under the control of the Director-General of Health and Medical Services. I have every confidence in the Commonwealth Intelligence Department, which operated not only during the war but also prior to the war period. That section has all the facilities possible for carrying out investigations and if it had been of the opinion that Sir Raphael Cilento had Fascist sympathies and was using his position as Director-General of Health and Medical Services to further the influence of the Fascists in the community it certainly would have taken action to incarcerate him, just as other people in the community were interned. Apparently there was no evidence whatever to warrant such action, and I think it is evident from this fact that Sir Raphael Cilento as Director-General of Health and Medical Services played the game by the State notwithstanding the

friendship he may have had in peace-time with some of the members of that Fascist group to which reference has been made.

The fact is that as Director-General of Health and Medical Services he has administered the health affairs of the State in such a way as to bring upon himself the recognition of other people throughout the world, so much so that he has been selected to carry out on behalf of U.N.R.R.A. certain important responsibilities that call for high medical skill and integrity. In face of these facts I contend that the attack that has been made upon him during his absence from Australia, when he has had no possible chance of defending himself through the Press or by other means, is unsportsmanlike and unfair.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. If the Minister had given me an opportunity last year to discuss this by bringing his Estimates forward I should have discussed this matter while Sir Raphael Cilento was in the State.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is rather difficult to control the debate, and I seek the co-operation of hon. members. I think the Minister, too, might please note my ruling and discuss the resolution.

Mr. FOLEY: I can understand your difficulty, Mr. Speaker. The debate is not actually a criticism of the administration of the department at all. In the case of the hon. member for Bundaberg it developed into an attempt to justify the actions of a certain doctor in his appeal against the decision of the Medical Board of Queensland and in the case of the hon. member for Mundingburra it developed into an attack on a doctor who holds a very important and eminent position in this State, but who is now absent from Queensland. There was ample opportunity for the hon. member to raise the subject of his criticism in the Address in Reply and on the Financial Statement, before Dr. Cilento left for overseas. However, he has seen fit to leave his criticism of him until after his departure from Queensland, thereby giving the doctor no opportunity to defend himself—a very unsportsmanlike attitude for any hon. member to take up. We in this country insist upon a fair deal for every citizen, and I contend that the hon. member has not given him what is generally described in Australia as a "fair go."

The hon. member for Bundaberg had a great deal to say concerning the case of Dr. Michel. I desire to inform hon. members that a complaint was made to The Medical Board of Queensland concerning Dr. Michel and The Medical Board of Queensland dealt with his case. It was alleged that Dr. Max Michel was guilty of misconduct in a professional respect. The complaint was investigated by the board. The board decided that a prima-facie case had been established against Dr. Michel, and so it was referred to the Medical Assessment Tribunal, the tribunal gave a decision, and the result was the deregistration of Dr. Michel.

Dr. Michel appealed against the decision, and certain questions were submitted to the Full Court for adjudication. One question was, "Was the decision of the Medical Assessment Tribunal in excess of jurisdiction by reason of the fact that one of the assessors was the president of the board?" The Chief Justice, Sir William Webb, answered the question "No," Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas answered the question "No." Both said that the appellant had waived his right of rejection. Mr. Justice Philp answered the question "Yes." The decision in respect of that question was a majority one in favour of the tribunal.

The next question was, "Was the decision erroneous in point of law because the trial judge did not administer an oath to the assessors?" All the judges answered that question "No."

Then we come to a very important question, the answers to which turned the scales in favour of the appellant. The question was, "Was it erroneous in point of law by reason of the judge's refusal to order the registrar to make available to the appellant a copy of the record of proceedings before the board?" In that case the Chief Justice answered "No" and the other two judges answered "Yes." From my reading of the resume of the findings I am of the opinion that the answers to that question turned the decision in favour of the appellant doctor.

However, there is this important question too: "Was there evidence to support the several findings of fact?" In that case the three judges answered the question in the affirmative. In other words, the Full Court was unanimously of the opinion that the findings of the Medical Assessment Tribunal were right. Dr. Michel was in fact on those findings guilty of professional misconduct. That is the most important point that this House should know. In other words, notwithstanding the hon. member for Bundaberg's effort, as it were, to remove any doubt from the findings as they affected Dr. Michel, the fact remains that he won his case on a point of law, not on a point of fact as outlined by the decision of the three judges of the Full Court.

I mention this matter because it was linked up with the Department of Health and Home Affairs, which to a certain point administers the Medical Act. In doing so it is natural that it must take cognisance of charges made by any member of the community against a doctor by referring them to the Medical Board so that all parties can get a fair hearing. That was all that was done in this case and the doctor concerned escaped by what one may term the skin of his teeth. The finding of fact of the Full Court was against Dr. Michel but the court ruled in his favour on the point that the decision to strike him off the register was erroneous in point of law because of the refusal to make available to him a copy of the proceedings taken before the Medical Board.

I pass from that question to the attitude of the Director-General of Health and Medical

Services regarding the system of treatment advocated by Sister Kenny in infantile paralysis. I am not conversant with all the facts that were adduced by the commission of inquiry held in this State on that treatment. I have, however, this knowledge, that this Government were determined to see that the Kenny system got a fair trial and so far have spent £78,000 in the training of nurses, under Nurse Kenny's jurisdiction, and in the setting-up of Kenny clinics and equipping them at various centres throughout the State. We are now equipping them again so that any child will have the opportunity of getting the Kenny treatment if it is so desired.

We have for the last 10 years or more had a clinic at the corner of George and Charlotte Streets. It has been overstaffed. During the whole of that period we have continually treated chronic patients—sufferers from infantile paralysis. Many patients have obtained very fine relief while in others not very great signs of progress were noticed. The mere fact that there is a hope that the treatment will revive certain muscles has an effect on the patient's health and possibly helps the patient to a great extent to regain some form of physical fitness, and this has induced the Government to continue the expenditure. Other clinics, through lack of cases, have more or less closed down. In Toowoomba we paid for the services of a nurse for months and months with virtually no work for her to do. Eventually when we recommended the closing down of that clinic we arranged for the transfer of that nurse into the general nursing services. We did the same at Cairns, Townsville and Rockhampton, but immediately there were signs of an epidemic we took steps to communicate with all Kenny technicians in the State and to re-establish our clinics. We did so in order that they may be staffed ready to operate. That is the position today. We have a clinic at Cairns, we have one at Townsville and another at Rockhampton, and instructions have been given to re-open the one at Toowoomba. We have given instructions to set up the Kenny equipment at the Brisbane General Hospital notwithstanding that we are cramped for space there, and to do so have had to remove patients out of a ward. It is very important that hon. members should know that of the 120 cases of infantile paralysis reported up to date in the recent epidemic only five parents have inquired for the Kenny treatment for their children.

In only one case did Dr. Fryberg recommend that the child be brought backwards and forwards in the ambulance to the George street clinic. That is the position. Notwithstanding the fact that we as a Government spent £78,000 already, and are willing to spend another £78,000 if it is going to save any of our children, we find that the parents in only five cases out of 120 cases asked for the treatment. In some cases patients are brought by air, in other cases by rail and motor, to the Brisbane General Hospital, and we not only intend using the Kenny method of treatment at the hospital, but the best of

the orthodox treatment. Doctors have already abandoned the plaster casts for children in this form of paralysis. They are now adopting the policy of rest, massage, manipulation and re-education; and occasionally they use a splint for certain purposes, particularly for giving the limb a rest at night-time. In those five or six points I have mentioned you have the principle of the Kenny treatment in co-operation with the best of the orthodox methods of treatment in use before the Kenny method.

Sister Kenny has at least brought about an awareness in the medical community and aroused a desire to investigate her ideas on this question of the re-education of muscles at different stages during the paralysis. In America many medical men are responding and feel there is something in the points she has raised. If she has done nothing else she is responsible for the awakening by the medical profession to certain things they did not know before. Let it be said to the credit of the medical fraternity that doctors—at least in the Brisbane Hospital—are adopting some of the principles she has advocated. We have done our best to establish the Kenny system in this State. If the parents have not responded, and have complete confidence in the orthodox method of treatment combined with certain Kenny principles, that is their business. We cannot force any particular treatment on them.

Mr. Macdonald: They do not know the difference.

Mr. FOLEY: They may not. The point is whether the doctors are getting results. We cannot tell immediately. I understand from a discussion I had with Dr. Fryberg that it takes at least two years before one can say that a muscle will not recover further, or whether one can say definitely what results have been obtained from the treatment. Time only will determine whether the treatment that is being given by our doctors is going to give results and restore to physical health many of the unfortunate victims of this epidemic.

On the question of what we are doing to try to prevent the spread of this disease from one to the other, I might mention that we have a committee of doctors, who responded during the last epidemic to the call of the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, and who responded on this occasion also. I find they do not know how the disease is transmitted to different areas of the State. They are absolutely at sea, and have no knowledge as to how the virus that they say is the cause of the disease travels, for instance, between here and the Territory in one case and Mount Isa in another case and to Bowen and then down to the southern part of the State. They are unaware how it is caused or transmitted, whether by human beings or insects or whether it merely travels through the air. That being so, it can be understood how difficult it is for any Department of Health to deal adequately with the position. The only thing that we can do—and it is being done already—is to circularise every local authority ask-

ing it to make an intense drive with regard to sanitation and health matters and do everything possible to improve the sanitation conditions in its area in the hope that thereby we may gradually minimise the effects of this disease.

Whether the fly is responsible is debatable. It is true the virus has been found in the faeces of patients. It has also been found in the faeces of contacts and thus to an ordinary layman it would appear that with the insanitary conditions to be found in many isolated parts of the State there could be no better agent than the fly for spreading this disease from one person to another and from one district to another, because air currents blow the fly many miles. I am only a layman and when this matter was raised at the doctors committee meeting no-one could give me any definite information as to whether any authority agreed that the fly was a contributing factor in the spread of this disease. Notwithstanding that I have adopted the safety-first attitude and we have appealed to the local authorities to embark on this drive I have mentioned.

I have outlined exactly the Government's views with regard to the Kenny treatment. I am not here to engage in an argument with the hon. member for Mundingburra as to whether Dr. Cilento was in Sister Kenny's corner or not; the fact is that notwithstanding any attitude he may have taken the Government have played the game by Sister Kenny throughout the scheme. We have expended £78,000-odd up to date and we will spend another £78,000 or more if we can help the children of this State, those unfortunates who may have been stricken down with this disease, to regain physical fitness and to see if we can prevent the spread of the disease. We are groping in the dark, as it were, but we are adopting the common-sense tactics of cleanliness and improvement in the health conditions in our community, but unless the citizens and the local authorities co-operate with us in that campaign no beneficial results will accrue. We can do no more than that.

No other points have been raised in this debate and consequently I am not in a position to refer to other aspects of the administration of my department other than to say that the report on the health services of the State has been tabled this morning and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, the records disclosed in that report show that the Government is playing the game by our citizens as far as concerns catering for their health by every means known to science.

Resolution 3—Department of Health and Home Affairs—agreed to.

Resolution 4—Treasury—agreed to.

Resolution 5—Department of Railways—agreed to.

Resolution 6—Department of Agriculture and Stock—

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) (3.3 p.m.): I had intended to speak on this department on Thursday night, but the Minister finished his speech at about three minutes before time

was up, and as three minutes was not enough time to deal with this important subject, I decided to withhold my remarks until today.

My main complaint about this vote is that it is not enough. The amount that is granted here is an insult to one of the most important industries in the State, and one of the most important departments—the Department of Agriculture and Stock. It is time that hon. members began to realise that we cannot expect to have an efficient and satisfactory department if enough money is not given to it, if it is not encouraged to tackle the problems of agriculture in a modern and scientific way. I have the feeling that for far too long now we have looked upon the Department of Agriculture and Stock simply as a department to give the correct scientific advice to farmers, to carry on a limited number of experiments in agriculture, and to do a little to help orderly marketing. I feel that that is far too little. It is time we looked upon our primary industries in exactly the same way as we should look upon our secondary industries, because I believe that this State will never prosper and its people will never be really prosperous until we have an orderly and efficient system of primary production coupled with a balanced, orderly, and efficient system of secondary industrial production. It should be the function of the Department of Agriculture and Stock to give a lead in scientific experiments or in dealing with diseases in agriculture. But, in addition, it is necessary that the department should act, as it were, as a State organising department for the whole of our agricultural system.

In the first place, our agricultural production must be carried on in an orderly manner and must be carried on in an efficient manner. It is obvious that if it is to be carried on in an orderly and efficient manner, we must have a planned system of agricultural production. We can no longer expect agriculture to flourish or function if it is not planned in accordance not only with the purchasing power of the people, but also with their needs. If their purchasing power is not enough to enable them to satisfy their needs then their purchasing power must be raised to enable their needs to be satisfied. During the war period, agriculture was carried on on much more efficient and much better planned lines than in the past, and it would be wise if the department tried to carry on the methods adopted in war-time into peace-time, in an improved form minus some of the defects that were inevitable and almost unavoidable with the rapid organisation of agriculture during the war.

I suggest, for instance, that the department should give serious consideration to the need either for retaining, if it has not been abolished already, or for re-introducing, if it has been abolished, the system of buying agricultural products in bulk on some contract basis. If we have the contract system of purchase, we can place wholesale marketing on a proper and orderly basis, and we can have a sound basis for a guaranteed system of prices with maximum and minimum limits. It is not sufficient simply to have

a maximum limit; there must be a minimum limit. We cannot expect the primary producer, when primary products are in short supply, to be content to keep his price down below the maximum instead of trying to get the highest possible amount and make the ceiling price his minimum, if at the same time we do not guarantee him a minimum or if he is not given enough during a period of glut. I believe that the soundest basis for this guaranteed system of prices is along the lines of the contract system, which was adopted by the Commonwealth Government in relation to agricultural production for the needs of the services.

I believe also that the department should not only encourage the farmers to make use of science so far as herd-testing, the proper type of seed, the proper type of plant, and so on, are concerned, but should help them or advise them as to the use of agricultural machinery, and encourage them to use it in a co-operative way. Queensland has lagged behind New South Wales in that respect. I think that New South Wales has done much more towards the development of the machinery pool system than Queensland has done, and I suggest that the Minister should give serious consideration to the extension of the principle of machinery pools in this State even beyond what New South Wales has already done.

Of course, I cannot deal with the subject of agricultural finance on this resolution because it has nothing to do with the Department of Agriculture and Stock, but it is obvious that the whole problem of agriculture is linked up with a proper system of agricultural finance.

Dealing with the question of organised marketing, I think that one of the weaknesses of the past has been that we have concentrated solely on organised wholesale marketing. I am of the opinion that organised wholesale marketing will never be a success until we have retail marketing also placed on an orderly basis. And so I suggest to the Minister that his Director of Marketing should give serious consideration to that need, especially as today we see the tragic spectacle in this State of people being unable to procure ample requirements of fruit and vegetables at decent prices in a State that could produce them in abundance.

Mr. Walsh: Is municipal marketing in Townsville a success?

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, but not the success that it should be or would be if there was organised marketing from the grower to the consumer. The difficulty with the municipal marketing at Townsville is that the produce is not controlled prior to the time when it reaches the municipal market. The municipal market at Townsville, however, has the effect of maintaining the profit margin at a minimum above the price that it pays for its fruit and vegetables on the wholesale market. Owing to its distance from the wholesale market the loss occurring in transport is very high and this means that the municipal market in fixing a minimum profit margin, still has its retail prices too high.

Mr. Walsh: The cost of transport is very high.

Mr. PATERSON: I am not speaking of the cost of transport but of the loss in transport, especially in the hot weather. A big proportion of the fruit and vegetables transported to the North for sale is lost in transport and naturally the municipal market has to bear that loss or rather has to pass that loss on to the consumer. My point is that until we have the sale of fruit and vegetables and other primary products all organised on a planned system, a system of marketing right from the grower to the consumer, we are not going to have complete success.

Mr. Plunkett: Do you mean Government control?

Mr. PATERSON: Not necessarily Government control right through. I believe for instance that where it is not advisable to have State control it would be better to have municipal or co-operative marketing. However, I think that on the wholesale side the Government could play a considerable part and where it is best to have co-operative wholesale marketing under grower control you could have a certain amount of representation on behalf of the consumers through the Government. To me it does not matter whether it is purely Government, purely co-operative, or purely a municipal control. The form of control will depend upon the circumstances and the locality where the produce is sold. It is obvious that in some places municipal and co-operative control would be the best form of retail selling, and that in others Government retail shops would be the best. That would depend upon the circumstances throughout the State. I understand, for instance, that municipal enterprise would have some difficulty in exercising control in some of the small towns of the West. I understand that the administrative difficulties would be great and in that case it might be better to have a co-operative enterprise or State shops or stores. My point is that we no longer can rely on private profit-making enterprise to ensure an orderly and reasonably cheap supply of fruit and vegetables and other primary products for the people.

Mr. Collins: It is very hard to control production, too.

Mr. PATERSON: I realise that, but it would be much easier to control production if we had a guaranteed or orderly system of marketing. It is obvious that production could be better controlled under an orderly system of selling than if production was left simply to the whim of the market.

Mr. Collins: Seasons play an important part, too.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes. But with a proper and orderly system of marketing we eliminate one of the great evils causing a scarcity and a glut in the production of primary products. We cannot overcome the vagaries of the season by legislation but we can minimise the effect of them by an increased application

of science to primary production. That is all that we can do to minimise those evils.

When I speak of an orderly system of marketing I want to stress the fact that I mean a system that is democratically controlled. For instance, if we had a State shop 900 miles from here it should be partly under the control of representatives of the people in that area.

I believe that that is the only way we are ever going to overcome the tendency towards bureaucratic centralisation, whether under State marketing or Commonwealth marketing or any similar system. For this reason I urge the Minister to give serious consideration to the retention of the district war agricultural committees. They played an important part in agricultural production in the war. It is true that they had many defects, but they were new organisations, created quickly to meet emergencies during the war, and therefore only an insane person would expect them to function without defects. The fact is that they rendered valuable services throughout the Commonwealth, and helped greatly to tackle the problem of the supply of agricultural products in the country. I am of opinion that these district war agricultural committees should not only be retained but more widely developed. One of their weaknesses was that sufficient of them were not set up.

Mr. Macdonald: Man-power paid no attention to their requests.

Mr. PATERSON: That is so. In this debate we cannot deal with Man-power. We do know that when they were created Man-power often could not supply the necessary labour. That was one of the defects that these district war agricultural committees had to put up with during the war period, but in peace-time they will not have to put up with that defect. If these district war agricultural committees suffered because Man-power could not supply the labour, that they recommended for primary production, that same defect need not exist in peace-time, because in peace-time thousands of our men will no longer be required for the fighting services. There is a great future for the district war agricultural committees.

Even though we have a perfect system of organisation, even though we have a perfect system of production, even though we have the most scientific system of production and a most perfect form of organisation of marketing, they will not be successful unless the ultimate consumer of the products can buy from the farmers. There is no use in giving the farmer a guaranteed price if the market for his products is limited, because it will only mean that he has a guaranteed price for part of his products. What we want is not only a guaranteed price but a guaranteed price for the maximum products we can consume. A guaranteed price for apples is not much good if it restricts consumption as at present when the people could consume four or even 10 times the amount of apples they are doing now. Guaranteed prices for pears, bananas, milk and so on are

no good if the people, the consumers, are not able to consume all the fruit and vegetables they require owing to lack of purchasing power.

So I suggest that side by side with this—although it does not actually come into consideration with the Department of Agriculture and Stock but I submit I am in order in concluding in this strain—the whole organisation of agriculture must ultimately be linked up with the need to produce a plan that will guarantee to the working people of this State and the working people of the Commonwealth, rising standards of living. If we do not do that, then all our good production and good marketing will not produce its fullest fruit.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (3.19 p.m.): I, like the hon. member for Bowen, did not have the opportunity of speaking on this important department the other night. The present prosperity of this State is based primarily on its proper functioning. If we for ever remain a primary-producing country there can be no real development in the years that lie ahead in a nation the size of Australia and a State the size of Queensland, unless their great natural resources represented by our primary industries are developed hand-in-hand with secondary industries. The future of world economy rests finally on the development of secondary industries round the natural resources of each and every country throughout the world.

That is why, candidly, I am worried about the future of the Mother Country, Great Britain. She has no natural resources to develop, except perhaps iron and coal. But her dominions have. Australia, Canada, South Africa and New Zealand all have natural primary resources waiting to be developed. Therefore I make this definite statement—and I will make it again and again—that the future of Great Britain in world affairs must be built round the Empire, for a United British Empire can lead the nations of the world for generations only if our Empire is developed.

Let us analyse some of the natural resources we possess. The first that comes to my mind is wool, not only because I am interested in it, but because I believe and I realise that without any Empire preference this represents untold wealth to this country. Australia, as we know, is the greatest wool-producing country in the world today. Before the war we produced 75 per cent. of the world's supply of pure merino wool. Before the war we produced £75,000,000 worth of greasy wool and only used in this country £9,000,000 worth of this great primary product. I say that Australia is unquestionably at the cross-roads; we have to answer the question: are we forever to remain a primary-producing country or are we to develop industry round the great natural resources that we possess? During the war Australia has laid the foundations of many industries that enable us to compete under normal conditions with almost all countries of the world. But the present strikes, go-slow tactics and attempts to curtail production—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the subject before the House.

Mr. PIE: I am maintaining—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order: I ask the hon. member to obey my call to order.

Mr. PIE: Is wool a primary-producing industry in this State?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Strikes do not come under this vote.

Mr. PIE: During the war the developments within the textile trade have been remarkable. With the introduction of the latest automatic spinning and weaving plants—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: Surely secondary industries will use cotton and wool.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The matter can be discussed in the right place.

Mr. PIE: Let us analyse another great natural primary product, namely, cotton. Do you know that the cotton-growing industry under irrigation could be expanded 100 times within present growing capacity and the Australian secondary industries would still be short of cotton? I was in touch with the director of a large group of cotton-spinners who intend to expand the Australian development enormously, and they say that with automatic machinery we can compete. I have had a paper from America from which I quote the following:—

“Economic Headache for South.

“Mechanical pickers, which promise to bring about such cuts, are now in commercial production. More than 100 are in use. The International Harvester Company, which began to develop a cotton picker 40 years ago, has produced most of them. It will produce another couple of hundred next year, perhaps more if materials and facilities permit. Other mechanical pickers are nearing production by Allis-Chalmers and John Deere.

“The IHC picker is a tractor with a high steel housing on top. The machine straddles the row of cotton. Barbed revolving spindles, 600 of them, catch and extract the cotton from the open bolls.

“The machine picks more than 1,000 pounds of seed cotton an hour. For human pickers, a normal season average would be 15 pounds of seed cotton an hour.”

At 3.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Mann, Brisbane) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. PIE: There you have within this very phase the secret of the proper development of the cotton industry of Queensland. I say that tremendous developments in cotton-growing are possible in Queensland. We have an unlimited market. The hon.

member for Bowen made it clear that it was useless to expand primary industry unless we had a market. I say we have a market, because the mechanical cotton-picker will make it possible to produce and pick cotton on an economic basis. The future of this country is bound up in the development of primary industry in relation to secondary industry, and unless the State develops the cotton industry it is losing a wonderful opportunity for using the natural resources of the State. In England recently I ordered 50 looms that will weave cotton and linen.

Mr. Webster of the Bradford cotton mills told me that they are forming a company of £1,000,000 to absorb cotton. Our cotton has to be blended with English and Egyptian cotton. If we can produce it on an economic basis, which is possible now with the mechanical cotton-picker, there is no doubt that this State, which is the best for cotton-growing, can lead in that direction. I discussed this matter with a director of the International Harvester Company in Chicago when I was there recently and he made it quite clear that their machine was a long way out of the experimental stage. It was now in actual production.

Mr. Brand: What is it?

Mr. PIE: This magazine contains a picture and gives the details to it. There is no doubt that it will save our cotton industry.

Mr. Foley: Could it compete against the Indian picking?

Mr. PIE: Yes, because the machine will pick 1,000 lb. an hour, whereas a man will pick only 15 lb. a hour, and if something cannot be developed out of that, something is wrong.

Now to deal with another possible great primary industry that could be developed along with secondary industries. Last October I asked for and received from the Department of Labour and Employment a report in relation to the establishment of a cannery at Bowen for tropical fruits. I went into the matter very thoroughly and I found that production in the Bowen area was—

Pineapples	21,242 dozen
Tomatoes	160,702 bushels
Bananas	15,688 bunches
Papaws	412 bushels
Mangoes	25,669 bushels
Citrus fruits	2,214 bushels

The production of papaws could be stepped up. I studied this report very thoroughly because I realised that before it was possible to develop an industry round this primary industry we must have the possibility of production. From this report I am able to say definitely that there is the possibility of building a large industry in canned fruits about Bowen.

The next thing would be to sell them. I am not willing to recommend anyone to develop this great primary industry unless the products can be sold overseas. I found that if a cannery was established in Bowen I would

be able to sell its production to one firm in Great Britain, but when I returned I found this State intended to go in for co-operative fruit factories.

Let the State make up its mind what it will do, but right now there is a wonderful possibility of developing that great primary industry in the North. The only practicable method would be to can the fruit on the site within 24 hours of picking. It is no use bringing the fruit down South days later and expecting to be able to make a good canned product. If it is not possible to do it at Bowen it might be done at Mackay. They are giving me complete details of their fruit production in that area. There is an export market for the fruits it is possible to can in those areas. This would develop a primary industry.

The hon. member for Cook made out a splendid case for the development of maize and glucose in the North. The more one analyses this State the more one realises the great primary industries we have awaiting development. It requires initiative and driving force, and no Government could do it. As a Government, however, we must go into these things, analysing the possibilities of primary production in each area, then form committees, and afterwards get to the right people in industry who are prepared to develop these natural resources. But first of all we must be absolutely certain of our overseas markets. It is useless developing any industry round primary products if it is found that there is no overseas market for the goods we produce. I say emphatically that Queensland has wonderful opportunities in the world's markets if she will develop secondary industries round primary industries. Our wool tops, spun yarn and other things can be developed and shipped overseas not always completely processed but half processed. We ship tremendous quantities of wool tops now to America and other parts of the world. A little later we shall ship spun yarn. We shall put in carbonising plants and ship wool carbonised. All these things revolve round the great wealth of this State—primary industries—but if this State is to be developed there is only one way to do it, and that is to analyse the primary resources of this State and develop industries round them.

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (3.32 p.m.): I agree with the two previous speakers that primary industry is one of the most important in the lives of the people of Queensland. The Minister in charge of the administration of this department has much work to do in watching the best interests of the various industries under his jurisdiction.

This afternoon the hon. member for Bowen suggested a revolutionary process of selling our various primary products right up to the consumer stage. I really do not know whether the hon. member was endeavouring to develop a theory held by some people in this country.

At least we do know that in the one country in which that system is adopted we have no reliable information to indicate that the

primary producers and consumers there are any better off than the people of Queensland. On the contrary, it would appear that the people engaged in all spheres of agriculture in Queensland are in a much better position than they are in Russia.

Undoubtedly the Minister will be confronted with many problems in his efforts to maintain the markets that should be available to our primary industries in the coming year, and I suggest that he should give first attention to what has always been our best market—Great Britain. If State help is necessary in achieving this then he should not hesitate to submit plans and schemes to his Government for the protection of our primary producers.

It is pleasing to know that at the end of a war our financial position in England is very healthy indeed. I am sure the Premier, who has just returned from that country, could give us an interesting account of the part that Queensland and Australian primary industries played in maintaining the financial stability of Australia over there. We know that we have a trade balance of £100,000,000 as at September this year, although I understand that £30,000,000 is to be transferred to Australia, and that primary production played a very important part in establishing that favourable balance. The hon. member for Windsor has mentioned the tremendous part played by wool in our economy. Undoubtedly our healthy position in London has been due largely to the sale of wool to the British Government.

At the present time our primary industries are threatened with the abolition of Empire preference as a result of the Anglo-American talks that have been proceeding for some time in Washington. I urge upon the Minister, who knows the problems of primary producers, to impress upon his Government and the Commonwealth Government the urgent necessity of maintaining live and strong agitation for the retention of Empire preference. I should like him to impress upon those concerned the fact that if Empire preference and exchange were abolished the result to our primary industries would be very serious indeed. I sincerely hope that he will give first attention to the need for retaining the benefits enjoyed by these industries and those engaged in them under Empire preference.

I should like the Minister to give us also some information this afternoon on the latest developments with regard to the buffalo fly, a menace that is spreading over too wide an area in the State. When we realise that a substantial sum of money is obtained from the graziers and pastoralists of the State by way of a buffalo-fly tax for the purpose of combating this menace it seems difficult to understand how the fly has been able to make such rapid progress over the last few years.

This rapid spread of the menace is causing the primary producers great concern, and I hope that the Minister will be able to give us the assurance that more will be done in the future than has been done in the past to prevent the scourge from reaching all the important dairying districts in the State.

I hope the Minister realises, too, that those engaged in mixed farming are apprehensive as to the possible serious disturbance of the market in relation to potatoes. The latest reports to hand are that the growers are unable to dispose of the whole of their potato crops, which brings me to the point that if markets and prices are right there is nothing wrong with the production end of the industry. There is evidence that a tremendous crop of potatoes has been grown and is now in the process of being marketed. Therefore I hope the Minister will tell the growers that everything will be done to see that their crops are harvested and marketed without any loss to them. Let it be remembered that the primary producers have responded nobly to the call to produce more foodstuffs for the country, and they should not now be expected to suffer the tremendous loss that appears to be imminent. I hope that the Minister will be able to assure the House and the people that all will be well with the potato-growers in the marketing of their crops.

Mr. L. J. BARNES (Cairns) (3.42 p.m.): I desire to congratulate the primary producers of this country on the excellent job they did both before and during the war. We seem to overlook the fact that the primary producers in this and other countries have provided more than their quota for the Army, Navy, Air Force and Land Army than any other section of people in the country. As we are well aware, the birth-rate in rural areas amongst primary producers is so high in this country that they were able to provide 130,000 for service during the war, and for that reason alone we should see that every consideration is given to them in the future.

I believe that stabilisation of farming and other rural occupations to give farming people a life of security must take precedence over any other policy designed for the preservation of Australia as a nation. If we are to exist, there is no alternative to that. As I have said before, Newcastle in 1938 put more in coffins that it put in cradles. The urbanised areas have failed to contribute their quota to the 20,000,000 people that we hope some day to see in Australia. It is interesting to note that in Sydney there are 290 children for each 1,000 potential mothers, whereas in rural areas the number of children is 520, or virtually twice as many. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to give every consideration to the subject of stabilising primary industries.

We have heard a good deal about the assurance of a market, and we have tried all ways of doing that. We have had for instance the payment of a subsidy for the growing of potatoes. I can quite realise that the payment of a subsidy to increase production during a war or a time of scarcity is probably a necessity. It helps to spread the tax involved over the privileged and wealthy people, who can afford to pay it, but my point is that it is only a palliative, that it does not cure the real trouble. It is only a temporary help, as we know now. For instance, if we pay a subsidy for the production of potatoes and the farmers can thereby

make a little more out of potatoes than they can when growing pumpkins, they grow the potatoes, but it will not be long before there is a glut of them, as there is today.

At 3.45 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. L. J. BARNES: There is a potential market for primary produce both in Queensland and Australia. At least £15,000,000 worth of additional primary products could be consumed in Queensland. They are not being consumed today because of high prices. The farmer is not receiving those prices. They are received by the middleman or the people who buy whole crops and sell half or three-quarters of it and dump the remainder in order to keep prices up. This practice is going on but it must be stopped. The Government can do more than they are doing to prevent this type of trading. The health of our nation depends on a nutritious diet for its people. In fact, the health of the community can be largely attributable to the people's diet. The other day I was reading a book that stated that 993 doctors made comparisons between the conditions obtaining in 1942 and 1888.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. L. J. BARNES: I quite realise that this is not a health vote.

We should be able to discover how many human hours it takes to produce £1 worth of wool, wheat or butter but up to the present no yardstick has been discovered to measure it. It is not a total answer to our primary-producing difficulties but it is necessary to see that a man working in the sugar industry, or butter industry, does not receive 6s. an hour for his product whereas a man in the wheat industry receives only 3s. an hour. This is a matter for the future. If we want primary production to survive we must evolve a reasonable method of educating our people in order to see that they get a sane price for all classes of products. There is no logic in the system that gives one class 6s. an hour for its product and another only 3s.

The hon. member for Bowen virtually suggested that collective farming would help us out of our troubles. He overlooks the fact that our difficulties do not lie in production but in distribution. In no part of the world has collective farming got a nation out of difficulties. The hon. member for Isis quoted figures showing that collectivist farming in Russia had not increased production. In fact, it has had the opposite effect. Quite a lot of land in this country is not being worked to its fullest extent. It would help primary production to do so. A dairy farmer has been defined as the owner of land surrounded by a mortgage and that is a good definition of the term. When peace comes about—it apparently has not arrived yet—we must do something to see that the primary producer works in reasonable security.

1945—3F

The control of prices would solve only part of the primary producers' problems. We know that the Federal Government prevented South Australia and Western Australia from growing wheat and that 12 months afterwards Australia was clamouring for wheat. We cannot control the elements but we can see that the farmer gets reasonable prices. There should also be some method whereby we can conserve a glut of primary products in a good season to tide us over lean periods. That is a matter for the Government, or better still, as in other countries, one for regional authorities to take in hand. The farmer is only too pleased to manage his own affairs and never wants the Government to do that for him.

I quite agree that a certain amount of control by the Government is necessary. By the creation of regional authorities I believe the farmer will be able to manage his own affairs very successfully. It needs a little help from the Government to enable the farmer to move in this direction.

We all know that the debt of the primary producers was approximately \$600,000,000 before the war, and in view of the excessive taxation, I do not believe that it is much less now. There appears to be a temporary prosperity but there will be a time of settling. With the heavy taxation it was impossible for the primary producer to pay off his indebtedness prior to the war. Before the war the average income of the dairy farmer throughout Queensland was £181 a year, and to earn even this he had to make virtual slaves of his children. Our farmers have kept going during the war without strikes and produced all the food for the armed forces and civilians. I believe we should hang a picture of the primary producers in the hall of our memory because they have proved a most moral lot of people—and this applies to most other countries. The dairy farmer's income is £3 10s. and the sheep man's is not much better, because his income was approximately £5 a week, and he has had an interest bill of approximately £130 a year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. L. J. BARNES: The income of the cattle pastoralist averages £366 a year or approximately £7 a week; so apparently there are many poverty-stricken cattle pastoralists, although we appear to believe that the cattle pastoralist is the wealthiest man in the world.

I believe that the Department of Agriculture and Stock could fill a long-felt want in education. Something more could be done to provide rural education in our schools in the rural areas. At the present time the curriculum is the same for rural and city areas, which is ridiculous. We cannot blame the Department of Agriculture and Stock for that. I believe the country boys of 15 should have two years with a practical farmer and then, if their record is satisfactory, be admitted for two years free of charge to the Agricultural College; and after that, possibly two years on reasonably good wages in the country, and then, with the help of

the Government, they should be in a position to establish themselves. I am not suggesting that the Government should give anybody money free of charge, but I think the Government must realise their obligation to settle people on the land. That is done in Denmark. We have taken a leaf out of their book in regard to regional authorities, which have been founded there for a number of years. We are all aware of the production in Denmark, but I do not suggest that we get down to the number of acres they have per man. We have plenty of land here and I believe we can copy the Denmark policy with benefit. It is the duty of the Government to provide rural culture, higher wages, and better living conditions. The Government have it in their power to do something for the farmer. He does not want a great deal of financial help. When the day comes when the farmer's interest bill is reduced the producers will be in a happy state.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert) (3.57 p.m.): Now that the Premier is present I would repeat what I said during his absence a few weeks ago: that the Department of Agriculture and Stock has such a great bearing on the general welfare and potentialities of Queensland from an agricultural point of view that it well warrants a greater status in the Government or in the Cabinet than it is given today.

Mr. Williams: It has full status in the Cabinet.

Mr. PLUNKETT: It has up to a point but it is not recognised at all by people outside or even inside Parliament that it has the status it merits in a primary-producing country. I do not mean to cast any reflection in any way and I am not saying anything about the personnel of the Cabinet. My point is that because of the importance of agriculture in a primary-industry State such as Queensland it should receive greater recognition than it gets. I am endeavouring to point out that it should be one of the most important if not the most important departments in Queensland. How that can be brought about I do not know.

Following on what I stated the other day I was glad to hear the hon. member for Bowen say that we do not get enough money from the Government for the help and the development of the Department of Agriculture and Stock in this State. The Estimates that have recently been discussed provide an amount in the vicinity of £234,000 for agriculture. That is not half enough, Mr. Speaker. The Government could spend more money in this direction. I do not say the Government should give guarantees here, there and everywhere but certain things are needed for the further development of Queensland that are beyond the power or the financial ability of the people. In this respect I refer particularly to the combating of droughts and how that could be done by irrigation. The ordinary farmer or the individual farmer cannot grapple with these things, for they are matters for Governments.

I was very pleased to notice that the State Government of New South Wales have recog-

nised what a drought means to the country not only in agricultural production but in stock losses, and they have decided to build 40 weirs across the rivers in that State. There they do not appear to be afraid of the few pounds it will cost. They intend to spend £450,000, virtually half a million pounds, on weiring the rivers in that State to provide water, which will in turn mean greater production. In Queensland we have just as bad droughts, if not worse, than they have in New South Wales, and unless we do things in a big way as they are doing, we shall lag behind. We know Victoria too does much in the way of irrigation, but in Queensland we only talk about it. Ever since I have been in Parliament we have been talking about weiring rivers and providing water for irrigation but we do not seem to do anything about it. That is a great mistake. Because it will cost a few hundred pounds or a few thousand pounds or a few hundred of thousands of pounds we hesitate. We do not take the broad outlook that this country will be here for all time and we must not let water run to waste and allow our agricultural production to lag because of insufficient water. A sufficient water supply should be made available and in this work the Government should be associated. They will not be asked to provide it for nothing because the farmers who use the water in irrigation will be able to pay something towards the cost.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to the hon. member that irrigation can be discussed on another resolution.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Up to a point I agree with some of the statements made about planned agriculture. As time passes, everybody is recognising that more planning is essential for the development of the State. We are slowly developing that and I must be fair and say that the Government in power are very helpful in allowing planning to go on the way it has, but the planning of the hon. member for Bowen, as I understood it, does not suit me. I interjected by asking if he meant Government control and he replied that in some instances it did mean Government control. We know what Government control of production has done in many places. We remember what occurred in Russia a few years ago when the Government told the farmers they had to go on this land and grow this or that and the following year the farmers grew sufficient only for their own requirements, the result being a famine. The Government then had to step in and tell them that if they did not grow so many acres of this or that they would take the land from them. We do not want that kind of thing to happen here.

We want all the help the Government can give us, but the people should control production. I have heard it said in this Chamber that we cannot allow the producers to control it because they would make prices so high that the people would not be able to buy their products. I point out that it is not in the interests of the producers to do that. Their best market is the local market, and if prices are so high that the consumer cannot

afford to buy the products, the producer must go down. I agree that in any planned scheme there should be some protection for the consumer, but do not let us get back to talking about Government control. The Government should give the men who are producing our raw materials for export all the help possible by weiring streams and improving pastures and legislating in such a way that the greatest possible benefit will be enjoyed by all sections of the people.

Another matter on which I wish to congratulate the New South Wales Government is the way in which they are associating themselves with the various producers' organisations. That practice should be followed here. So long as the Government do not attempt to assume complete control the producers will well repay all the help they can give in formulating a planned scheme for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Some time ago the Governments of Queensland and New South Wales came to a gentlemen's agreement about the growing of rice. I do not know whether this gentlemen's agreement is to go on for ever and ever, but the fact is that we in Queensland have not had rice for many years, and present indications are that we shall not have any for the next two or three years. The important point is that although there is a shortage, we in Queensland are not allowed to grow rice. There is every reason now for ending that agreement, especially when we find that the 125 rice-growers in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area have been asked to curtail their production. The reason for this is that they have been using so much water that they are bringing the salt to the surface and destroying pastures as well as rice. If they continue using this amount of water the productivity of their land will be destroyed. In the year 1943-44 they produced 4,000,000 bushels, but in 1944-45 the production dropped to 1,717,000 bushels. The average return at Leeton was 93 bushels to the acre under irrigation. In the Albert electorate, at Merrima, near Southport, Mr. Swan has produced 80 bushels to the acre without any artificial water. When a man can produce that amount of rice, and when he wishes to grow it, I can see no reason why he should not be allowed to do so, at least while we are as short of rice in this State as we are. He finds it impossible to get seed, however, and therefore cannot produce the rice.

Mr. Williams: Has he ever grown it for commercial purposes or for fodder purposes?

Mr. PLUNKETT: He has not been allowed to install the necessary threshing machines, and therefore has had to sell most of it as hay. This man and others like him, who can grow rice and who wish to produce it, should be allowed to do so when the people of Queensland need it as urgently as they do. It is time the Minister reminded the New South Wales Government that they should suspend this gentlemen's agreement in view of the facts that there is a shortage of rice in Queensland and that the New South Wales growers have been asked to restrict production.

Queensland is one of the few States that can grow good cotton but we shall never be able to produce it on a payable scale until we adopt more scientific cultivation and harvesting methods than we have done in the past. Let us see if we cannot make the industry a very profitable one. After all, do not forget that the price paid for a commodity governs the quantity produced. That is plain from the production of potatoes today. During the war when there was a shortage guaranteed increased prices were given and the production of potatoes increased tremendously, although unfortunately today we have too many. It is important in a State like Queensland, with its widespread mixed-farming activities, where farmers can switch from the production of one crop to another, that a payable price should be given for their products. Of course, if a high price is guaranteed for one product farmers will concentrate on its production to the neglect of another; on the other hand if the price is low farmers will not produce it. In short the farmers will not produce a product that does not give them a reasonable return. As I have said, too, we should encourage the production of rice here and in that instance also apply more scientific methods to cultivation, production and harvesting than have been adopted hitherto. We can grow more tobacco than we do. Why are people not growing more tobacco than is produced in this State? Is it that the price is too low or are the methods of production wrong? Primary producers have struggled on the land for years and years combating droughts, floods and pests. And speaking of those disabilities, I am reminded of the ruin caused by the hailstorm at Sunnybank only yesterday. We should give serious consideration to the plight of those people to see if it is not possible to arrange an insurance scheme to compensate them for such loss. Primary producers have suffered considerable loss from hailstorms in the past and so there is every justification for the adoption of a reasonable scheme of insurance.

Mr. Williams: That rests with the growers themselves.

Mr. PLUNKETT: But there must be a planned scheme, the growers must be called together to be told of such a scheme and consider it. I am not blaming anybody in this connection, I am only trying to encourage the authorities to do what should be done. Nor should we hesitate because these schemes might cost a million or so. Why not do it and do it in a big way and so make it possible for the people already on the land to make a greater success of their undertaking?

Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) (4.13 p.m.): The development of our natural resources and the populating of the country are the most important problems to be solved by this State today. Especially is that so in view of the fact that ex-service men are to be placed on the land. We cannot afford to take any risks in this connection. The matter is a very serious one and it involves so many elements of danger that it behoves us to take the most

careful steps to see that any such scheme does not fail.

When establishing our new farm settlements we must develop irrigation to give the settlers some measure of security. New settlements will be created, not only for our returning servicemen, but for others, including people from overseas, who will want to go on the land. It is both urgent and important that we should examine every angle to provide a system of irrigation to ensure the success of primary production.

The many matters pointed out by the hon. member for Albert have to be faced by those on the land, whether they are experienced farmers or new settlers. They include disease, drought, hail-storms and floods, which occur with unfailing regularity and against which there is little or no protection. So far as it is humanly possible some means of protection should be devised. The Government must utilise natural water resources to provide irrigation systems in conjunction with land settlement. If not, we can all visualise what will happen to any new settlement when faced with a drought. The drought may last one, two or even three years and the result would be calamitous, not only to the individual farmer but to the whole community.

We all read of the great damage wrought in the Sunnybank areas from the disastrous hailstorm last night. I have seen those results previously in this State. One can take out insurance against damage by hail, but that protection is very inadequate indeed. We in the sugar industry have the opportunity of insuring against cane fires. In certain periods of the year tremendous losses occur from fires, particularly under certain circumstances. Huge losses result from uncontrollable fires. Each year representatives of insurance companies interview cane farmers to induce them to insure against fire, but so many conditions are attached that the cover is practically valueless. When the season is advanced to a certain stage a number of farmers burn their cane and cut and send it to the mill, thus reducing the risk of destruction by fire. I have thought so little of that means of fire protection that I do not take out such an insurance cover.

I have been very much interested, particularly in the last 12 months, in rice-growing, a subject that has been already introduced into this debate. Rice-growing on the irrigation areas of New South Wales has been curtailed, particularly in the Murrumbidgee area, because the large quantity of water used prejudices other important crops.

The areas used for rice-growing in New South Wales have proved very suitable for the purpose, but the trouble is that it takes such a large quantity of water that it has a detrimental effect on forms of production of even greater value than rice-growing. Rice takes 7 to 10 ft. of water an acre and other crops that are equally valuable can be grown with 1 acre-foot of water. That is the position that was put to me very clearly when I was down there. I believe they are seriously considering ceasing to grow rice

in that area and growing it in other areas because the great amount of water they have had to use had the effect of bringing the water from the 18-ft. level to within 3 ft. of the surface. They were also bringing salt water to the surface and that ruins the citrus trees. Citrus is worth over £2,000,000 whereas rice-production is worth only something under £500,000, so they have sound reasons for trying to stop the excessive use of water because of the interference with other crops. Rice land is valuable for other purposes also; and it was sound policy on the part of the Department of Agriculture and Stock in New South Wales to investigate other things to take the place of rice-growing.

I have discussed rice-growing with men who know a good deal about the subject, and I believe we can grow large quantities of rice in Queensland under more suitable climatic conditions than that it is being grown under in New South Wales. You cannot grow rice every year on the same land; you have to practise rotation and spell your rice lands two or three years. Rice-growing will have to be done by mechanical means because we could not economically produce it in the way in which it is produced in the Asiatic countries. Up-to-date methods must be used to enable it to be economically grown in this country. In order to grow 100 acres of rice each year one would need 600 or 700 acres to provide for the rotation of areas under crop. It would be necessary also to apply the water as economically as possible. These are very important matters.

I believe steps have been taken to investigate rice production in this State and I think it is very necessary that we should have the opportunity to grow rice if the industry is to be moved from New South Wales; no agreement that has existed in the past should prevent us from taking advantage of the opportunity. I know that other States are looking to the possibilities of rice-growing. Western Australia is giving some attention to the matter and we should lose no time in seeing what we can do in regard to the matter. I am willing to undertake at my own cost the ordinary preparation of the land and I will endeavour to produce a crop, if the extraordinary costs are met by the department. In order to get water on the land you must have the water higher than the area that you want to irrigate, and it would be necessary to have large quantities of water in order to have water available when required. Experimental plots are properly set out and proper channels and drains are made. The water has to be pumped and that would be an additional cost that would have to be taken into account. Regard would have to be paid to it in computing the cost of production of an experimental crop.

In Queensland we have all the necessary conditions. In North Queensland we have the large areas of land that would be necessary. Expense would be entailed in clearing the land, but with modern methods this would be comparatively cheap. An adequate quantity of water would have to be available when required, although in the

greater part of the rice area it would probably not be necessary to apply the water continuously because of the heavy rainfall there.

Another point to which serious consideration must be given is the period of harvesting. It is essential that there be dry weather for that purpose. Cultivation is not a great problem, in fact the contouring of the land is the greatest part of the job, but harvesting requires dry weather to enable machinery to be used. Conditions in Queensland differ from those in the other States of Australia. We have the wet season. Moreover, we have areas that experience considerable periods of dry weather.

Rice-growing would be a splendid undertaking for the settlement of a considerable number of returned soldiers. It is very easy work. As a matter of fact, the Government of New South Wales are very unpopular with the people of the rice-growing areas at the moment, for the simple reason that the growers realise that they have to leave that form of agriculture for reasons already stated. It really takes up only six months of their time, and the remainder of the year they have to themselves. Some of them use their time in that part of the year for fat-lamb-raising. They cannot undertake dual agricultural production when growing rice. The life is really an easy one, and would be admirable for returned soldiers. It would give them very good returns if they were established in areas in which success can be assured, as it is in New South Wales. It is well worth considering, and I am very pleased to know that the Minister is going fully and thoroughly into the question. As far as the gentlemen's agreement existing between Queensland and New South Wales I look at it in this way: we carried out our undertaking with the New South Wales Government, and now that they are going to move the rice-growing areas we are under no obligation whatever to them. The door is now open for us to go ahead with the job, but of course, at the same time, the right and proper thing to do would be to consult with the New South Wales Government.

It is tragic that we have not been able to develop tobacco-growing in this State. It is one of the forms of agriculture that lend themselves to very great development, and as we have seen, can be a successful undertaking for returned soldiers. I cannot understand why we import such a great quantity of tobacco into this country when we know that we can produce leaf of very high grade, but we do not appear to be able to make headway on any considerable scale. It is very important that great attention be paid to this industry, because it means much to the future development of Queensland.

There are other forms of agriculture that must play an important part in the development of the State. One thing to which I think we can look forward with confidence is the development of tropical agriculture in North Queensland. With it we must make provision for the establishment of canneries. Representations have been made to me on

several occasions concerning the establishment of a cannery at some central point in the North. Townsville has been suggested as the most central site, and I believe that it is the best place. A cannery here would need to be extensive because it would have to cater for a huge area capable of producing tremendous quantities of tropical fruits. Townsville is the centre of the tropical North and it has available all the facilities necessary for establishing a cannery of the desired capacity. I suggest that serious consideration must be given to the early establishment of a cannery there and to the development of our rich lands for the settlement of returned soldiers and others who are willing and eager to go on the land in an area where there is an assured rainfall.

There is another matter with which we have been concerning ourselves a great deal and that cannot be overlooked in an important debate such as this. It really concerns the Department of Public Lands.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member can discuss that matter on the Resolution for the Department of Public Lands.

Mr. THEODORE: Then I shall leave that matter until then. There is a great future for the people of Queensland because our agricultural possibilities are enormous. Very little is known of the possibilities of North Queensland and few fail to realise even what is possible in dairying up there. I have seen production figures for dairy farms that lead me to believe that as a result of the introduction of new pastures in North Queensland we can be confident of great development and progress in dairying in that part of the State. The most important thing is to lay the foundation of good pastures and at this stage I pay tribute to Mr. McKeon, of the Department of Agriculture and Stock, for the splendid work he has done in laying the foundation of pastures in the tropical areas of North Queensland. I know his heart and soul is in North Queensland, I know that he is desirous of carrying on that work and I sincerely hope that he will be given every opportunity to continue it. I trust that the South Johnstone experiment station will be allowed to continue and that those who may settle in the North will be encouraged to seek the advice and help that will be available there at all times. The development of the land is essential because it must be appreciated that every man who is settled on the land successfully is a national asset, and I look forward with confidence to seeing the population of North Queensland doubled in a very short time and to seeing the successful establishment of many forms of agriculture with resultant benefit to the State and the nation.

Hon. T. L. WILLIAMS (Port Curtis—Secretary for Agriculture and Stock) (4.39 p.m.): I agree with those hon. members who have spoken that the efficiency of farming can be maintained only by improved agricultural practice, and by the application of greater measures of scientific research linked with practical scientific work in all phases

of it. When I spoke the other day I paid a tribute to the work of the officers of the department generally. Perhaps hon. members can realise how extremely difficult it is for a departmental head to carry on his work when five or six of his closest officers are either absent on military service or on other duties. However, those who have remained have carried out their duties in a very noble way.

The hon. member for Windsor spoke mostly of the need for the development of secondary industries in conjunction with an increase in primary production. That is the correct view. We cannot develop our secondary industries related to agricultural production and the processing of agricultural products to any great extent unless we have a bigger outlook towards primary industries. The matter is wrapped up in the future of farming, and the future of farming is governed by a number of things, among them being rural reconstruction on a sounder plane than agriculture rests on at the present time. We must have plans to combat drought, we must have plans to prevent further deterioration in the fertility of the soil due to over-stocking and over-cropping. We must meet the challenge of soil erosion, and we must make up the leeway in the matter of fodder conservation, and especially irrigation, so that we can maintain production and increase it. Last year, when I spoke on the Address in Reply I made some reference to these points, and particularly to the future of farming. I said that whether we realised it or not the future of farming was ours to face, and face it we must. I said also that whether we lived in the country or the city we were all in this together, that what affects one sooner or later affected the rest, and there was no escaping that issue.

The department is giving of its best in the facing of these problems. What concerns us more than it has in the past can be set down in a series of questions in this order—

1. What does the farm produce for the owner and what will it produce in the future?
2. Is the land in the possession of the farmer being used by him to the best advantage?
3. What are his prospects in the future of receiving a steady and reasonable price for his products?
4. Is he being asked to pay too much for his land, his equipment or his transport to market, and so forth?
5. Is he a capable farmer?

Unless these questions can be satisfactorily answered, one must admit that we cannot hope to meet our rural problems in the way in which they should be met.

I went on to say last year that the spending of too much money on the farm because of war prices and adverse seasons has a serious result for the farmer concerned, but does not necessarily concern other people. The solution of the farm-finance problem is both essential and difficult in many countries.

If a farmer borrows more than he can afford to pay his position is made much more difficult than it would otherwise be because the lenders of the money, whether a State Government department, a private lender or a bank, are involved in any adjustments that consequently have to be made. Therefore the reconstruction of farm finance will be one of the most difficult jobs associated with post-war land matters.

The way in which land is worked and the size of the farm for its economical working, both to the farmer and State as well as the production use of it, are also of vital importance. As a matter of fact, there is no more important or controversial question affecting rural reconstruction in this post-war period than the size of a man's farm. How big a farm should be and the best way to use it, which also decides the standard of living of the man and his family, together with the type of development, and the way in which it is developed—these things are allied with the size of the farm. It goes without saying that a large number of farms are either too small or too large. If a farm is too big for a man to work then some of its valuable resources cannot but be wasted. If it is too small the farmer cannot earn enough to provide his wife and family with the comforts they deserve, nor can he look after it as he should. American sources inform us that under-cultivation, waste of resources and over-cultivation of land lead to exhaustion in fertility and soil erosion. We in this country must pay more attention to those factors than we have done in the past. These problems will be among the most difficult facing farming in the future. I could speak at some length on these points but it is not necessary.

The question of farm equipment was raised by the hon. members for Bowen, Isis and Windsor. It is no longer necessary to argue, particularly after the experience we have had recently, about the need for a greater use of machinery in farm production. It is necessary for the farmer to understand why he is using a certain type of machinery and the reason for so doing. Today farm machinery is doing much to replace the shortage of man-power that has been our unfortunate lot for the past three or four years. A growing number of farmers today are convinced that without machinery they have little if any hope of making their farms prosperous in the post-war period.

The hon. member for Bowen advocated a programme that he unblushingly and certainly unceremoniously stole from the very party which I have the honour to represent and that today is part and parcel of our agricultural policy and our agricultural programme.

Mr. Foley: He has done that with all Labour's planks.

Mr. WILLIAMS: He has certainly done so in other cases, but today he has seen fit unceremoniously and unblushingly to crib those planks from our platform. He spoke of the need of a planned system of agriculture to meet the needs of the country and its

people. This Government have had a planned idea for agricultural production. It is being gradually implemented and being put into operation. The war certainly did, as he said, force the Commonwealth, and in turn the State, to implement a plan for agriculture that has had some good results. He said he hoped this would be continued. We can afford to continue some of the planned production schemes we have in operation today.

The hon. member spoke of the need for greater use of machinery in groups. I do not know if he meant collective farming, and I do not care. I point out that the Treasurer introduced a Bill some time ago making it possible for loans to be made available to co-operative dairy associations to buy for the use of their suppliers machinery that will cultivate, harvest and conserve the different forms of fodder, in the hope that production in dairying will increase to the extent it is desired it should increase. Commenting at the time on the Treasurer's Bill, I pointed out that the Government's scheme presented an excellent opportunity for fodder production and conservation of fodder upon an economic basis. I concluded by saying—

"In the rush of mechanisation that will be a feature of the immediate post-war period the dairy farmer of this State cannot afford any longer to stand or remain aloof. However, it was only through such means as this that the majority of dairy farmers would be able to afford mechanical tillage, harvesting and storage of adequate fodder crops. The Government scheme gave that opportunity for them to embark on their own account through their associations in that direction."

I believe the Treasurer is awaiting the decision of the co-operative societies concerned before getting on with the job as quickly as possible. The D.W.A.Cs. were mentioned on Thursday and again today. I do want to pay a tribute to their work. They have formed a valuable liaison between the State and Commonwealth authorities, and the farmers. It is hoped that the D.W.A.Cs. will be allowed to continue to operate in the interests of the farming community.

The hon. member for Windsor mentioned quite a number of matters to which I referred briefly on Thursday evening when replying to other members. The hon. member for Cairns appeared concerned chiefly with the retention of payable prices for farm products. The Government of Queensland are fully seized of the need for paying every attention to that important matter.

The hon. member for Albert had some misgivings as to the place the Department of Agriculture and Stock had to play in the scheme of things generally, and feared that the department was more or less a Cinderella in the eyes of the Cabinet. I assure the hon. member that the Department of Agriculture and Stock has its full place in both recognition and rights in the decisions of the Government to carry out Labour's policy in this State. If he referred to the small amounts made available or appropriated for the department, I assure him there are certain

circumstances that he should take into account.

Rice-production has been mentioned by several members. I assure the hon. members for Albert and Herbert and other hon. members from North Queensland who have been rather persistent in their request that rice-production should be given some consideration in this State, that only a few days ago I took the matter up with the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock in New South Wales and I signed letters that were sent to various places in India with a view to getting a quantity of seed with which we can carry out, I hope, useful experiments in rice-growing.

The hon. member for Albert confined his other remarks mostly to the dairying industry. He pointed out—and rightly so—that greater production per cow in the herds of this State is necessary. Comparing this State with other States and with New Zealand we find that we certainly lag behind. The Government's aim, when circumstances permit—when the full staff of dairy technologists and inspectors once more return to the departmental fold—is to have a full-sized scheme of herd production, fodder conservation and all improvements in the direction of raising fodders both new and old, on a basis never hitherto attempted. This will be brought about in the hope that dairy production per cow in Queensland will reach at least somewhere near that of the other States of the Commonwealth or surpass it.

It may sound ambitious but I have in mind trying to raise the production of the dairying herds to the height that the Government, hon. members and the dairymen themselves wish it to rise to. The hon. member drew attention to the fact that to ensure greater increase in production we must grow greater quantities of fodder by means of irrigation and pay attention to the needs for soil conservation and the arresting of soil erosion. I assure the hon. member that these matters are receiving attention from myself and my colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands, in relation to soils that are being eroded and land that is becoming depleted because of the deterioration of pastures in various areas of this State.

Resolution 6—Department of Agriculture and Stock—agreed to.

Resolutions 7 to 19, both inclusive, agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

OPENING OF COMMITTEE.

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

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

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1945-1946, a further sum not exceeding £10,786,165 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1945-1946, a further sum not exceeding £5,230,460 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1945-1946, a further sum not exceeding £2,350,500 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1944-1945, a supplementary sum not exceeding £882,007 10s. 2d. be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1944-1945, a supplementary sum not exceeding £220,133 8s. 3d. be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1944-1945, a supplementary sum not exceeding £27,891 8s. 3d. be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1946-1947, a sum not exceeding £4,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

“(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1946-1947, a sum not exceeding £3,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

“(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1946-1947, a sum not exceeding £800,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.”

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2.

FIRST READING.

A Bill, founded on the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was introduced and read a first time.

SECOND READING.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (5.6 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

This is the final Appropriation Bill and covers the Estimates-in-Chief for the current year and Supplementary Estimates for last

financial year, which have already been passed in Committee; and following the usual practice, a vote on account for the next financial year, which has also been passed in Committee.

This appropriation will provide Supply for the remainder of the year and for a short period in the next financial year, and is made up as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
On account of Estimates, 1945-1946—			
Consolidated Revenue	19,286,165	0	0
Trust and Special Funds	14,230,460	0	0
Loan Fund	3,850,500	0	0
Supplementary Estimates, 1944-1945—			
Consolidated Revenue	882,007	10	2
Trust and Special Funds	220,133	8	3
Loan Fund	27,891	8	3
Appropriation Vote on Account for Financial Year 1946-1947—			
Consolidated Revenue	4,000,000		
Trust and Special Funds	3,000,000		
Loan Fund	800,000		
	£7,800,000	0	0

The total appropriations on account of Estimates 1945-1946, referred to above, are made up as follows:—

Consolidated Revenue—	£	£
Total as per Estimates	25,065,699	
Less Statutory Appropriations (Schedules and Interest on Public Debt)	5,779,534	
Total Appropriation Bill (as per Part F)	19,286,165	
Trust and Special Funds—		
Total as per Estimates	14,232,385	
Less Statutory Appropriation	1,925	
Total Appropriation Bill (as per Part G.)	14,230,460	
Loan Fund—		
Total as per Estimates	3,850,500	
Total Appropriation Bill (as per Part H.)	3,850,500	

Appropriation for financial year 1946-1947:—

The amounts included in this Bill on account of services for 1946-1947 are for:—

Consolidated Revenue Fund	£	4,000,000
Trust and Special Funds	3,000,000	
Loan Fund	800,000	
	£7,800,000	

The comparable amounts provided in the Appropriation Act No. 2 of last financial year on account of 1945-1946 were:—

Consolidated Revenue Fund	£	3,500,000
Trust and Special Funds	4,000,000	
Loan Fund	800,000	
	£8,300,000	

The appropriation as above for the next financial year is based on the estimated expenditure for approximately eight weeks.

The requirements for Consolidated Revenue are £500,000 more than that granted for the current year, as the expenditure on account of increased salaries and expansion of departmental activities will require the larger sum.

The amount asked for on account of Trust and Special Funds is £1,000,000 less than that granted for the present year, owing to the

falling off in the expenditure on account of Commonwealth Authorities.

The amount required for Loan Fund is the same as was included in the Appropriation Bill for the previous year.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) (5.9 p.m.): In considering this Appropriation Bill, which provides supply to carry on the services of the State for the present financial year and part of next, we must take into consideration the fact that it also provides the money for the programme of works that Parliament has already discussed this session. When we consider all these things we wonder what effect the present growing industrial disruption in the Commonwealth is going to have on the State's loan and ordinary works programme and what effect it will have on the spending of the money provided for in the Bill. Although during the past few years we have had all sorts of assurances from both the political and industrial labour sources of a new order and full employment after the war, I think it is becoming much more apparent that we are rapidly achieving not a new order but a new disorder, which might result in widespread unemployment and a general lowering of the living standards of the people not only in this State but in the rest of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Foley: Is this the only period in which we have experienced strikes?

At 5.11 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Mann, Brisbane) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. NICKLIN: No, but it is one of the most serious outbreaks of industrial lawlessness that this Commonwealth has ever experienced and it may have a very important bearing on whether we are able to carry out the programme of house construction for the people and the many necessary developmental works that the State has in view. We see evidence on every hand at the present time of the grave danger that is facing the State's works programme because of this industrial disruption and there is no doubt that if the problem of industrial trouble in the South is not resolved in the very near future we are not going to be able to carry out, particularly the housing programme because the success of it will depend on the supplies that will be available to enable those houses to be built. At the moment this industrial disruption is causing a shortage of the essential requirements for house-building and it is very apparent that in the future this industrial trouble will spread to other important industries.

What, after all, is perhaps the worst feature of the whole situation is that our system of industrial arbitration is falling into disrepute because of the action of a minority of industrial hooligans and because of the fear or the inability of the Federal Government, who have the fullest possible power under the National Security Act, to control these minorities in the interests of the law-abiding sections of the community. We cannot view the situation that we are

facing today with any degree of complacency because as I said before, if the question is not settled it is going to disrupt the State's programme completely, not only in regard to housing but also in connection with the other works programmes envisaged in the Bill.

In this morning's Press we read a statement made by Mr. J. Stewart, of the Australian Labour Party State Executive, Sydney, wherein he said—

“Interruptions to this condition are deliberately designed to cause chaos, in which the workers will be sufferers.”

There seems to be no doubt about that point. There are a very small militant minority right at the core of this industrial unrest, who are undoubtedly stirring up trouble with the idea of creating industrial chaos, so as to enable them to put their policies and their nostrums into practice.

There is a different feeling altogether in the community today from what there was years ago, particularly in this State when we first introduced the industrial arbitration system. Away back in 1915 the Hon. E. G. Theodore, then Secretary for Public Works, introduced the Industrial Arbitration Act on which our industrial arbitration system is founded. In doing so he said—

“I have no doubt that the awards made by this court will be rigidly observed by employers and employees alike. I think that this court is founded upon a correct foundation, and with the confidence established between both parties there will be no question but that the awards will be observed without the possibility of anyone ignoring them.”

That was the attitude in which we approached industrial arbitration in those days. That was the attitude that has been adopted throughout the years with few exceptions, up to the present time, and brought about the excellent conditions which have existed between employers and employees in this State.

Mr. Hanlon: Our Queensland workers are very law-abiding.

Mr. NICKLIN: We do not want the spirit of the arbitration system as exemplified by Mr. Theodore broken down. As the Treasurer interjected, we in Queensland have been reasonably free of industrial trouble, but this State is going to suffer from this general industrial unrest in other States if something is not done to deal with it very quickly.

Unfortunately we had evidence in this State not very long ago of an effort to break down the industrial and conciliation system that has been built up by our arbitration laws. We had the spectacle of three members of this Legislative Assembly addressing strike meetings and urging the workers to defy the Industrial Court of this State. Actions like that bring into disrepute the arbitration system of the State and bring about the industrial lawlessness and the industrial unrest that are in evidence on every side. Members of this Assembly should set an example and instead of endeavouring to incite strikers to

break the industrial laws should use their influence to get those defying our industrial laws to obey them and take action according to the very excellent system that has been set up under them. I am glad that the Treasurer, who was Acting Premier at the time, and his party, saw the danger and took steps to deal with the hon. members responsible.

The resolving of the present industrial unrest is very largely in the hands of the Federal Government. It has power under the National Security Act but apparently is not game to take the necessary action to end the present situation. If it does not take the necessary action very shortly we shall have widespread strikes, widespread unemployment and a general lowering of the living standards of this Commonwealth.

During the course of the debate on the censure motion in the Federal Parliament recently on the subject of industrial lawlessness the Prime Minister said that he would not join in any crusade to crucify the workers. Is not a crusade being carried out at the present time to crucify the workers of the Commonwealth by this small minority of industrial disruptionists who are endeavouring to hold up to ransom the people of Australia? I think any Commonwealth Government—or any Government for that matter—should do the job they are elected to do, that is, to deal with this question before it brings about chaos and unemployment in our community. I think this is the most important political problem facing this country at the present time. The Federal Government, as I stated, have ample power to deal with it but apparently for party-political reasons are unable to do so. They are dodging their responsibility. By giving this political power to this disruptionist section they are only crucifying the law-abiding wage-earner and every other section of the community who depend upon the enforcement of law and order in an impartial manner.

It may be said, as the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs said the other day, that this is not the only country in which there are strikes at the moment. It is true that this industrial trouble is world-wide but in those other countries where there is industrial trouble industrial conditions are not regulated by law so effectively as they are in Australia; and strikes in those countries have not the same backing by members of the various legislatures as they have here in Australia. When we consider the excellent industrial machinery that we have built up in this community for the benefit of all parties concerned, it is indeed disquieting to see this machinery swept on one side and instead of the principle of arbitration and conciliation a policy of industrial disruption rampant in our land. Not only that, but the effect is that we are making sections of the community who are willing to work suffer as a result of the actions of the small minority of disruptionists who apparently have gained a great deal more power in the community than they are entitled to have at the present time. These guilty parties should not only be punished but, whether they are unions or individuals, should

be deprived of the benefits of industrial laws; in other words, if they are not prepared to accept the industrial laws of this community, they should be industrially outlawed. The Government should be prepared to take the necessary steps to resolve this very unfortunate position as quickly as they possibly can, not only for their own benefit but for the benefit of the people they were elected to govern.

There is no doubt that if this industrial trouble continues to grow and spread it is going to have a very detrimental effect on the people of this State and the Government's programme of works, because we must inevitably be drawn into it by the fact we are dependent for so many essential supplies on the areas that at present are the centre of this industrial trouble. I hope that the Treasurer will make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government and request them to take steps to deal with this situation, using as an argument the fact that if this industrial trouble is going to spread it will have a very detrimental effect on the people of this State and the works programme of the Government. We in this State have in the main loyally obeyed the industrial laws, so why should we have to suffer because the Commonwealth Government, whose duty it is to deal with the situation, are apparently not prepared to do it?

Passing on to another subject that is very much bound up in this Appropriation Bill, I turn to the question of the relations between the Commonwealth and the State. As we all know, at the present time the Commonwealth is responsible for the collection of all income tax and the States are in receipt of grants from the Commonwealth Government paid out of the revenue received from these collections. There is no doubt that as a result of that arrangement the Commonwealth financial activities are very closely bound up with State financial activities.

The activities of one have a bearing on the activities of the other, and although there is this arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States in regard to the collection of money there is also a certain amount of control over the expenditure of tax collections. State Treasurers can have a very definite influence on the financial affairs of Australia through their association with the Loan Council, and in addition Labour Treasurers, who are in the majority on the Loan Council, are in a position to add their weight towards securing such taxation reforms as may be considered desirable.

Mr. Hanlon: They have already made a start in taxation reduction.

Mr. NICKLIN: There has been a start but it has been a very poor start up to the present time.

Mr. Hanlon: They do not want to give them a shock. (Laughter.)

Mr. NICKLIN: I am afraid the taxpayer is not quite so ill as all that, that he would die of shock if taxation reductions were made. In this connection, the main fact to be kept

in mind is that a capitalistic democracy depends upon the preservation of incentive as the mainspring of the economic machine.

Mr. Aikens: To exploit, you mean.

Mr. NICKLIN: The alternatives to capitalistic democracy are Communist or Fascist capitalism. Under either of those forms of government, the preservation of incentive is of much less importance because both labour and capital can be conscripted at the will of the dictator.

Mr. Hanlon: At the point of a gun.

Mr. NICKLIN: At the point of a gun if necessary. The hon. member for Mundingburra interjected that the capitalist exploited. I do not know whether he stands for capitalistic democracy or for Communistic or Fascist—

Mr. Aikens: The whole capitalistic system is based on the exploitation of one man by another.

Mr. NICKLIN: I reiterate that it is far better for us to have a system of capitalistic democracy in which we retain the incentive to earn as the mainspring of our economic machine than to have Fascist capitalism or Communistic capitalism, the mainspring of which is the point of the gun or the dictate of some dictator who may happen to spring up. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that, if we wish to preserve democracy and to maintain high standards of living, extreme taxation of the rewards of human effort and of the result of investment should be lessened as much and as quickly as possible. From that viewpoint the Commonwealth Budget for 1945-46 was extremely disappointing. Notwithstanding the fact, as the hon. gentleman has said, that we have some reduction, it is extremely disappointing. Considering that the war had ended, the reductions given by the Federal Treasurer were meagre, indeed infinitesimal.

The State Government and the financial position of the State Government are vitally affected by any failure of the Commonwealth to reduce unnecessary expenditure and taxation. In their own spheres they can make a considerable contribution towards these desirable ends, but because of the war Commonwealth finance has been the deciding factor in our financial set-up. For 1944-45 the expenditure for war purposes was £460,000,000. For the current year, in which the war with Japan terminated in the first six weeks, the expenditure is estimated at £360,000,000. Even allowing for £54,000,000 of deferred pay for the members of our fighting services, the astonishing figure of the remaining £306,000,000 remains as the war expenditure for what is practically a peace year. Deferred pay is only a fraction of the actual amount payable to men and women while they remain in the forces, to say nothing of the cost of their maintenance and the cost of all the various establishments that a large fighting force has necessarily to maintain.

In many quarters it is suggested that the Commonwealth Government are budgeting for

this huge amount because they desire to maintain employment in the war industries and fighting services as long as possible, because, as we all know, there is an election next year, and because if they bring about a termination of this war expenditure rapidly there may be a break-down in the full employment policy or in this new order about which they have been talking for so long but for which no plans have been made. The reason why this huge war-time expenditure is being continued is that the Commonwealth Government have no real plans for putting into effect their post-war programme. This huge expenditure of the Commonwealth Government is unquestionably having a detrimental effect on State finances and that is why I drew attention to the effect a tie-up between the Commonwealth and State finances may have.

To give some idea of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, let me remind hon. members that some weeks ago it was reported that employees in munition works at Bathurst and Orange had refused to accept notices of dismissal. Notices had been given that their work had been terminated because the munitions they were making were no longer needed for the war effort. The Commonwealth Government decided that their services should be terminated but they made representations and it was decided to keep these men and women working in these munition factories making things that were not needed and necessarily will have to be destroyed, when those men and women could go back and help take up the slack in the many industries at the present time employing men and women to make the much-needed requirements of civilians. In the fighting services also we have large numbers of men kept in various establishments doing more or less nothing, yet primary industries are crying out for men and women. These important industries, which are the very life blood of our nation, have no priority of release so far as the Man-power or the Army are concerned. When we consider that in the next two months all the prisoner-of-war labour at present being utilised by primary industries as a war measure will be withdrawn and that splendid organisation the Land Army, which has done a wonderful job during the war years, will be disbanded, and when we take into account the loss of essential labour caused to primary industries from this source, together with the fact that the short-sighted policy of the Commonwealth Government is such as to deny primary industries a priority for the release of essential labour, we begin to wonder what is to happen to them. When we have things like this happening we realise what an important effect the actions of the Commonwealth Government can have on the financial affairs of the State.

Again, when we have the Commonwealth Government continuing to waste public money by carrying on war-time departments, many of which have been provided with larger votes, we appreciate the need for urgent action by State Treasurers at the Loan Council in particular to curb this unnecessary expenditure. To quote one of these war-time departments that is apparently going to be the most expensive peace-time department, let me

refer to the Department of Information. In the present Commonwealth Budget the financial responsibility of the Commonwealth Government for the current year is £376,000 for the Department of Information. This sum is £97,000 more than the amount expended in this direction for the previous war years, and this on a department that was established allegedly for war purposes and in the first year in which it was established cost only £22,000!

Apparently this is to become a department for political propaganda, and it is one of the unnecessary bureaucracies that arise from the war and will apparently survive the war. In view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government are maintaining these unnecessary heavy items of expenditure, the Treasurer of the State, on behalf of the people, should enter an emphatic protest and ask the Commonwealth Government to curb this expenditure which inevitably must have a detrimental effect on the finances of the State.

At 5.40 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. NICKLIN: When we look at the growth of income tax over the war years we realise that some action must be taken to give relief in this respect, not only to individual taxpayers but also to the companies and the corporations that provide a large amount of our employment, so that they may give more employment and play a bigger part in the post-war period even than in the past. During the first year of the war, that is, 1939-40, the average amount of tax on incomes under £200 in the hands of individuals was £1 4s. 5d. per annum, and in 1943-44 this had risen to £9 15s. 2d. On taxable incomes from £201 to £500 the corresponding figures are £6 11s. 4d. and £45 0s. 2d. In the case of companies the average amount of tax taken by the Commonwealth and State Governments in 1938-39 was 4s. 6d. in the £1, but it is now about 12s. in the £1. Company taxation yielded £16,000,000 in 1938-39 and £55,000,000 in 1943-44. Australia now has the highest taxation in the English-speaking world. It has also the steepest rises in the grades of taxation. During the war exorbitant tax rates did not have the detrimental effects they will have now, although they were responsible for a considerable amount of slackening of effort, including strikes, absenteeism and so on. There is no doubt that much of the absenteeism that occurred during the war arose from high taxation.

Mr. Gair: It was a poor spirit of patriotism.

Mr. NICKLIN: It was a poor spirit of patriotism, as the Secretary for Labour and Employment knows only too well, but unfortunately when it comes to £. s. d. some people have no patriotism whatsoever.

Now that the war is over we have to review the situation in the light of its effect on the period we are entering. We must remove this drag of high taxation on industry. The

period we are about to enter is of vital importance for two main reasons. The spur of patriotism has been removed from some people who did have a certain amount of patriotism and were willing to accept this high taxation, whereas others had no patriotism, they would not accept the high taxation and showed their disapproval by their absenteeism. Now that the spur of patriotism has been removed from these people who were willing to accept those heavy payments and so help the war effort generally, and now that competition from other countries will return, we must seriously and quickly review the effect of the high incidence of taxation. This is particularly so in respect of companies and corporations to which we look to provide a very large share of employment.

We look to them to develop their industries in order to take care of many of our servicemen and servicewomen when they re-enter civil life. If we do not give some encouragement to these industrial companies, which provide a large share of employment, they will not be able to do the job expected of them. What was the position of the companies during the war? As I mentioned, they paid exorbitant taxes.

Mr. Power: They had very healthy credit balances too.

Mr. NICKLIN: Some do.

Mr. Aikens: They paid taxation only on their declared income.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am afraid the hon. member for Mundingburra has a very poor opinion of many people in the community; he must judge them according to his own standards.

The majority of public companies in this State and other parts of the Commonwealth are willing to do their bit. In return they expect their share of any profit they may make. They do not want exorbitant profits; they only want a fair share and we must concede it to them. If they are willing to take risks and invest their capital they are entitled to a share of the return on their capital invested.

What effect do exorbitant taxes have on companies? High taxation destroys the incentive to invest in companies and particularly to take risks with capital. Most of our successful companies at present were established by people who were prepared to take risks with the capital they invested in them. In many cases the risks did not work out as expected and they lost their money. In other cases they did work out and made a return on the capital invested. Therefore, considering all the facts, they are entitled to some return on their investment, particularly when the amount of employment they give is considered. High taxation must in its incidence reduce ruling wages and other incomes. We must all admit that taxes, particularly indirect taxes, are passed on to the individual, namely, the worker and the primary producer, who however cannot pass them on in

turn. Therefore, this exorbitant taxation, which we have imposed on companies during the war-time period is certainly not only detrimental to the companies themselves but reduces their employment-giving power as well as increasing prices and the cost of living of the workers and primary producers.

What effect has this exorbitant taxation on individuals? It reduces the lower incomes below the standard subsistence level. It destroys the incentive to become more skilled or to earn higher incomes. It also chases out of the country those with high technical scientific or managerial qualifications. In addition it prevents persons with such qualifications from coming to Australia.

Up to the present I have only dealt with direct taxation. Indirect taxation has perhaps a much worse effect than direct taxation. When we consider the amount of indirect taxation people are paying at the present time we must realise the serious effect it must be having on the financial position of the State.

In the year 1944-45 the Commonwealth Government derived about £100,000,000 from indirect taxation, mainly from customs and excise duties, sales tax, and similar imposts. I think there is an urgent need for a reduction in the sales tax. It should be reduced as much as possible on all capital goods, such as building materials, machinery, and farm equipment—all essential requirements to provide work in our community. When we consider the detrimental effect of direct and indirect taxation on the individual and the community, we must come to the conclusion that most industries will find a great difficulty in effecting repairs neglected during the war and replacing worn-out and obsolescent plant and machinery. Britain, the U.S.A., and Canada have made substantial concessions to companies in recent Budgets towards assisting them to restore their industries to efficient levels, and also towards the cost of scientific and technical research. No similar concessions generally have been made in Australia. This is a point the Treasurer should take up with the Federal Government with a view to seeing if some concession cannot be given to our companies of this State to enable them to make up the wear and tear of the war years and set aside some of their reserves without having to pay exorbitant taxation on them, and to enable them to build up and expand their enterprises to meet the demands that will be made on them in the coming years.

In April this year the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, when presenting his Budget to the House of Commons, said he recognised the hamstringing effect that high taxation was having on industry in Great Britain. He also said—"The present level of taxation has been unquestionably depressing to the spirit of enterprise and taxation of this kind could not and should not be continued." He made fairly substantial concessions to enable industry to recover from the wear and tear of war.

Although economy and efficiency in State expenditure will help, I think the main concern of the Treasurer should be the effect

of taxation upon the people and upon the social and economic structure of the nation of the finances of the Commonwealth Government. At Loan Council meetings and at every other opportunity he should stress the fact that standards of living and social welfare generally depend upon a high level of production, the source of which is personal endeavour. If we are to continue the present high exorbitant rates of taxation in this State it will bring about a breaking-down of the urge to produce, and it is going to have only a detrimental effect on the future of this country.

That is the reason why I have touched on these two subjects during the course of my speech on this Bill—the need for more drastic action regarding the present industrial unrest that is menacing the future of our country and the wasteful expenditure and high taxation by the Commonwealth Government, which is having a detrimental effect on the whole financial stability of Australia and is going to vitally affect the finances of the States in the future. I think if those two questions are tackled as they should be tackled the result should be to bring about reasonableness in the community.

If we can bring about reasonableness in the community again, get all the people back to work, and start a steady flow of the essential materials required to put into effect the works programme envisaged in this Appropriation Bill, we shall have a prosperous people and a prosperous State. But if we allow industrial unrest to prevail, if we let the small minority of industrial destructionists to rule this country, there will be only chaos and the repercussions that will inevitably follow in Queensland will be to the detriment of her people and of the State's finances generally. Therefore, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer will make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to persuade them to accept their responsibility as a Government in dealing with this vital question and also point out to them very strongly the detrimental effect their financial policy is having on the development of this State. If the Treasurer does that he will be doing a great service to this State.

Mr. POWER (Baroona) (5.56 p.m.): I listened with interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and up to a point I agree with him that the action of certain agitators is causing industrial unrest in this country. I have little or no use for people who deliberately cause industrial unrest. That applies not only to those who are responsible for what is taking place here today but to many of the supporters of the party to which the Leader of the Opposition rightly belongs and whose case he has always put.

The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that I addressed a meeting at the Trades Hall recently in connection with the tramway strike. I am very happy and proud of that fact. I make no apology for my action in connection with it, because I believe and know that the men concerned had a case and had the leader of the Queensland People's

Party, the hon. member for Hamilton, met these men in conciliation that strike would never have occurred. What do we find? The Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the hon. member for Hamilton, in his dual personality, making statements concerning that dispute that were entirely untrue and unwarranted. He stated that the tramway men had received a war loading of 8s. a week. That statement is entirely untrue. The amount given to the tramway workers on that occasion was 4s. a week. I should know, because my brother gave evidence in the Industrial Court in support of the claim. We find that all the blame for what took place as regards that strike has been laid on the tramway men. I blame the council and its administrators for what took place because had they met the men in conference the position would not have developed as it did.

I am proud of the fact that what the tramway men did they did in accordance with section 51 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts, and I shall always be happy to be on the side of the worker rather than on the side of the scab. I would rather be on the side of the workers than on the side of those who would go out to wield the baton and belt the workers of the State, as they were belted in the 1912 strike. I remember the facts of that strike and I know the hon. member for Hamilton was a special constable on that occasion and had he the same opportunity again he would again belt the workers as he did then. Broadcasting from Station 4BH, the hon. member made unwarranted attacks on the tramway men. He made untrue statements about the action of several members of the Labour Party who supported the men on that occasion.

Mr. Edwards: You would be a deserter.

Mr. POWER: I can take anything that is coming to me. I do not approve of the policy of some industrial unions that takes away from its members the right to decide whether a strike shall take place. Section 51 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act provides that members of a union who feel that they have a grievance may conduct a ballot to decide whether they shall strike, and that was the procedure adopted by the tramway men some little time ago. I know that many industrial disputes are taking place today, and I know that the rank and file of the unions have no say whatever in connection with them. I know that the executives of various unions have decided that the men shall strike and the men have followed the dictates of their executives. The time is long overdue when some of these executives should be shorn of such powers. The members themselves should have the right to decide whether they will engage in a strike at any time. If the decision whether there is to be a strike is to be left in the hands of a few militants, grave industrial trouble can arise in this country. Therefore, decisions should be made by the rank and file members of the union, and that is what took place in the tramways dispute.

I remind the Leader of the Opposition that Queensland is not the only State in

which industrial disputes are taking place. I remind him that in the State of South Australia, which is governed by people of the same political colour as himself, there is industrial trouble today with the tramway men, and I understand the railway men also are involved. What action has been taken by the South Australian Government to prevent that trouble from taking place or to settle the strike? I was in Adelaide in January of this year and made it my business to discuss with the tramway men many of their grievances. I know they have been working long hours, and that they believe that an alteration of their system of working is overdue. My point is that while the Leader of the Opposition accuses this Government of doing nothing in connection with industrial disputes that have arisen here, there is a big industrial upheaval in South Australia, the trams have not been running for the past 12 days and railway men are now involved. Strikes are not peculiar to Queensland. They are taking place in South Australia, America, England and other countries.

Mr. Gair: There were fewer industrial stoppages in Queensland during the war than there were in any other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. POWER: During the war years there was less industrial trouble in this State than ever before in its history. The Secretary for Labour and Employment, by his intervention, has been able to arbitrate and to bring certain parties together to settle industrial trouble.

We heard not one word of protest from the Leader of the Opposition when the master bakers of Brisbane decided to strike and left the people of Brisbane without bread for a long time, nor did we hear any word of protest when an effort was made to extend that trouble outside Brisbane to other towns in the State. There is not one word of protest when the master class decide to strike, but when the industrial workers decide to strike because of the conditions under which they work there is a loud cry of protest.

Had the hon. member for Hamilton, the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, agreed to meet the tramway men in a spirit of conciliation, had he agreed to call a conference, this strike would have been averted, but he said, "I am not going to meet them."

Mr. Chandler: After they were on strike.

Mr. POWER: At a later stage the hon. member for Hamilton, the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, after saying that the Industrial Court was the only authority that could alter the wages and conditions of the workers engaged in the Tramways Department, said, "I am prepared to give you the New South Wales conditions." Despite the fact that he had said that the Industrial Court was the only place in which the matter could be settled, he was prepared to give the tramway workers of this State—

Mr. CHANDLER: I rise to a point of order. I did not make such a statement. That is untrue, and I ask for its withdrawal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will state his point of order.

Mr. CHANDLER: I never made the statement attributed to me by the hon. member for Baroona. He said that I offered the men New South Wales conditions. I never made any such offer. It is quite untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Baroona to accept the denial of the hon. member for Hamilton.

Mr. POWER: I accept his denial, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with parliamentary procedure but I want to say that the offer was made and it was made on behalf of the Brisbane City Council, of which the hon. member is the leader.

During the course of that industrial dispute the hon. member for Hamilton never came into this Chamber but went away in haste and made statements over the air that were entirely untrue. Let me remind the hon. member of one of those statements. This afternoon I was accused of making statements about him in his absence. I am prepared to back any statement that I may make in connection with this matter. I had a shorthand-writer taking notes of the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton from the sanctity of 4BH where the workers could not get him and he could not be questioned. He said that the tramway men of Brisbane received a war loading of 8s. a week. That statement is quite untrue and entirely without foundation in fact. The hon. member for Hamilton must have known that it was untrue. He must have known that the Industrial Court gave the men only 4s. a week. I am sure of what I say because, I repeat, my brother gave evidence in the Industrial Court in support of the claim.

That is one statement about which I have bowled out the hon. member. Now he says that he did not make the offer to the men of the New South Wales conditions. Then who made the offer? Who authorised the making of the offer? As a matter of fact, the matter was discussed by the Establishment and Co-ordination Committee of the Brisbane City Council, of which the hon. member is a member, and there was a determined attempt by the Brisbane City Council to create a general industrial upheaval in Queensland. He is not going to get away with these things as far as I am concerned.

Now let me deal with the finances of the Brisbane City Council. Section 41 of the City of Brisbane Act provides that the budget of a local authority, the Brisbane City Council, must be balanced as nearly as possible. Now let us see how the hon. member balanced the budget of the Council during the last few years. What he did I believe is a distinct breach of section 41 of the City of Brisbane Act. This is how he attempted to balance the budget and this is how the people of Brisbane were misled. In 1940-41 he budgeted for a surplus of £12,000 and his actual surplus was £207,885. In 1941-42 he budgeted for a surplus of

£20,793 and his actual surplus was £110,198. In 1942-43 he budgeted for a surplus of £46,700 and the actual surplus was £312,515. In 1943-44 he budgeted for a surplus of £17,183 and had an actual surplus of £627,499. In 1944-45 the actual surplus was £572,435. The excess of surpluses over estimated surpluses for those years amounts to £1,733,473.

Mr. Foley: Did he reduce the rates?

Mr. POWER: I am coming to that point. We also find that certain revenue from the tramways undertaking and the power-house undertaking was transferred to the general fund. There is nothing in the City of Brisbane Act to prevent that transfer from taking place. According to the Auditor-General's report on the books and accounts of the Brisbane City Council, the production of the power-house for the year was 174,654,000 kilowatt-hours, compared with 163,116,500 in 1943-44. Current is supplied to the tramways and electricity undertakings at cost, after allowing for the sale of a number of units to the City Electric Light Company Limited. That is quite sound business, but I do not know why it should be at cost. It does not say in the report at what price these units were supplied to the City Electric Light Company Limited. However, we find this statement in the Auditor-General's report—

“No profit or loss, therefore, is shown on the transactions in the revenue account for the year.”

Here we have an undertaking the size of the power-house undertaking in which no profit or loss is shown on the transactions in the revenue account for the year.

Why? Why has the attempt been made to conceal the profit and loss account? The surplus from the transactions in 1944-45 was £21,440. This made a total contribution to Consolidated Revenue for 1945 of £274,053.

I read with very much pleasure the comments made by that very fine officer, the chairman of the State Electricity Commission, Mr. Cochran. He said that he was rather concerned at the fact that the profits of the electricity department were being transferred into consolidated revenue. He, like myself and every member of the Government, believes that any profit made from the sale of electricity should be returned to the consumers by means of decreased charges rather than be transferred into the consolidated revenue of the council. Furthermore, while that has been taking place a clamour has existed throughout the length and breadth of the city of the extension of the electricity mains to many parts. No attempt has been made by the Brisbane City Council to extend that power where it is required. We have heard a great deal about the provision of electricity for the farmers. For months and months the farmers in the Brookfield area have been clamouring for an extension of electricity into that area.

Mr. Chandler: They are getting it now.

Mr. POWER: They may be getting it now, but we all know that the matter was held up for a long time by the Brisbane City Council.

Mr. Pie: On account of man-power.

Mr. POWER: I will make you squeal before I finish with you. The time is opportune for a reduction in electricity charges to consumers in the City of Brisbane. During my period as a member of the Brisbane City Council many reductions in those charges were made by the then Labour council to the consumers of electricity. Although that council made quite a number of reductions to the consumers, no reduction has been made to them by the present administration.

Mr. Chandler: That is not right.

Mr. POWER: The surpluses have been tucked away in the consolidated revenue of the council. No reduction has been made in my account. If any reduction has been made it has been to the big consumers.

Let me deal with another aspect of the operations of the Brisbane City Council. We find from the same report of the Auditor-General that in 1945 £289,597 15s. 11d. was transferred from the tramways undertaking to the consolidated revenue account of the council. I am one who believes that the users of the tramways are entitled to a reduction in tram fares. The conditions under which passengers travel today and the tram fares are scandalous. We knew that during the war period that we had to put up with sub-normal conditions because of the lack of man-power and the tramway men did an excellent job during that period, but today there is no shortage of man-power. You can go to any depot of the Brisbane City Council's tramway department and find notices there that any female employee who desires to be released will not have her application opposed. There is an abundance of labour today in the tramway department but there has been no improvement in the tramway service and no attempt to reduce fares. On the other hand, the finances of the Brisbane City Council have been bolstered up as a result of its revenue departments.

Take the rate position of the council. No attempt has been made to reduce rates. The Leader of the Opposition said he believed there must be some relief from taxation. We all believe there must be some relief from taxation. We also believe that there must be some relief in domestic taxation by the Brisbane City Council. We find that the council, instead of honouring its pledges to the ratepayers at the last election to reduce rates has built up huge reserves. (Opposition interjections.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: We find also that no major works have been carried out. We find, too, that valuations have been increased, with a consequential increase in revenue. Again, ratepayers in arrears of rates have through regularity of employment been in a position

to redeem their arrears. As a result the revenue of the council today is buoyant. That is no credit to the administration, but is so merely because tramway revenue has increased, electricity surpluses have increased, arrears of rates have been reduced, no relief has been made in electricity charges or tramway charges, nor in rates, and no major works have been carried out. They have done nothing whatever for the citizens of Brisbane but they have made lavish promises.

We heard there was going to be a green belt all round Brisbane, and great improvements were to take place. The place is full of green belts, but the trouble is you get lost in them, because the weeds are 2 feet high on the footpath. If hon. members had a look at "Truth" on Sunday they would see a man holding up two snakes caught in a paddock in the electorate of the Treasurer that was owned by the council and controlled by the council, but no attempt was made to clear. (Opposition interjections.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: We find also that the Brisbane City Council is serving notices day after day upon the owners of properties to clean them up, yet they allow that state of affairs to operate on their own premises. It is time a general exposure was made of the affairs of the city of Brisbane; it is time the people realised what they have put up with for a long time; and I take this opportunity of exposing them.

Let me come to another matter.

Mr. Pie: I'll bet you talk yourself into the Cabinet tonight.

Mr. POWER: The only Cabinet you'll finish up in is at the other end of the building.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have called "Order" on several occasions, I remind hon. members that I will take more drastic action if my call is not obeyed.

Mr. POWER: I am concerned with the filching of public parks and reserves from the citizens of Brisbane. When you pick up the papers from time to time you notice that the Brisbane City Council proposes to buy another park. It is buying land all over the place and trying to resume some land in my electorate; but I can assure it that it will not get away with it because my friend is being well fortified; he has a capable man handling the matter for him.

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. POWER: I am a better man than you. I assure the hon. member that I shall always prefer British-born to those of German extraction. They have said that they propose to take all the dairies out of the city of Brisbane as soon as they could. They have an ordinance and when it suits them they turn round and break that ordinance. What happened out at Bardon? I propose to read some correspondence that has taken place between the Lord Mayor of Brisbane and people in the electorate of the Treasurer. I

want to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that some time ago the hon. member for Hamilton said the tramway men or the Tramway Union had not approached him in connection with the statement I made of one towel being provided for 400 people. Let him deny that. He made that statement in this Chamber and he stated what I said was not true. That letter and its contents are in "Hansard." I got a copy of the letter the Tramway Union sent to the Lord Mayor, the member for Hamilton, drawing his attention to the fact that 400 employees had to use one towel. He said he knew nothing about it. Later on he said the letter was not from the union. I have the reply of the hon. member for Hamilton. I waited days and days to get this back. When he knew I was going to read it he ran out like a cur and hid out at the back while I was reading the letter. This is the letter sent to the Lord Mayor from the residents of Bardon—

"Dear Sir,

"We, the undersigned, do strongly protest against the fencing in of the Council Reserve situated at the corner of Cooper's Camp and Cecil Roads, Bardon. It also appears that the person erecting the fence intends to take the fence across Cecil Road where it meets Cooper's Camp Road. To fence in a road is contrary to all Council By-laws, and although the road at this point has yet to be made, the City Planner has made provision for it as a main road connecting Bardon to the Ashgrove Terminus. As this area is essentially residential, the grazing of cattle in the Reserve would prove detrimental to the health of surrounding residents. It is enough to have a dairy in the locality without having grazing paddocks adjoining newly-constructed homes in Cooper's Camp Road.

"Many of us have children attending the Ashgrove State School and the walk through the Reserve saves the children half a mile in their journey to school. In addition people and children cross the Reserve to attend the Roman Catholic Church and Convent in the Drive.

"It seems that the Council has overlooked the fact that Cecil Road extends from Chiswick Road to Cooper's Camp Road, as at the present time it is just a dead-end street. Property owners have given a total of ten perches of land to enable the road to be completed, and after waiting ten years the road is still to be finished. The time has arrived when we should have this road, and we the property owners and users of Cecil Road consider that the said Reserve should be taken in for a re-survey of that portion of Cecil Road.

"Trusting that this petition will receive your early attention, and this injustice is promptly rectified,

"Yours faithfully,

"Henry W. Miles."

(Signatures of Petitioners attached.)

I might mention that according to the policy of the C.M.O., of which the hon. member is the leader, there should be no dead-ends and the streets should be taken right through.

This is the letter from the hon. member for Hamilton addressed to Mr. Miles—

"Dear Sir,

"I am having investigations made concerning the protest lodged by you and other residents of Bardon, against the fencing-in of the reserve at the corner of Cooper's Camp road and Cecil road, and also the fencing-in of Cecil road where it joins Cooper's Camp road, and I will again communicate with you as soon as these investigations have been completed."

Mr. Pie: Even your own members are bored.

Mr. POWER: So long as I am boring you I am doing well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: I will read the reply.

Mr. Yeates: Take it as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. POWER: This is the reply of the Lord Mayor after his investigations—

"Town Hall, Brisbane,

"11 October 1945.

"Mr. H. W. Miles,

"Saigon,"

"Cecil road,

"Bardon, W.4,

"Brisbane.

"Dear Sir,

"I refer to the petition forwarded by you concerning the fencing in of the area owned by the Council between Cecil and Cooper's Camp roads.

"An inspection revealed that the area was fenced and the accesses inadequate. The Council has not given any rights over the land referred to and at present the area is under the control of the Council. The person who erected the fence has been contacted and asked to remove the fence and seek in regular manner the use of the area.

"Should the Council give agistment rights over the area you may rest assured that it will be for a short term only and will not be exclusive use. In addition, provision will be made for the public to have access from Cecil road to Cooper's Camp road.

"Instructions have been given to have this matter finalised immediately, and I feel certain that any temporary alienation of the area will not be inconsistent with the needs of the general public.

"Will you be good enough to inform the signatories to the petition accordingly?

"Yours faithfully,

"J. B. Chandler,

"Lord Mayor."

I want the House to listen how the Lord Mayor writes in one strain and the alderman for the district writes in another. These are the people who say they are anxious to do the best they can for the community in

general, but they do not know what is happening in their own domain. I am sure the hon. member for Hamilton has little or no knowledge of what is happening in this Chamber because he is never in the House. This is a letter from Alderman Groom in connection with this matter—

“Dear Mr. Miles,

“I wish to thank you for your letter of the 8th instant with reference to a petition signed by a number of residents in your area, addressed to the Lord Mayor.

“The position with regard to the fencing in of the area concerned is, to the best of my information, as follows:—

(a) There is no dedicated roadway across the land in question.

(b) That the land has not been leased to the person against whom the complaint is made, but he has been granted agistment rights of the area.

“I visited the area with the Town Clerk yesterday and recommended that immediate action should be taken as follows:—

(a) That sufficient of the fence should be removed to give free and convenient access to members of the public desirous of crossing this land.

(b) That consideration should be given to the provision of road access from Cooper's Camp road to Cecil road.”

On one occasion they say they had no rights, and then we find the alderman for the district stating they have rights. In this connection also two fire hydrants have been fenced in. I shall be lodging a complaint with the Secretary for Public Lands tomorrow, because it is he who deals with the matter of putting a fence across a creek. They have even done that. This is what the present council does fencing in roads to give agistment, promising the people the world and doing nothing, fencing in fire hydrants. Is it not high time the general public realised what an unholy mess the Brisbane City Council is in? It really does not know what it is doing. An alderman and the Lord Mayor do not really know what is taking place between one department and another. In addition, I would point out that by-law No. 316 which will be found on page 105 of the old by-laws of the Brisbane City Council, under which it is now working, provides that no person can erect a barbed wire fence on a road without the permission of the council, and the fence must be 18 in. back from the alignment of the road.

Now we find that this gentleman, by some strange pull, has been given a lease and a further by-law of the council has been broken in that this man has erected a barbed-wire fence across a road where children pass, and I remind the hon. member for Hamilton that if any child who goes across that place where cattle are grazing meets with an accident at any time the local authority is responsible for it. Of course, it does not come out of the pockets of the Brisbane aldermen, it comes out of the pockets of the ratepayers of the city.

I bring these facts before the general public to show what is taking place. I strongly protest against the unfair treatment and unfair discrimination that are taking place with regard to the treatment of the Labour wards. I have protested against the expenditure of money that has been made available by the Government for the eradication of mosquitoes. Preferential treatment has been given to the wards that are represented by anti-Labour aldermen. As a matter of fact, I am satisfied that the health of the people is only a secondary consideration of the present Brisbane City Council. Here we have the medical officer of health of the Brisbane City Council—and I am informed he has not a diploma of public health—stating in the Press this morning that he did not know whether flies had any connection with infantile paralysis. An eminent medical man replies to him in the Press and says that flies play an important part in this matter. It is high time there was a general overhaul of the affairs of the city of Brisbane, the general administration in particular. The medical officer of health of the Brisbane City Council has criticised the Government's administration, but any man who has no diploma of public health should not be allowed to occupy the position of medical officer of the city of Brisbane. I understand that this diploma is one of the qualifications for the position, yet this man is appointed. I suggest that the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs investigate the matter, it certainly warrants serious investigation.

As to general administration, nothing has been done for the people, rates have remained high, tram fares could have been reduced, electric-light charges could have been reduced and many other improvements could have been effected. I issue a challenge to the Leader of the Queensland People's Party. I invite any hon. member, when he goes home tonight, to take his rate notices for any three years of the Chandler administration of the city and compare them with the rate notices issued during any three years of the Jones administration and he will find that he has paid more in rates to the Chandler administration than he has done to the Jones administration.

Mr. Walsh: And got less service.

Mr. POWER: And got less service. I challenge the Leader of the Queensland People's Party to refute that statement. I could indict the Brisbane City Council for many things, but I have stated my case sufficiently.

Again I inform the Leader of the Opposition that I am happy at the fact that I was associated with the tramway men in their industrial upheaval, I am proud of the fact that I addressed them, and I assure the Leader of the Opposition—and my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Government will bear me out—that neither I, the hon. member for Merthyr nor the hon. member for Brisbane was castigated or questioned in any way in Caucus over our actions. I much prefer being on the side of the unionist to being on the side of a scab and I hope

I shall never live to see the day when any child of mine will adopt the attitude that the Leader of the Queensland People's Party adopted in 1912 when he had himself sworn in as a special constable and batoned down the workers of the State.

Mr. COPLEY: Mr. Speaker!

Mr. AIKENS: Mr. Speaker!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kurilpa.

Mr. Aikens: The choke-off.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I heard the remark of the hon. member for Mundingburra.

Mr. Aikens: I intended you to hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is objectionable to the Chair and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. Aikens: Very well, I withdraw the interjection.

Mr. COPLEY (Kurilpa) (7.50 p.m.): I do not wish it to be thought that I desire to choke off any hon. member of this Assembly from saying anything that he has to say on the matter before the House.

I appreciate to the full the remarks made by the hon. member for Baroona. On a previous occasion in this Assembly I made certain statements in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton, who said that the Government's Budget was not framed on business lines.

I rose to speak only because a very awkward situation is arising in some of our courts. For instance, Mr. Leahy, stipendiary magistrate, has decided that he will not initiate certain litigation, whereas Mr. Landy, another stipendiary magistrate, has said that he will. At the present time the people of Brisbane are entitled to a better deal than they are getting, not only in connection with the Fair Rents Court, but also in connection with the Commonwealth legislation and regulations relating to the eviction of tenants. We have had cases in Brisbane in which anomalous positions have arisen. In the past in Brisbane no person who had the right to any property or the right to get any property knew just what the position was, whereas in the country there has been a more or less definite point of view, and there the members of the legal profession always knew that there was a continuity and consistency of decisions on these matters. As a member of the Government Party, I very seriously deprecate the position that has arisen in Brisbane, and I suggest to the Government that they appoint one man to look after not only eviction matters but also matters arising from Commonwealth legislation on the point. I am satisfied that you, Mr. Speaker, know of cases in which anomalous positions have arisen. I know of one case in which a magistrate refused to give an eviction order. It is true that the person in occupation of the house had a wife and one child, but the person who applied for the eviction order had a wife, a boy 16 years of age and a girl

18 years. He had a prisoner-of-war brother who was coming home and they would have had to occupy a home of one room and a kitchen. The magistrate refused to grant an eviction order in that case, but in another case where there were two persons fewer in the family of the applicant the magistrate granted the eviction order.

I rose more or less to point out the anomalous position that was arising today, and to suggest that in view of the serious housing problem there should be more consistency in dealing with these matters. In view of the position that has arisen the Government should appoint one magistrate in Brisbane so that he may be in the same position as the one magistrate in the country town. I know that in cities like Toowoomba, Ipswich, Maryborough, Rockhampton and others solicitors will say, "A definite position has been laid down. We cannot go to the court because the magistrate takes this point of view, but if there is a question of greater hardship, then it is all right." In the country there is a continuity of decisions. I have always contended that without consistency there cannot be a proper administration of justice, and that where you have five, six or seven stipendiary magistrates or acting stipendiary magistrates administering a law from different points of view, you get inconsistencies and lawyers will simply say, "We will give this a go."

They took that attitude the other day. Where do the public stand? Where do we as a Government stand if our stipendiary magistrates make varying decisions from day to day? If you had one man to control the Fair Rents Court and one man to control evictions the members of the legal profession will say, "Under these conditions the stipendiary magistrate will not make an order." I suggest strongly to the Government that not only should one stipendiary magistrate be appointed to control eviction matters under Commonwealth legislation but that they should appoint a man to deal with evictions and Fair Rents Court matters. If such an official had a fairly wide discretion and fairly full powers the Government would be saved a lot of heart burnings.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Treasurer) (7.58 p.m.): There has not been a very great deal to reply to in this debate so far. I should like however to say a word in reply to the concern expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to industrial unrest. During his speech the Minister for Labour and Employment interjected that there was less industrial unrest in Queensland than in any other part of Australia. I venture to add, "In any other part of the world." Our industrial-arbitration system here is speedy and effective and it is very rarely that we have any hold-ups.

We are remarkably fortunate in that in industrial matters we have been so little disturbed in the last 12 months. One must remember that the community has gone through six years of a very worrying and dangerous war. Members of industry in every walk of life have been under a very

heavy strain and inevitably on the conclusion of hostilities there was a reaction.

Industrial unrest has not been confined to Australia; it is evident all over the world. We find that in Britain, even at the time the British people were deciding to take up another hole in their belts because of food shortage, food-carrying ships were tied up all round the English coast because of the industrial hold-ups there. The matters in dispute may or may not have been worth the cost to the community, but at a time like this such disputes will arise. The United States of America is now in the grip of a tremendous upheaval. If you look at tonight's "Telegraph" you will see that on the average 40 ballots a day are being requested there on industrial disputes, about whether a strike shall be permitted or not. The mainland of Europe itself, if not in a state of industrial upheaval, is in one of complete chaos not only industrially but politically. We see the same thing in Asia.

We are a very fortunate people and should be grateful to the Queensland workers and appreciative of the way in which they have faced up to this period of change from war to peace. They have shown a desire to evade as far as possible the inconveniences to the public that are associated with industrial disputes. I for one am very grateful to them for it. When the hon. gentleman said that Governments should do something about these things, what does he propose a Government should do? If men say they will not work does he propose to drag them forcibly to work and do what the dictators did—shoot them, or put them into internment camps or labour camps or prison camps? A refusal to work usually arises through some sense of grievance. The dictatorships mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition did as I stated. There were no strikes in Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, or in Stalin's Russia.

Mr. Aikens: Or in Franco's Spain.

Mr. HANLON: Or in Franco's Spain. There are no strikes in countries where to stand up for your rights means to sacrifice your life. Individual freedom has disappeared in those countries. We do not propose to adopt those methods here. We do not propose to adopt the methods of either Communism or the other dictators. It is a very desirable thing that members of this Assembly and the executives of industry generally should show as much restraint and tolerance in dealing with employees as they have. It is the duty of those of us who hold positions of responsibility in the community, whether in public life or trade or commerce or secondary industries, to endeavour as far as we possibly can to justify the responsibilities of our position by exercising a little more patience and a little more tolerance than usual, in view of the strain that the workers of this country have been under for some years.

Now, I am pleased to see the hon. member for Hamilton here this evening, because on the last occasion he graced this Chamber with his presence he made certain statements

about finance that I desire to correct. At the conclusion of the Budget debate, the hon member—

Mr. Chandler: I did not speak the last time I was here.

Mr. HANLON: As far as I can recall, the last time I saw the hon. member here—

Mr. Chandler: You are being very kind.

Mr. HANLON: Not at all. It was a morning speech—somewhere about 1 o'clock in the morning the hon. member addressed himself to the question before the Committee. He took occasion to castigate the Australian Labour Party on the ground that it had not inspired financial confidence, and his accession to the position of Lord Mayor immediately brought about financial confidence in the city of Brisbane, which had considerably improved its borrowing position. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman stated that when he first took office in Brisbane he was compelled to pay from 10s. to 20s. per cent. more interest on loans than Southern borrowing authorities paid. That of course was not true. In my usual careful manner, rather than argue about the matter at that stage of the evening, I decided to check up on loans that had been obtained by the Brisbane City Council and guaranteed by the Government, which are all known to the Treasury officers. Before dealing with this statement—

Mr. Chandler: I quoted a specific authority.

Mr. HANLON: If I remember rightly, the hon. member said that private persons were willing to lend at £3 6s. 3d. per cent.

Mr. Chandler: Private banks. I said one specific authority in Victoria.

Mr. HANLON: The words I took down—

Mr. Pie: That appear in "Hansard"?

Mr. HANLON: I am not quoting from "Hansard," I am quoting from notes. He said when he entered the Brisbane City Council the council was paying from 10s. to 20s. per cent. in excess of what was paid by Southern borrowing authorities.

Mr. Chandler: The Victorian Works Board I quoted.

Mr. HANLON: I very carefully noted what the hon. member said—perhaps he could look up "Hansard" and see if I am making a mistake—and I am very sure these are the words he used. He mentioned the Metropolitan Board of Works at a later stage. He went on to say—

"The Metropolitan Board of Works, Melbourne, could borrow infinitely better than the city of Brisbane. In the last financial year, because of the higher prestige of the city . . ."

Since the hon. member graced it—

"he was able to borrow at a rate lower than that of the Metropolitan Board of Works."

Again the hon. gentleman was not telling the truth. It is a very bad thing for a member to be careless of the truth, because we are not in the habit of taking these statements at the value the hon. member places on them. I have always investigated these statements, particularly statements coming from the hon. member, knowing how careless he is.

This is the fact of it: it is noted that during the period, 1938-39, the financial year the hon. member entered the City Council—

Mr. Chandler: I did not enter it until 1940.

Mr. HANLON: Well, before the hon. gentleman entered it.

Mr. Chandler: I only quoted my own borrowing.

Mr. HANLON: In the year 1938-39 the hon. member had not done anything to uplift the prestige of the Brisbane City Council, and at that time loans were obtained by the Sydney County Council, and the Sydney Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board, at 4½ and 4½ per cent. During the same period a similar rate applied to advances by the Brisbane City Council. Apparently the credit of the Brisbane City Council before Mr. Chandler's advent was high, as a comparison will show. The council has recently been able to obtain a low interest rate. Naturally the various banks and insurance companies are looking for an outlet for funds that they cannot invest in any other way. That is not peculiar to the city of Brisbane.

The hon. member for Hamilton stated that during the last financial year it had been possible to borrow at a lower rate than applied to the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works, which he states previously could always borrow infinitely cheaper than the Brisbane City Council.

As a matter of fact, the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works, over a long period of years—for the last 30 or 40 years—has been recognised as the outstanding local-governing body in Australia and on the average has borrowed over the past 30 years or more at a lower rate of interest than any other local-governing body in Australia. Actually, at the time the hon. member came into power that was not so. Things were becoming equalised because interest was beginning to be controlled by the war. Generally speaking, the Melbourne body has been able to borrow at a lower rate and a check of the fact shows that in May 1945 the Metropolitan Board of Works, Melbourne, borrowed at £3 6s. 3d. per cent.

Mr. Chandler: By public flotation.

Mr. HANLON: The rate was £3 6s. 3d. per cent. for a 15-year period. In June 1945, just a few weeks later, the city council of Brisbane raised a loan at £3 6s. 3d. per cent. for a 10-year period.

Mr. Chandler interjected.

Mr. HANLON: It is no use the hon. member's trying to bluff this out. The hon. member knows that a loan for a 15-year term is worth considerably more in interest than a loan for a 10-year term.

Mr. Chandler: Not necessarily.

Mr. HANLON: It is necessarily so. The Commonwealth Government have just completed the flotation of a loan for national purposes and I believe—I may be a little bit wrong—that the credit of the national Government of Australia is just as high as the credit of the Brisbane City Council and they paid 2½ per cent. for a 5-year loan and 3½ per cent. for a 15-year loan.

The longer the period one borrows for the higher interest rate one has to pay. If the hon. member looks up the finances since he has been in the Brisbane City Council he will find that the longest-term loans he borrowed come from the State Government Insurance Office.

Mr. Chandler: Would you like me to tell the House the circumstances of that borrowing?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Windsor is having a terrible time holding down the hon. member for Hamilton but I think he will have to pole-axe him to keep him quite.

Mr. Pie: I can look after myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: He is looking after him very well. The hon. member also took the opportunity to abuse the State Government Insurance Office. That was very ungrateful of him because he was very glad to accept accommodation from the State Government Insurance Office and he got his accommodation from that office at a rate lower than that laid down by the Loan Council.

Mr. Chandler: And only after fighting.

Mr. HANLON: If he got a bargain rate only after fighting he is not entitled to say that he did not get a bargain rate at all. It is the falsehood I am objecting to.

Mr. Chandler: I did not.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member has no right to come into this Chamber and tell untruths about the State Government Insurance Office. He has no right to slander that office but I know it is in keeping with the campaign the hon. member has always carried on and it is in keeping with the campaign he carried on with the Brisbane City Council before he became a member. If the Labour Party had adopted the same tactics of endeavouring to destroy the credit of the City Council the hon. member would not be able to borrow a threepenny bit.

Mr. Chandler: Oh!

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member can laugh. Not a penny has been borrowed by the Brisbane City Council since the hon. member for Hamilton has been Lord Mayor that the Government of Queensland has not guaranteed. He has not raised a threepenny bit on his own credit in the Brisbane City Council. Every cent that has been raised has been raised on the guarantee by the Government and the southern authorities he has been talking about told him he had to do that.

Let me compare a loan borrowed recently by the Glenorchy Shire Council in Tasmania. I do not know where Glenorchy is but I received a circular from the Federal Treasurer recently—and that was about the time the hon. member was skiting about his credit—asking approval to the borrowing by the Glenorchy Shire Council of a large sum of money. I think it was £100,000, at the rate of £3 6s. 3d. per cent. for 20 years.

Mr. Chandler: By public flotation.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member will have to take his medicine. When he departs from the truth he will have to take the exposure. That loan is not guaranteed by the State of Tasmania at all. The credit of that little country council—and I have never heard of it—is so good that it can get a loan for 20 years, as the hon. member could not get for the city of Brisbane at a rate of £3 6s. 3d. per cent.

A 20-year loan for the Commonwealth Government would be worth more than that on the rates of interest they are paying, yet a little country shire council can get it, and it has not even got the honour and prestige of having the hon. member for Hamilton as its chairman. The hon. member should remember, when he gets up and makes statements of that kind, that we are not silly enough to take them without checking up on them.

The State Government Insurance Office has looked after all the local authorities in Queensland up until the war period to such an extent that it supplied loans to all shire councils totalling £1,950,000. During the period before the war, when it lent £1,950,000 to shire councils, it had invested only £25,300 in any other form of investment, and all those loans have been at or below rates fixed by the Loan Council, many of them being below. In addition, for the borrowing of shire councils—and the hon. member will know this in borrowing for the Brisbane City Council—the rate of repayment is a very important consideration, and when these loans are made on a 30-year basis with the repayments fixed for a period of 30 years it makes it much more comfortable for the local authority than a shorter-term loan with repayments to be made at an earlier period, even though it is at a lower rate of interest. The hon. member should be aware of that. The State Government Insurance Office is the only office that now makes long-term loans. He got a

loan for 20 years in March 1942 at 3½ per cent., the maximum at that time being 3½ per cent. on the 20-year basis. In June 1945 he received £75,000 at 3½, the borrowing being for 10 years, but the repayment rate being fixed on a 30-year basis. The State Government Insurance Office goes to considerable pains to make the burden of repayment of its loans as low as possible on the people of the city. The hon. member need not flatter himself that it was because he was Lord Mayor of Brisbane that the State Government Insurance Office made the repayment as light as it possibly could. It made the repayments on a 30-year basis because the State Government and the State Government Insurance Commissioner are considerate of the burden on the people of Brisbane, not because the hon. member was there. Fancy the hon. member getting up and abusing the State Government when all the time he is in the position of having to thank the State Government, if he is honest enough to do so, for getting special consideration from the State Government Insurance Office!

Let us consider the difference in repayment periods. On the principle of repayments over 30 years the annual instalment is £3,995. On the principle of a 10-year repayment, on which other lenders are prepared to lend, the repayment is £8,899 a year, a difference of £4,904 a year to the people who are repaying the loan. The period of the loan is of tremendous importance. That is why the housing authority makes provision for a 25- and 30-year period for the repayments by workers on their homes. It is a longer period for paying off, but the payments are lighter on the weekly-wage envelope of the worker. That is exactly why, in the business with which he is associated, the hon. member gives to the purchasers terms that are as attractive as possible—to get business, because the repayments on radios or anything he may sell will fall as lightly as possible upon the wage envelope of the worker who is investing in a radio.

It was due to the Insurance Commissioner that I should give that reply to the statement made by the hon. member. Of course, by this time we have learned to take what he says with a grain of salt, but still it was necessary to put the matter on record. There is nothing further to which I wish to reply.

Motion (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1 to 8, both inclusive, Schedule, and Preamble, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment.

THIRD READING.

Bill, on motion of Mr. Hanlon, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 8.26 p.m.