

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 1947

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER, 1947.

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

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLY, CLONCURRY—MOUNT ISA.

Mr. KERR (Oxley) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. With reference to the Premier’s recent announcement on the development of the mineral belt between Cloncurry and Mount Isa, and the need to supply water in this area, when will the geophysical survey of this area be commenced?”

“2. Will any survey be made of the cost of providing the water needed to develop this mineral area?”

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Normanby) replied—

“1. and 2. Representations are being made to the Prime Minister with a view to having the services of geophysicists of the Bureau of Mineral Resources made available to undertake the work.”

GEOLOGICAL AND HYDROLOGICAL SURVEYS,
MARY VALLEY.

Mr. MACDONALD (Stanley) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“Referring to the statement in His Excellency’s Opening Speech regarding the geological and hydrological examination of the Mary Valley, will he kindly indicate the results of such examination to date, with particular reference to the Conondale area?”

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Normanby) replied—

“An examination and surveys of the only two feasible moderate storage sites in the Mary Valley at Conondale and Yabba Creek have been made as well as a general geological and hydrological reconnaissance extending from the sources to the mouth of the Mary River. Dams would be expensive at either site in comparison with the quantity of water stored. Irrigation is being practised in this valley, and considerable expansion can take place before conservation of water becomes necessary.”

POLICE STATION, STAFFORD DISTRICT.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“In view of the fact that the district of Stafford has increased until now there are approximately 3,000 people within a radius of one mile from Stafford tram terminus, will he give consideration to the establishment of a police station in this suburb?”

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

“Representations have already been made by the hon. member for Nundah, Mr. F. E. Roberts, to the Commissioner of Police, and as a result the boundaries of the Police Divisions of Chermside and Windsor have been adjusted, and an additional constable has been attached to the Windsor Police Station. The increase of population in this or any other area will be closely watched by the Commissioner of Police so that adequate Police protection can be provided in these Divisions.”

MATTRESS-MAKING AT CENTRAL TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“1. Are any youths attending the Technical College to learn mattress-making?”

“2. Is there a qualified teacher in attendance to instruct in this particular trade?”

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

“1. One (1) mattress making apprentice is attending the Central Technical College, and is undertaking the upholstery course.

“2. An upholstery teacher is employed.”

ABANDONMENT OF UNIVERSITY COURSES BY EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“1. What were the totals of ex-service men students enrolled last year at the University for the study of medicine, economics, and engineering?”

“2. How many such students in each category have since given up their studies?”

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

“1. Medicine, 101; economics, 28; engineering, 105.

“2. Medicine, 11; economics, 1; engineering, 16.”

INTAKE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera): I desire to ask the Secretary for Public Instruction whether he has an answer to the following question, which I addressed to him on 28 August—

“Of the intake of 131 teachers during the period 1 January to 1 August, 1947, from sources other than the Teachers’ Training College, what were the principal sources from which these teachers were recruited?”

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

“Of the intake of 131 teachers during the period 1 January to 1 August, 1947, from sources other than the Teachers’ Training College, the majority were ex-teachers, who were re-admitted to the teaching service.”

TRAINEES AT TEACHERS’ TRAINING COLLEGE.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera): I desire to ask the Secretary for Public Instruction whether he has an answer to the following question, which I addressed to him on 28 August—

“1. As at 1 August, 1947, how many trainee teachers were attending the Teachers’ Training College?”

“2. Of this number, how many had been in attendance—(a) over 21 months; (b) less than 21 months, but over 18 months; (c) less than 18 months, but over 12 months; (d) less than 12 months, but over 6 months; (e) less than 6 months?”

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

“1. 414.

“2. (a) 26, (b) 37, (c) 36, (d) 271, (e) 44.”

UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS, QUEENSLAND.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“What is the number of men and women receiving unemployment financial benefits in Queensland at the end of July last out of the total for Australia of 5,364 men and 192 women, as reported by the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Holloway)?”

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane) replied—

“The administration of unemployment financial benefits is a Commonwealth function. Particulars of the numbers in receipt of such benefits in Queensland are supplied each week to the Government Statistician on the distinct understanding that the information is used for statistical purposes only. I am therefore precluded from supplying the information.”

ENGINE CLEANERS, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. How many engine-cleaners joined the railway service in the year ended 30 June, 1947?”

“2. How many left the service?”

“3. How many were promoted or transferred to other positions in the service?”

“4. What number of cleaners were employed at 30 June, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946?”

Hon. J. E. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) replied—

- "1. 74.
 "2. 69.
 "3. Promoted, 107; transferred, 17.
 "4. 30 June, 1941, 520; 30 June, 1942, 636; 30 June, 1943, 797; 30 June, 1944, 926; 30 June, 1945, 1,023; 30 June, 1946, 855."

STATE HUTS, COLLINSVILLE.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. What complaints, if any, have been received regarding the condition of—(a) the State huts at Collinsville, and (b) the drainage system of these huts?

"2. What action, if any, has been taken to—(a) replace the State huts (which were built for temporary purposes as a war measure) with houses more in keeping with modern standards of health and comfort, and (b) remove any menace to health which might arise from the drainage system?

"3. In view of the fact that some of the tenants of the State huts suffer damage and inconvenience caused by defects, including defective roofs which leak badly in wet weather, will he expedite measures to have such huts replaced with houses more in keeping with modern standards?"

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Normanby) replied—

"1, 2, and 3. Owing to the urgent demand during the war period for increased supplies of coal in the Northern Division, it was necessary to transfer approximately 120 miners from other centres to Collinsville. Accommodation had to be provided quickly, and the erection of huts was the solution. At the time it was intended that they were to provide temporary accommodation only. Complaints were received as deterioration caused defects, including defective roofs. A point was reached at this stage where many of the miners returned back to their own centres. The matter of the implementation of a housing scheme at Collinsville has been under reference to the Housing Commission, and I understand that investigations are being made by the Commission with a view to speeding up a building programme of homes at that place. Allotments of land—1 to 12 of section 47, Town of Collinsville—have been relinquished by the Mines Department so that they may be set apart under The State Housing Acts. Arrangements have been made with the manager of the State Mine for the services of two employees of the mine to be made available for at least two days per fortnight to keep grease traps free of any matter which might foul the drainage system and cause the effluent from the huts now being used to collect in stagnant pools. The manager has been instructed to see that drains are clear at all times. While awaiting the result of the Housing Commission's activities repairs to the huts are being effected and they are being maintained in an habitable condition."

QUEENSLAND RADIUM INSTITUTE.

Mr. TURNER (Kelvin Grove), without notice, asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

"Has his attention been drawn to a statement appearing in the Brisbane 'Telegraph' of 2nd inst. that Melbourne is to have the first cancer institute to be established in Australia?"

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers) replied—

"Yes. I have noted the statement referred to and would point out that Queensland established its Radium Institute in 1944 upon the recommendation of Dr. Ralston Paterson, Director of the Holt Radium Institute, Manchester, England, who visited Queensland and the Southern States at the end of 1943 to advise the respective State Governments on a set-up for cancer treatment.

"The development of the Queensland Radium Institute as illustrated in its second annual report to Parliament last year prompted Dr. Paterson to write to the Queensland Government last December congratulating the Institute on the very rapid progress it had made. Dr. Paterson said that it was a source of great satisfaction to him to know that the Queensland plans had matured so successfully and completely and that at the moment of his writing the Queensland Radium Institute constituted the only positive achievement resulting from his visit to the Commonwealth.

"The scheme implemented by the Queensland Government includes free treatment and free transport facilities for any sufferer regardless of means from any part of Queensland to the treatment centre.

"Sub-centres of the Queensland Radium Institute have been established at Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, and Cairns, and the Radiotherapist of the Institute also visits Maryborough and Bundaberg."

FORM OF QUESTIONS.

EDITING BY MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (11.7 a.m.): **Mr. Speaker**, as Question No. 7 (with reference to the Commonwealth Coal Board and Blair Athol) has been altered without reference to me and has now an entirely different meaning, I desire to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a matter for the hon. member. Whilst we are on this important matter I should like to make a statement. I preserved all that part of the question of which the hon. member for Windsor gave notice that was of an interrogative nature. The part of the question disallowed dealt with a hypothetical proposition, and also asked whether certain statements of a private individual published in the Press were true and, as hon. members know, questions of that kind are not permissible.

I might add that if hon. members would endeavour to have their questions phrased more in consonance with Parliamentary standards they would appreciably lessen the onerous duty laid upon me of editing them.

Mr. RUSSELL (Dalby), proceeding to give notice of question to the Premier—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the hon. member, he being a new member, that he should avoid comment as much as possible in asking questions.

PAPER.

The following paper was laid on the table—
Balance-sheet of the Queensland Trustees Ltd. as at 30 June, 1947.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DEBATE.

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

“That under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the period allotted to Debate on the Address in Reply be further extended to nine full sitting days.”

Motion agreed to.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—EIGHTH ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 262) on Mr. Crowley's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (11.20 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, first of all I take this opportunity as Leader of this party of congratulating you on again being appointed Speaker of this House. As you know, there have been times when I have disagreed with your rulings, but I appreciate that you had a very difficult position to fill. You have displayed that sense of fair play which is essential in any Speaker of an Assembly such as this.

Fortunately, as a member of the Empire Parliamentary Association throughout the British Empire, I have had the opportunity of seeing our great British House of Commons in action, and I must say that that was an inspiration to me. I appreciated in particular the splendid dignity in the House of Commons attaching to the Speaker. For a number of years, Captain Fitzroy was Speaker of the House of Commons. He was elected on a non-party basis. Now, Sir Clifton Brown is the Speaker. He occupied that high office during the war years and now, although a Labour Government are in power, he has been re-elected.

In England no party ever opposes the Speaker in his constituency.

Mr. Moore: Do you approve of that?

Mr. PIE: If we could get a splendid officer we should not, and I am not saying we should not approve of it in the case of our present Speaker.

This is a precedent that every British Parliament could adopt—the Speaker of the House must forever be free from any party political affiliation. Sir Clifton Brown was Speaker of the House of Commons during the war years and occupies that same office when a Labour Government are in power. I understand that the Premier will be going overseas next year and I hope that he will take advantage—I know he will—of visiting the House of Commons regularly to see the Mother of British Parliaments in action. We have a wonderful organisation over there in the Empire Parliamentary Association and any member of Parliament can appreciate its value to his parliamentary education. It was an inspiration to me to see on the front benches men such as Churchill, Attlee, Bevin, Anthony Eden, and others during the war years fighting for the British Empire with one common purpose. They forgot party politics and that Parliament became the greatest Parliament the British nation has ever had. My one regret is that it was not continued into the peace, because the problems associated with the rehabilitation of our great British Empire are very real and almost as great as those of the war years.

Before proceeding with my speech in general, I must say that I regret the episode in this Chamber the other day in which you had to call a Minister of the Crown to order. That, Mr. Speaker, I take it, was due entirely to a misunderstanding and I wish the public to know that the Secretary for Public Instruction did not realise that you were calling him to order. I regret that so much publicity was made of it. I mention this to protect the Minister. It was purely a misunderstanding and I do not desire the public to think that the general outlook of Parliament can be judged on such an episode.

I pay tribute to the new members in this Assembly on both sides of the House. The result of the last election has brought to Parliament men who are prepared to rise and say what they think, to bring some new thought into the debate, irrespective of party political affiliation. I repeat I pay tribute to these new members, and particularly to the hon. member for Nundah. He made an excellent speech. I did not agree with it all, of course, but he made an excellent speech on where this State stood with regard to the Commonwealth's infiltration into the sphere of our great State Parliaments.

Then we had the hon. member for Cairns, who was very nervous, just as I was when I came here as an Independent with no-one to whom I could refer as to what I should or should not do. I can tell the House that the sweat trickled down my back when I made my first speech in Parliament.

Mr. Macdonald: Icy cold.

Mr. PIE: And icy cold, too. In my opinion the hon. member for Mirani made one of the best maiden speeches I have ever

heard in this House, and this because he was speaking about things of which he had a great and abounding knowledge. It was a pleasure to listen to him.

The same may be said of the hon. member for Dalby, who spoke about things that mean so much to this country—the great outback of which some of us have not the great knowledge he possesses.

The dairying industry was covered by the hon. member for Wide Bay. The hon. member for Cooroola brought us a practical knowledge of railway work. The hon. member for Nanango brought us inspiration in connection with the ideals and principles that we should all endeavour to carry out, and the hon. member for Warwick played his part.

Then there are my own new members. I am really proud of their first efforts. I pay tribute to the hon. member for East Toowoomba and the hon. member for Hamilton on their maiden efforts in this House. They certainly have nothing to be ashamed of in that direction.

I wish to pay tribute now to God himself for the splendid rains that we have had in the last few days, rains that mean so much to the future of this great country. I had the opportunity of going out West to Cloncurry and Mount Isa and through to Charleville. Then the country was parched and dry. While I was out there rain came, and when flying back over those areas a few days afterwards I saw what a great difference the rain had made, and was inspired by seeing what this country can do.

I listened to His Excellency's Speech with considerable interest but I really felt a little sorry for him because I believe that in making the Speech of his advisers he was merely reiterating the old story of Labour's broken promises. Beyond a vague 10-year plan, a socialistic plan in which neither we nor any free Australian can believe, and the 40-hour week, there was nothing really new in the Speech. Water conservation, railway improvements, better road transport—every hon. member knows how desperately we need better road transport; a trip over the road from Townsville to Ingham brings that home to one—electricity and irrigation, we have had them all. We have made a record of every promise that the Labour Government have made and to date we have a file containing £26,000,000 worth of broken promises. This file is piling up and hon. members would be surprised at the amount of broken promises the Government have made.

Then we have a file of new promises. The other day the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs mentioned a plan for making an El Dorado of North Queensland. According to "Truth"—and I take it he wrote the article for "Truth"—he plans an El Dorado for the North. Let us read what Mrs. Cain had to say when she returned from the North.

Mr. Jones: Read what I had to say.

Mr. PIE: It would take up too much of my time. Mrs. Cain, the wife of the Vic-

torian Premier, on her return to Brisbane after a holiday on the Barrier Reef, said that conditions on the island on which she stayed were primitive. She said she enjoyed every minute of her holiday on the island and would return there again even if conditions were primitive.

I believe in this State. I know the great natural advantages we have. I have been in Honolulu and I know the beach at Waikiki. That beach could not compare with beaches on our South Coast or North Coast. Sir, around that beach they built the great Royal Hawaiian Hotel, and the services in that and other hotels like it make them famous throughout the world. That is where, I say, we should start. We should not start by getting people up here to see primitive conditions such as those spoken of by Mrs. Cain. We should make certain that when people come here they will have all the comforts they require. That is how we should start off, rather than paying £175,000 for a building in Sydney to encourage people to come to places with these primitive conditions. Let us improve conditions at our tourist resorts and then see to it that the people go there.

This is constructive criticism. I want the Government to reverse their procedure. They should get on with the job of improving the great natural resources and then get the people to come North. Any man knows how unpleasant it is after a hard day's fishing to have to sleep under bad conditions. If you can offer good fishing—and fish abound in Northern waters—you should be able to provide decent conditions for fishermen on their return.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the hon. member for Mundingburra that he obey my call to order.

Mr. Aikens: I only interjected once.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! And I suggest to the hon. member for Windsor that he keep calm.

Mr. PIE: I hope you will give me credit for the time I have lost.

We have another great promiser in connection with hospitals. This promiser is Mr. Coll, and he has promised the expenditure of £150,000 on a wing at the Brisbane General Hospital, and he is going to do other things, despite the fact that the Government have told us definitely that they will decentralise hospitals. There is the promise of expenditure of another £150,000 at Bowen Hills. Mr. Chris. Coll is the promiser. There is also the promise of the expenditure of £200,000 on the Mental Hospital at Indooroopilly.

A new Secretary for Mines has taken the place of the old Minister, and he has made promises about expanded mines production. I have in my hand a photograph of Mr. Foley, taken I should say about 30 years ago, stating that the Government were

hustling on housing and were speeding up timber supplies. On the other hand, we have the timber-getter saying through the A.W.U. to the Government that the conditions under which timber men work are a disgrace to any Labour Government. That was contained in the A.W.U. report, and the Minister who was in charge knows it.

Mr. Jones: Never saw it.

Mr. PIE: I will give him a copy of it if he promises to give it back.

I have got no criticism to make of the Governor of this State. I respect him and his wife—they are grand people—but I deeply deplore attacks on our representative of the King, made in Townsville by the hon. member for Mundingburra and some of his satellites. I am sorry, Sir, that with his tradition and background of service to this great nation he should be—

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I have been wondering what the hon. member was driving at. I understand he refers to a statement some of my colleagues and I made as aldermen of the Townsville City Council concerning the Governor's discourtesy. We made a statement when not under Parliamentary privilege, and we stand up to that. I do not know whether the hon. member is entitled to refer to remarks I made as an alderman.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Let me give a ruling on that point. Any hon. member may refer to such statements in this Chamber.

Mr. PIE: It is apparent that the hon. member for Mundingburra tries to retain for himself a privilege that he does not think anyone else should have. I have come to the conclusion that he can give it but he cannot take it.

Mr. Aikens: Why did you squib on your meeting in Mundingburra? You advertised a meeting and then squibbed on it.

Mr. PIE: I will deal with the hon. member in a moment. I am sorry, as I said before, that Sir John Lavarack, as Governor, loyal to the Empire, should be asked to implement a plan by the Labour Government for the complete socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange, that Communistic principle which should have no place in the economy of a free democracy. Socialism in any form will destroy democracy, just as it is destroying it in England today, and producing the mess we see they are getting into there. You cannot have democracy running side by side with Socialism or any form of totalitarianism.

I am sorry also that the Governor was called upon to deliver a Speech that conveyed such vague proposals. We want constructive immediate planning in this State and such constructive immediate planning as will lift the State from the mire of stagnation industrially, where she is, to the heights of prosperity where our great national resources warrant her being. In this State we have, as I have said over and over again in this House, great natural resources from Cairns

to Coolangatta, awaiting development, but all we hear in this House is promise, promise, promise—things that have never been done. I have frequently said, and I repeat now, that Queensland is the greatest State in the Commonwealth of Australia and that I shall always fight for the rights of this State irrespective of any party affiliations.

The outcome of the recent Premiers' Conference bears out my contention that the State Government can no longer trust the Commonwealth, that the State is being harassed by the power-lusting Commonwealth Government that the Labour Government have consistently helped to elect over the last seven years. The Premier of this State and his Government do not know whether they are coming or going.

And now listen to this: the "Sunday Mail" very aptly expressed what was happening in Australia today when it said that the States had been added to the airlines and the banks, to the growing list of enterprises to be eventually wiped out by the Commonwealth.

The Premier himself, apparently, knew what Mr. Chifley's intention was because, as hon. members know, he is reported as having attacked the Prime Minister personally on the policy of the acquisition of States' sovereign rights, something that was given to us years and years ago. Our State's sovereign rights are now gradually being taken from us by this power-lusting Commonwealth Government.

Let me comment on the Premier's attack. In no unmistakable terms he bravely told the Prime Minister that he would have none of the Southern-controlled Coal Board in Queensland, that Queensland was quite capable of working out its own destiny and of developing the State's valuable coal deposits, and had existing legislation to do so. But what do we find now? Shortly after his return we find that he is working in with the Commonwealth Government in that regard.

That was a grand statement at the time. Every Queenslander applauded it. But now we find that those conditions are not acceptable to the miners. I bet you that within three or four months the Commonwealth Government will control the mines of this State, otherwise we shall not have any mines working. It does not need much imagination to know that.

Then our Premier bravely supported the contention of the Premier of New South Wales that the States were bleeding to death. With Mr. Cain, the Premier of Victoria, he said that the Commonwealth was strangling the States with uniform taxation. Here are the headlines! There is no doubt about it; the Premier certainly got headlines in regard to the whole matter. "The Commonwealth Government was strangling the States," that is what the Premier said. Then he attacked the Prime Minister's taxation programme and told him—

"The Queensland Government would prefer to have the obligation and, if necessary, the odium of imposing its own taxes and the responsibility of spending its own money."

I believe he was right. I believe Queensland needs more money to develop its vast natural resources than a State like Victoria, which is a little pocket-handkerchief State already highly developed compared with ours. We need about five times more than Victoria to develop this great State of ours. I believe the Premier was right.

Then he was more bitter when he attacked the Commonwealth Government on the question of free hospitals, and what the Commonwealth Government would do to this hospital system of ours. He was right in that claim, I am sure, because every hon. member knows the mess that centralised government has meant and what the Commonwealth Government have done, too, in relation to our free hospital system.

The Premier was right, and his statements read to me like the utterances of a strong man fighting for State rights. I was one who applauded those sentiments but in my opinion he actually wrecked all those statements when he returned to Queensland. This is what he said then—

“With care and economy, I feel certain that we shall now be able to prepare a balanced budget for this year,” said the Queensland Premier (Mr. Hanlon) tonight.

“Summing up the Premiers’ Conference at Canberra, he said that he was quite satisfied with the results.

“We did not get everything we asked for, but we did not expect to get everything.”

That statement, following the complete disagreement by the Premier at the Premiers’ Conference, labels him, as I have said on many occasions, as a man with two characters—really a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. I have said that from every political platform because I believe the Premier unwittingly says one thing and a few months afterwards changes it. I say that openly, not under the privilege of Parliament at all.

This admission of the Premier makes it very clear that Mr. Chifley cracked the whip on the Premiers. It is obvious to any man with any brains at all that once the life-blood of any country is taken away, that is, the finance of the country, that country or State like any business cannot function satisfactorily. What does it mean? Queensland has to go down to Canberra and almost plead for funds to develop this great State, and unless the Premier says to the Prime Minister that he will carry out certain obligations we will get no money for the development of this great State. As Mr. Forgan Smith truly said, uniform taxation meant that we shall become a common mendicant dependent on the whims of the Commonwealth Government. What he said would happen years ago is coming about now, because this State is dependent on the Commonwealth Government for funds to develop the State.

I believe that State Labour Governments are on the way out. I believe that the days of some politicians throughout Australia, particularly Labour politicians—not neces-

sarily members of this House—by their present totalitarian actions, by their disregard of the rights of the people, and their attitude in looking after themselves before all others and the people they represent, are numbered. Surely the people in this great free country of ours are not forever going to put up with this politicians’ paradise in this country; this paradise of salary grabs when all wages are pegged, of political pensions when other people within the Civil Service have not enough in their pensions to live on; of unlimited travelling expenses? Every Federal member who goes abroad is entitled to £100 a week for travelling expenses, and he lives in a suite at the Savoy—these grand Labour politicians who have been on unlimited unnecessary overseas trips. Some of us saw that cartoon recently in which there was hardly a Minister in Canberra. Ward, Calwell, Dedman, Evatt—all were spending our money at a time when all people are called upon to contribute to the nation’s economy. The political appointments of the Hon. Mr. Makin, the Hon. Mr. Forde, the Hon. Mr. Beasley, and last but not least, Mr. Stockwell, in this State, are all breaches of decency and honesty in the political sphere.

I believe also that the results of the last State election, combined with the Senate election, proves conclusively that this Labour Government are in power on a minority. It does not matter which way you look at it. I took a few figures out and I have them here; and dissecting them shows this result very clearly: Labour got 272,350 and the Opposition 288,778 votes.

Mr. Moore: How many did your party get?

Mr. PIE: This has been made up with Queensland People’s Party votes—the hon. member can have a look at them—168,092 and Country Party 120,686. That is not taking Independents into account, because we allocated Independents in the area where they should be: if someone was supporting Labour we put them into Labour and if someone was our way we put them our way. Taking these figures into account—and they were taken from what was tabled in this House; I do not know whether they have been altered since—the total we got is 52 per cent. of the votes, while the Government and Independent supporters represent only 46 per cent. of the people of this State.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. PIE: The Communists with them. We do not want any truck with the Communists—I will say that now; their thoughts and mine are totally different. I think the hon. member for South Brisbane knows that too.

We have proved in our speeches in this House on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition that this State Government hold their power by juggled electoral boundaries, stuffed rolls, and corrupt campaign practices; and last, but not least, actually on a minority vote.

We do not make these statements without proof. If this Government want proof we can give them statutory declarations one after the other. We had them photostated so that if the police raided us—which they threatened through the Government to do—we could give them a photostat copy of every statutory declaration. If you saw some of them it would make your hair stand on end. We want a public inquiry into this thing for all time.

The hon. member for Kelvin Grove said, "Why didn't you have an inquiry into Kelvin Grove?" We intended to do.

Mr. Turner: I never said that.

Mr. PIE: We had all the facts and we submitted them to counsel because we believed we had a case in relation to an Elections Tribunal, but he ruled otherwise. That is the reason—because in his opinion we could not prove that there were sufficient votes in dispute to alter the result of the election. We thought there were but now we cannot have an Elections Tribunal. We want a complete examination of all the proof we have. Here is one beautiful example that would stir any man in relation to election malpractices.

Mr. Bruce: You can table that.

Mr. PIE: Yes, I will table it for every hon. member to see. It is a challenge that the Minister will be sorry he made. (Whereupon the hon. member laid the paper on the table.) It is a photostat copy of a statutory declaration that will open the eyes of every hon. member of this Parliament. We are not afraid to stand by all our statements and I am not making them under privilege of this House. I will make them anywhere. We can prove conclusively that we have the evidence that warrants a complete investigation of the whole position.

There is one other important matter that I must bring forward today. It is of vital importance to this country and to our great British Empire because Australia's future is irrevocably linked with the future of our great British Empire. Britain's present and future economic problems are very real. As you know, two and a-half years ago, a week after V.E. Day, I had the opportunity of travelling over Germany, visiting Essen, Cologne, Belsen, and other places, and in 2,000 miles of travel I saw what had happened in Europe and the problem Britain would have to face in the years ahead. I realised that she would have to take the responsibility, otherwise the great Russian menace would come down, as it is doing now, and gradually Communism would take over the whole of Europe.

I shall never forget that journey. Leaving Bremen one Sunday morning I asked about the smell and was informed that there were 110,000 dead lying under the ruins of Bremen. The whole picture was of tremendous significance. It made one realise that 22 miles across the Channel—a distance from Brisbane to Ipswich—was Great Britain, which had the responsibility of looking after Central Europe. At that time high-ranking officers said to me and others, "Let us get

this job over now. Let us finish this Russian menace, otherwise it will come down eventually and destroy Europe." If there are any who need clarification of that they can read it in the report of 40 pages that I tabled in this House and also sent to the Prime Minister. I wrote of a journey through desolation, giving a picture of the happenings in Europe and the responsibilities that Britain would have to face.

I repeat, as I have said hundreds of times, that Britain alone has no future as a leading world nation—and do not twist this for political purposes—but Britain combined with our great British Empire can lead the world for many generations. Australia, Canada and South Africa and other parts of the British Empire have vast natural resources that are waiting development. We Australians have to be prepared to play our part in this difficult period through which Great Britain is passing.

To any thoughtful person it is obvious that today Britain cannot afford to pay for what she buys from us. The shortages in Australia of imported goods are very real. Only this morning the Commonwealth Government brought out restrictions on importations from dollar-exchange countries, but that has been happening for ages. One could not bring in anything from America for the last three months without establishing its essentiality, without proving to the Customs Department that it should be brought to this country.

We Australians must give more to the Mother Country, and I ask every Australian in this House who has friends in Great Britain to keep on sending parcels. I send about 14 a month, and the letters I get back from the recipients are a revelation. I remember having dinner one night with friends of mine, and I discovered afterwards that they had been round to their neighbours borrowing things in order to give me something to eat. Now that man wonders why I have not missed sending a parcel to him every month.

But we Australians must not be fools to ourselves. We have great natural resources waiting to be developed. Take our great wool industry alone. Anything up to 10,000,000 people could be employed in the secondary industries that use wool as a raw material. Before the war we exported about 65,000,000 lb. of wool out of a total of 75,000,000. We could develop great industries to employ our own people. I am trying to do that myself. We have established spinning and weaving, in which we shall use 15,000 lb. of wool a week. Instead of for ever remaining a primary-producing State, shipping our raw materials to other countries where they establish secondary industries, we must process here and employ our own people.

I repeat that we must not be fools to ourselves, for I can prove that there is a disregard of what Australia is doing. One great product that can be produced in Great Britain is being exported to South Africa, Australia, and other countries in the world—

I refer to certain canned goods—while the same canned product is being imported by Britain from Canada. Today 900,000 cases of these particular canned goods are going from Canada to the British Ministry of Food for use in Britain, and in Europe, and this at a time when Britain is exporting the very same goods to Australia.

Again, we are a great producer of beef extract. Britain will buy all that we can produce. She is buying it from America, too, and using up hard dollar exchange, yet what is happening? Bovril and other beef extracts are being sent back from England to Australia, America, and other parts of the world, back to countries that have everything they need in that line. It is for that reason that I say we Australians must not be fools to ourselves. We must tell the British people, as I have told them on many occasions in Bradford, Manchester, and other places, that if they want to keep Australia British they must bring their industries to our country and build them round the natural resources we possess. If that is done we shall become the exporter for the British Empire.

The position in Britain is acute, as the following extract from a letter addressed to me from Manchester, dated 26 August, shows:—

“I quite agree that it is galling that we should have to turn business away like this, but unfortunately we are not making very much headway from a production point of view in this country. If we could only get Mr. Churchill back again, and get this Socialist Government out, we might get on with the job. The Socialist Government have promised all the workers shorter hours and larger pay packets, but they have forgotten to tell them that they have to get down to work. The sooner someone tells them this—and they act upon it—the better it will be for all.

“However, we are now in the throes of a crisis—and we shall just have to see how they tackle it. No-one has any confidence, and business men cannot therefore conduct their businesses as they would wish to do.”

That is the very position that will develop in Australia under socialisation of industry. Already people are a little shaky on Blair Athol. Why? They do not want to be Bill the Goose and build up a great industry for the Government to take over when they get it going.

Is it not obvious that the whole position needs going into thoroughly before such a great step is taken? I could go on for a long while dealing with these matters—I am only halfway through what I have to say.

(Time expired.)

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (The Tableland—Secretary for Public Instruction) (12 noon): I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment, and I offer congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and some of the younger members of the Opposition on their excellent speeches.

I do not intend to deal with any of the election matters that have arisen out of the

unsavoury minds of the Queensland People's Party, but I intend to reply to the hon. member for Aubigny in regard to roads. Recently he announced that the people in his electorate and surrounding districts were very badly handicapped by a shortage of main roads. I decided to get out the figures, to see whether the hon. member was telling the truth. In 1920 the late W. N. Gillies put through this House a Main Roads Act and had it not been for that and had a Tory Party remained in power we probably should have had today some of the old roads we had when we took office in 1932. Since that time a network of roads has been built throughout the State.

In the Aubigny and Dalby electorates since 1932 the following amounts have been spent on main roads—

Aubigny electorate—£803,900—permanent work and maintenance.

Dalby electorate—£800,900—permanent work and maintenance.

That, however, does not tell the whole story, because in 1932, when the Labour Party came back to power, there were miles and miles of road between here and Toowoomba in its natural state. Every yard of that road today is bitumened. The road from Warwick to Brisbane through Cunningham's Gap has shortened the distance between those two places by a considerable number of miles. The Toowoomba-Warwick section was connected and that road goes right through to the border. People must realise, of course, that there was a big hold-up in main-road activities during the war period, but the policy followed by a Labour Government in 1932 is being continued under the Main Roads Commission.

When I was in control the Act was amended to enable feeder roads to be built in conjunction with main roads. Many people, I know, said when we were building main roads that they were tourist roads, but we had to get a general skeleton of main roads before we could deal with the more immediate necessity to the farmers, the feeder roads. The legislation was amended accordingly, but I did not overlook those interested in mining because the amendment included mining access roads.

Grants up to 50 per cent. over long-term periods were provided to enable councils to build urgently needed roads. I will tell hon. members a story. I went to Dalby and saw the Wambo Shire Council and I said, “If you accept this offer of a 50-per-cent. grant to build main roads, we will give you the right alignments.” Quite a number of the councillors said, “The chairman is against it,” to which I replied, “But can you not outvote the chairman?” Eventually they did and today Dalby has some splendid roads. In the days of the Tory Government it could boast of no roads at all but then this change came and it has that excellent road connecting Dalby to Bell, which goes on to Kingaroy. It has also the Condamine Highway. Indeed, by the adoption of the system of 50 per cent. loan and 50 per cent. grant the Dalby people have been able to build roads radiating in all directions

from Dalby and numerous roads connecting with either a main road or a railway line. So it can be seen that the hon. member for Aubigny has very little reason to complain.

A great deal has been said on the subject of banks and banking. I am not going to express my private opinion about banking but I do intend to give the views of several eminent men on the subject and I am going to point out some of the things that have happened under the system of private banking that could not possibly happen with a Commonwealth-controlled bank. Lest someone should ask what I am quoting from I want to say right away that it is from "The Economic Record, No. 17," and I suggest that hon. members should have a look at it in the Parliamentary library. It says—

"The phrase 'Nationalisation of Banking and Credit' excites in the minds of some people a picture of outrageous Communistic tyranny; while in others it conjures up visions of a veritable paradise of order and prosperity."

Further on it says—

"The power vested in the controllers of monetary policy transcends in many respects the power vested in governments and in parliaments. It matters not that those who have in the past been charged with these tremendous powers have been only partly conscious of their ascendancy. The fact remains they have had possession of a mechanism, the ill-management of which has reduced the commercial world to chaos, de-spoiled the workers of the hard-won standards, precipitated millions of toilers into hopeless unemployment and whole communities and nations into bankruptcy and despair.

"If these consequences are attributable to the money power; if the management of the banking system and the creation, contraction and control of credit can have such a widespread influence, the argument in favour of bringing the responsible instrumentalities under public control is well-nigh irresistible."

Later it says—

"The notion that the banks are the repositories of all wisdom in the matter of monetary control, and should be left in undisturbed possession of their assumed right to be the arbiters of monetary policy and to create and direct the flow of credit, is now being rudely shaken even in conservative England.

"Sir Arthur Salter, a noted economist and former director of the Economic Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, in his recent Alfred Marshall lectures at Cambridge University, suggested a plan by which the Bank of England should confine its future function to the issue of credit, but that the policy for the determination of the quantum of credit, and the channels into which the credit should be directed—in other words, the determinant of monetary policy—should be a public authority set up under the sanction of the Government of the day."

"The bank," he says, "surely ought not to decide itself, on its own authority and with its present constitution, whether policy should, for example, during a given period, be directed towards securing an upward or a downward movement of prices. The Bank is admirably fitted to be an executant of general policy but not to determine it. Plain policy should, I suggest, be laid down by the Government, which in turn should itself be advised by persons reflecting the views of those engaged in all the main activities of the country."

It has been suggested during the debate that the politicians would control the banks if they were nationalised. The banks would be controlled by people who would be appointed by the Government. If the Government are competent to appoint men to the High Court of Australia, men who must be above suspicion and carry a tremendous responsibility, surely that same Government could appoint competent men to take control of banking when the banks are nationalised.

Then I have a book bearing the title, "The British Empire in Australia," written by Brian Fitzpatrick. This book describes the achievements of the Tory Party. It depicts things that could not happen under a nationalised system of banking. It says—

"Next month other bank failures began, with the suspension of payments by the old Bank of Van Diemen's Land, the British Bank of Australia, and the Anglo-Australian Bank. In March, 1892, the Mercantile Bank of Victoria suspended payments, the first of the Associated Banks to do so. Runs on the bank's deposits were becoming commonplace, and insolvencies in 1890-92 were 2,600 in number, with aggregate liabilities of £6,500,000. In all the colonies in 1891, more than 2,400 insolvents were recorded, with liabilities totalling more than £3,000,000. Everything was slumping. Taxation per head in Victoria fell off from £3 9s. 8d. in 1889 to £2 14s. 5d. in 1892 and in a similar comparison Customs revenue went down half a million pounds (or about one-sixth of total revenue). At the beginning of 1893 the Federal Bank suspended payment, and on 5 April the pioneer in the land-mortgage business, the Commercial of Australia, which was one of the largest and best regarded of Victorian banks, started a real panic when it closed its doors. Twelve of the great banks of issue in the three eastern colonies followed suit within little more than a month, and went into 'reconstruction.' They were liable at the moment of suspension of payments, for deposits to the value of £72,000,000, nearly one-third of which was due to depositors overseas. The London, the English, Scottish, and Australian, and the Australian Joint Stock were among the most important of the twelve, which numbered five Victorian concerns, two New South Wales, three Queensland, and two British. The aggregate of their liabilities was £103,300,000, or £11,000,000 more than the aggregate liabilities of the banks still open. (Of the suspended banks' deposits, £10,000,000

was at current account and £7,000,000 was Government money.) In reconstruction the dozen banks wrote off £1,100,000 of their £8,300,000 aggregate paid-up capital and called up £6,200,000 fresh capital, including £1,600,000 from shareholders on London register."

A worker in this State did not have very much money—he was not paid very much—but in the aggregate many workers had money in the banks that represented their life earnings; and they were completely swept away and taken from them by the banks. An hon. member the other day mentioned Ned Kelly. Well, Mr. Speaker, these Ned Kellys were the shining representatives of the Tory Party—these Ned Kellys, who controlled the banks, these fellows who robbed the workers, were the shining representatives of the Tory Party of that day. Today we have the same representation on the other side.

Mr. Morris interjected.

Mr. BRUCE: I am not telling hon. members what they want me to tell them. The people who argue against the nationalisation of banks are entirely insincere or ignorant.

The Fisher Government introduced the Commonwealth Bank Act, and you can see the cartoons that were published at that time—all the papers are there in the library—showing the worker taking home his day's wages, which were represented by a barrowload of bank notes. That was the sort of rubbish they put over in those days. Now that it is proposed to make this bank a complete bank in the interests of the people, one created by the people for the people, with their money under the Commonwealth control, our critics say, "Socialistic control." Every penny is the money of the people yet it is in control of the people who are making money out of the people. If that money belongs to the people, who has a better right to take control and guard that money than the people?

Mr. Chalk: That is what Hitler said in 1930.

Mr. BRUCE: Hitler said a lot of things.

Mr. Chalk: You can see the result of it.

Mr. BRUCE: I will deal with Hitler very shortly. I might satisfy my little friend on the corner by dealing with an educational question. Some controversy arose over the appointment as a State school teacher of a gentleman called Mr. Stockwell. First I want to state that Mr. Stockwell forfeited £6 a week in salary by taking the present job. I knew nothing about Mr. Stockwell till the hon. member for Enoggera asked a question in this House. I gave a statement to the Press that reads as follows:—

"Had the Teachers' Union Secretary, Mr. Daughtrey, asked him about the appointment as school teacher of Mr. Stockwell who was Labour candidate for Wide Bay and a former A.W.U. organiser he would have investigated the appointment, the Education Minister, Mr. Bruce, said last night."

"Mr. Daughtrey preferred, however, to state his case through the Press," Mr. Bruce added.

"He was replying to a 'Courier-Mail' leading article which said that 'It was understandable that the Teachers' Union should be asking questions.'

"Mr. Bruce added that neither the union nor Mr. Daughtrey had asked him a question on the subject either in writing or verbally. The first query came from Mr. Morris, M.L.A., in Parliament.

"Because he had left for the North seven weeks before the elections he had not known Mr. Stockwell, and the first he had heard of him was when he saw his name amongst the list of candidates sent to him for checking results on the night of the election.

"To a question in the leading article: 'If Mr. Stockwell had not been a Labour candidate in the last State election and an A.W.U. organiser, would the Department of Education have considered that he was sufficiently qualified to start teaching?' Mr. Bruce replied: 'This question will be answered at an early date.'"

I gave a statement to the Press. I might mention here that these people who try to teach me are sadly lacking in education and this will be proved very clearly by what I am about to say.

Mr. Morris: Have we not the right to ask a question?

Mr. BRUCE: I am not referring to the hon. member. He should not be so sensitive, and I would ask him to listen carefully to what I am about to say.

This is the statement given to the roundsman of the "Courier-Mail," Mr. Dick—

"In regard to sleeper cutting," continued Mr. Bruce, "there is a book that Mr. Daughtrey, if unable to purchase, should get in any lending library, called 'From Log Cabin to White House'; the chief character in this book had to fell the timber and split the logs in order to erect a home for himself. For Mr. Daughtrey's benefit, I just wish to state that this same character later on reached a very prominent position in his own country.'"

"From Log Cabin to White House" dealt with the life of President Garfield, but the "Courier-Mail" suggests that I might find in Mr. Stockwell another Abraham Lincoln. This in the sub-leader of a paper that sets out to teach me! "From Log Cabin to White House" did not deal with President Lincoln at all, but, I repeat, with President Garfield. I would impress on hon. members that I did not mention the name of Abraham Lincoln, but the people who want to educate me, the "Courier-Mail," come in with this sub-leader—

"That School Appointment.

"The argument that has arisen between the Minister for Education, Mr. Bruce, and the Secretary of the Teachers' Union, Mr. Daughtrey, over the appointment of Mr. Stockwell, defeated Labour candidate for

Wide Bay, to a teaching post at the Childers State School can be reduced to this simple question—"

They then state the question, and later state—

"Mr. Stockwell may have a natural gift for teaching. He may even be another Lincoln, as Mr. Bruce seems to suggest he might be."

Let me tell the "Courier-Mail" now that if they want to refer to President Lincoln in the future they should read "The Pioneer Boy," which deals with his life. Here we have a man being paid a high salary, who apparently either does not know or is too lazy to do any research, writing a leading article criticising the Government and trying to tell me something about education. I am quite sure that Mr. Stockwell would have known that Lincoln was not the leading character in "From Log Cabin to White House."

Mr. Aikens: I will wager that your remarks will not appear in the "Courier-Mail."

Mr. BRUCE: That does not worry me. I have made my point.

I have not travelled outside Australia, but I have travelled a good deal in Queensland and Australia and have met many men who, if Mr. Stockwell is unqualified, would also be unqualified to hold their positions. Simply because a man has not passed a certain examination is no reason why he should be debarred from teaching, particularly when we realise how extremely short of teachers we are at the present time. I know of one man who had been cutting cordwood for the Mount Cuthbert Smelters. With a few strokes of a charcoal stick on a wall that man could do black and white sketches that were almost the equal of those of Phil May. Probably the only reason why his ability was not recognised was that he was a hard worker who made big money on contract and who went on the booze every party day.

Then, in some of the hotels in the North there are works of art by men, all of whom have been workers, that would equal the work of recognised artists. In Gordonvale there is a painting of a horse the equal of anything done by any other artist in the land.

Then there is the case of the man in the North who mined and smelted his own tin and made a set of false teeth equal to any set that any dentist in Brisbane could make. The "Courier-Mail" might find that suitable for Ripley's feature. If there is any doubt about what I say, members of the Assembly and my private secretary and another officer saw those teeth recently. The "Courier-Mail" can ask its representative in the North to see them if they want to publish it in Ripley's feature. The man who made the teeth would not be allowed to practise dentistry but he made those teeth out of tin and they were the equal of anything any dentist could make.

He is dead now, but I knew him and he wore those teeth for years. If anybody suggested that man had the qualifications of a dentist there would be an uproar.

I want to say a word or two in connection with teaching generally, and to say that there is more interest in culture by certain people in the world today than towards Christianity. The hon. member for Windsor mentioned his visit to Europe. Education covers the world and I believe that had more attention been paid throughout the world to the Christian doctrine and less to culture what the hon. member saw in Europe would not have occurred. We are continually hearing talk about culture but many people cannot give you the definition of the word. Let us look at the teachings of Christ, who was a carpenter. He was the greatest teacher the world ever knew. He had no qualifications and had not passed the Senior or some such examination. His father was a carpenter and he followed his father's occupation. Will anybody deny that he was the greatest teacher in the world?

Mr. Aikens: He could neither read nor write.

At 12.32 p.m.,

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

Mr. BRUCE: He was crucified by the people very largely who advocate certain forms of culture today. Hitler had culture but his culture started with the letter "K." It was a form of culture. People are trying to push all classes of culture onto the Department of Public Instruction. There will be other Hitlers and other men with subversive ideas and other men who are not interested in the well-being of the people as a whole. I say today, speaking as Secretary for Public Instruction, that fundamentally we should be teaching our youngsters to take their places in life when they leave school.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRUCE: People often come along with cranky and crazy ideas, to overload the curriculum in the name of culture. Fundamentally our job is to make them good Australians and train our youngsters to carry out a job of work when they leave school.

On one occasion when I was presiding at an education conference, a teacher moved that the school age should be two years. I said that if some people had their way they would be up at the maternity homes waiting to take the children as they were born. Most of us in this House have been brought up in the country or the bush; some have not—they are unlucky. I was brought up in the country and the happiest days of my life were my pre-school days. Later on, at school, I did not have a bad time, but I say that there is a tendency today to take away the joy of life from children—the joy of life that is their absolute right. There are many people who want to take charge of children

and direct them from the time they can walk; we should give our children the greatest freedom it is possible to give them. They tell us that the psychologist can look the child over and decide what he is suited for.

Mr. Morris: Do you not believe in that?

Mr. BRUCE: I do not. The better way is for the school-teacher to deal kindly and properly with the child and so find out what the child wants to do; in that way you win the greater part of the battle. What person over 40 can say what a child is thinking? Can he say that the child is suited for this or for that? If you want to build up a dictatorship that is the way to do it. The important thing is to find out what the child is doing.

Prior to the war perhaps a young fellow was guilty of stealing a motor-car and given a month. I would have given him 12 months in a garage and we should have had damn' good mechanics today. A working lad may be a born mechanic simply breaking his heart to be in charge of a car or other machine. He steps into a motor-car and drives it away. I am not talking now about the professional black-marketeers. If that lad had been given 12 months in a garage we should have had the finest set of mechanics in Queensland today.

A child between 4 and 9 years of age does a great deal more thinking than many hon. members in this Chamber are doing. Most of our school teachers are in close association with the children and by their kindly contact, which exists in most cases, they can find out what the child is doing, but I do not think that a man up in years can, by looking at the face of a child to see whether he has long ears or brown eyes, decide what the child is suited for. Apart from that, such a person would have an unconscious bias of some sort and that would operate to the detriment of the child. I have no desire to go into details, but how many men who have risen to great heights would have reached those positions if they had been hand-picked and sent to certain occupations? What would have happened to Dr. Bradfield in those circumstances? He might have become a dentist or a farm labourer, or a carpenter. Once you find out what the child requires you have overcome much of the handicap of living.

Mr. Morris: That is the whole policy.

Mr. BRUCE: Only the teacher can do that. No-one can decide that simply by looking the child over. It can be done only by the school teacher in close contact with the child. If you could find out just what the child was thinking you would probably know that he could tell his examiner what was best for him rather than that his examiner would be able to tell the child what was the best for him. (Laughter.) Have a talk with a child of 8, 9 or 10 years and you will get much knowledge. He will be able to tell you something about life.

The opportunities open to children under our educational system should undoubtedly be enlarged. There is no reason why a working man's son should be debarred

by his father's lack of funds from receiving an education similar to that available to the son of a wealthy man.

(Time expired.)

Mr. JESSON (Kennedy) (12.41 p.m.): I wish to offer my congratulations to Sir John Lavarack on being appointed to his present high office of Governor of Queensland. I wish to tender my congratulations to Mr. Speaker, also, and yourself, Mr. Mann, on your re-election to your exalted offices, to hon. members who have been returned at the election, and to the new hon. members.

At the outset I intend to reply to a number of charges that were made against my scrutineers and myself, in addition to apologising for the treatment meted out to the scrutineers of the Queensland People's Party in my electorate, because if all that was alleged took place they must have aided and abetted me in committing breaches of the Elections Acts and carrying out malpractices. I emphatically deny all the statements made. I shall prove quite conclusively to this House and the people outside that propaganda was indulged against me for over two and a-half years. During my speech I shall fit each part into its proper perspective. They all lead up to the vindictiveness that has been shown against me. I shall also show that many thousands of pounds were spent against me in the Kennedy electorate in an effort to oust me.

The Queensland People's Party sent crying, begging letters to the people. I shall show them that hundreds of pounds, in fact thousands, were expended in that effort. I shall tell you how much money would have been spent to try to oust me if the basic wage was paid to its employees in the electorate, to cover the vanity, mendacity, and vindictiveness of the miniature Fuehrer in this House—he even imitates him with the "little bit" under his nose. He said he could not join the Labour Party on account of having a big business, but he crawled into this Parliament on the backs of the workers in the Hamilton electorate. Then, having got into Parliament, he went overseas, where he was told by his Fascist friends how to build up and educate the people, and what to do when he came back from this election. (Laughter.) It is quite all right, I have definite proof of this.

Mr. Pie: Say that outside this House and you will see what will happen to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Brand: Are you game to say it outside? (Interjections.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask hon. members on my left to obey my call to order. I also ask the hon. member for Kennedy to address the Chair.

Mr. JESSON: Before I was so rudely and disgustingly interrupted by the hon. member for Isis, who, by the way, has only made his appearance here after a fortnight's absence, I was about to say that the hon. member for Windsor on his return from

overseas gave a lecture in this House and talked about devastated Germany—he was a V.I.P. across there—and I then pricked his little bubble by asking him to tell us something about Coventry. From then onwards he started a campaign of vindictiveness against me. In the last Session of Parliament I exposed some of his smart tactics in regard to certain of his business activities. He did not like that. In fact, he resented it very much. That possibly accounted for the fact that in the recent election he addressed meetings of the electors of Kennedy on no fewer than nine occasions.

Mr. Pie: I got 700 at my meeting whereas you got only nine.

Mr. JESSON: I will tell the hon. member something about that before I finish. He is nothing more than a Chicago gangster.

Let us go a bit further. He at a later date goes on with his tactics. He goes up to the Kennedy electorate, he and his other storm-trooper friend, and they start operations against me in February. The hon. member for Windsor did the same thing as he did in this House. He went round trying to put the minds of the people against me. These tactics, the same as those adopted by people who lower the prestige of Governments, were carried out in Germany before the Nazis captured the Reich. All those tactics were used—slandering good people to such a degree that they thought they would get the sympathy of the people and oust this Government. Lo and behold, I came back here after being up to my electorate, and I was in the House one day when the member for Enoggera approached me and asked me what my chances were. I said I thought I had a pretty good chance. He asked me if I had any money to bet. I said “I have not any money, but I can soon get some.” He said, “I do not know where this chap is at the moment; I will make some inquiries.” He left me about 3 or 4 o’clock and made an appointment with this chap to meet me to back Johnston, my opponent, for £200 or £300. They tried to trap me into making a bet. I made the appointment for 5 o’clock. I went to the appointed place and who should be there but Storm-trooper Major Hall, the organiser of the Queensland People’s Party, and a witness, waiting for me to lay a bet so that they could oust me if I won the election campaign. I went along to the place and met these gentlemen, and I said, “It is you, is it?” because I had a very unpleasant experience with this Storm-trooper Major Hall in Ingham, when he was going to clout me—punch me drunk—in a hotel.

Mr. Morris: You did bet with him up there?

Mr. JESSON: I did not have a bet with him; a friend bet him, and he has not paid yet. I will tell you about the incident at the hotel. I went along and when a friend of mine came out I mentioned the fact. I said, “If you want to bet you can have a bet with them.” (Opposition interjections.) I am telling the House facts. They came

out and Hall said, “I want to put £15 on Johnston.” This chap said, “Go away; do not talk to me about £15. I do not want to bet with you; I want to bet with Jesson.” I said, “I know a little mate of mine who will bet you £15 if you want some money.” I brought the mate out. He said, “No, I do not want to bet with you; I want to bet with Jesson; you are nobody.” One chap, a prominent business man, said, “What do you think we are—a lot of mugs to fall for your stuff? Get off the premises and don’t try to put that over Jesson and me.” They slunk off like dingoes. That is No. 1.

After that I went to Ingham and walked in with Watson, a farmer, Cosgrove, a business man, and Melville, who owns the hotel. We were standing in the hotel and I was talking business with Watson about some money he is getting from the Agricultural Bank, and in walked drunken Hall. “Hullo, Nugget Jesson, I didn’t meet you before,” he said. I said, “Whom are you calling ‘Nugget’ Jesson?” He said, “Your friends call you that.” I said, “You don’t happen to be a friend.” He wanted me to have a drink and I said, “I will have a drink.” When we had the drink he said, “Are you going to shout back?” and I said, “No.” (Laughter.) I repeated that I only drink with my friends. I then walked out of the hotel. That was at lunch-time. That afternoon the storm-trooper, after getting instructions from his headquarters in Brisbane, came with the candidate, whom I had only seen once before. He walked about and shook hands with different people and I thought he would say to me, “Well, the best man wins,” but no—he came across and abused me on false information that was retailed him by his storm-trooper, Wanstall—the little chap that tries to emulate Little Willie of Kaiser Bill fame.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member would be better served if he referred to hon. members of this House by their correct titles.

Mr. JESSON: The fact remains that they came around and when I shook hands with this gentleman he gave a sort of little pull towards him. I used my shoulders and pushed him back and said something about his calling me some very nasty names. He told me to commit a lot of certain offences on myself. (Opposition laughter.) I am telling the truth. It may seem laughable to the dills over there laughing—the loud laughter that speaks the vacant mind of the over-educated with too much money. I repeat that I am telling facts, and these people cannot refute them. Of course, it would seem a laughing matter to anybody opposed to the Labour Party.

But I have not finished with them. As I have said, this person came and abused me. Later he made a punch at me but there was no fight because my fighting days are over. I said to him, “Look Johnston, I only wish it was 15 years ago that you did this.” That goes for the hon. member for Windsor too. He objected to my blowing the gaff that

he was in the Shamrock Hotel at Ingham. In an endeavour to explain it, he wrote a letter to the newspaper and said—

Mr. PIE: I move—

“That the letter be tabled.”

Mr. Gledson: He can read a letter.

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member read it, because I sent it to him. I am too honest for those jokers. The hon. member for Windsor has also my reply, therefore why is he squealing to have them tabled? He knows all about them, as he got them. I sent them by registered post to be certain he got them. I should like to draw attention to the fact that his statement about the Shamrock Hotel is incorrect: his mother owned it and he managed it. Moreover, they were black-marketing in the Shamrock Hotel: this is Johnston, the associate of the hon. member for Windsor, that good man who thought he could oust the hon. member for Kennedy. They were fined up there. They reported Mick Bennett on a bribery charge. Mick Bennett stood before a judge and jury and was found not guilty but it broke his heart and he is in his grave today. The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs knows that they were put on a charge of selling grog below the proper measurements to the public—robbing the workers. They laid a charge against Mick Bennett, the same as they laid charges against the Man-power officers, because he was called back after being nine months in the hotel. That is the Queensland People's Party candidate—such an honest man!

When the hon. member for Windsor stands in this Chamber and slanders me I must retaliate. I will tell the House something else—I am not hiding anything. Furthermore, I will not be silenced by the quips and glances of members of the Opposition. I will read out the statutory declaration tabled this morning so that every hon. member can hear. I have nothing to be ashamed about because it is a pack of lies.

What I am about to read is nothing compared with what the itinerant vendors, insurance agents, oil men, and brush men whispered round the houses of Ingham against me after I had spent 23 years of my life serving the people there faithfully. Listen to this—

“There is a man named Blackshaw, who gives his address as Queensland People's Party, Townsville, has been visiting Ingham and describes himself as the Campaign Director for Johnston, your opponent. I do not know what his occupation is. He is an elderly man with a Chummy accent. He was in the bar the other day at the Central, three-parts drunk—”

These men are very good boozers—

“and was doing a lot of skiting. He said this election means a fight with the gloves off between the Queensland People's Party and the Government. He stated that the party had the skids under Messrs. Foley, Bruce, and Mann.”

I notice the three persons mentioned are all here—

“He also said that they had a lot on you. He said that he had a man who is prepared to get up on the platform and roar out for everyone to hear that he gave you £100 to get a timber contract for him at Mount Fox and you put the £100 in your pocket and did nothing for the man. The name of the man was never mentioned, but he said he was a local. He said he has plenty on you that will be ventilated at the campaign.”

That is a pack of lies and it only shows the depths to which these people will sink in an attempt to gain political kudos and to satisfy the vanity of the hon. member for Windsor, about whom I have said consistently since his first appearance here that he was going to be a traitor to the cause that put him in Parliament.

Mr. Aikens: Forgan Smith put him into Parliament.

Mr. JESSON: I know that, and he has been an everlasting disgrace here. Forgan Smith would have dropped dead if he had known what a traitor he would turn out to be. These are only some of the things they did during the election campaign.

I propose also to produce facts to show they were guilty of duplication and plural voting, that they sent “How to Vote” cards with the member's number on them, how they put postal votes in with applications for postal votes. The hon. member for Aubigny made a great mouthful about my going down by 2,000 the other day, but the fact is that I actually improved my figures by about 50 votes.

When I came back to Brisbane I was approached again over the phone and asked if I wanted to have a bet. They wanted to get me out either by lying, betting, or some other dirty trick. The hon. member for Windsor did not say anything this morning. All he did was table a photostat of something containing nothing but bad language and lies. He did not have the guts to read it out. Why did he not come out into the open? Again, why did he not take his place in the House as the leader of the Queensland People's Party, as he calls himself? Why, he is the second last speaker for the party! He is the type of gentleman who gets 1,000 miles behind the front line when there is a war on. He is the man who jumped out of the Army because he thought he would be doing more in his business. He made enough out of his business to float a £500,000 company.

Mr. PIE: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the hon. member for Kennedy stick to the truth. If he makes such statements outside this House he will be dealt with in a proper manner. The statement that I jumped out of the Army is offensive to me, and I ask for its withdrawal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Kennedy must accept the denial of the hon. member for Windsor that he jumped out of the Army.

Mr. JESSON: I accept it. He might not have jumped out, but he got out.

Because he intended to be the new Messiah, he went to Germany and England, came back to this country, and joined up with the Liberal Party.

At 2.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. JESSON: I was referring to the reason for the hon. member for Windsor's overseas visit, and I said that he was sent overseas for the same reason as the Deputy Leader of his party, the hon. member for Toowong, has gone down to Melbourne at the present time. The hon. member for Windsor was sent to England, and there he consulted with big financiers. On his return to Australia the Queensland People's Party joined up with the Liberal Party of Australia. Mr. Chandler, who was the leader of the Queensland People's Party, was poked into the background and before the last State election they got hold of Mr. Chandler and sent him overseas on a trip, allegedly to arrange loans. We all know the history of that. He went to America without the approval of the Commonwealth Government. No local authority or shire council can borrow money on the open market without the approval of the Commonwealth Government. Later on, the town clerk of Brisbane was sent across to America to make Mr. Chandler's visit look all right. They got the Lord Mayor of Brisbane overseas out of the road because he had the habit of saying the wrong thing at the wrong time, as his past performances have shown.

When the hon. member for Windsor came back here his party was determined that it would win the elections. He tried to be the leader in Queensland. That was the plot against the workers of this State—the plot by those who controlled big industry. They wanted to wield the big stick and lay it on the backs of the workers. They wanted to break down the conditions that had been gained over many years. I told the people about this plot. I exploded it, and that is why the hon. member for Windsor in his vanity hates me and tried to do all he could to defeat me.

In my speech this morning I made reference to the hon. member for Windsor's war service. He got up and said that what I had said was offensive to him and that it was untruthful, and he asked me to withdraw. I withdrew by remarks. But I have a pamphlet here entitled, "Queensland's future must be protected by constructive legislation."

A Government Member: Anything on the front of it?

Mr. JESSON: Yes, of a glamor boy or mannequin. On the bottom there is the name of Mr. Bruce Pie. These are his own words, "He was 41 years of age and he was asking the people of Windsor to support him. He was anxious to serve his country. He joined the Militia as a private, subsequently receiving his commission. He was adjudged by the military authorities as too old for active

service overseas." This is the man of 41. Why, I had mates of mine killed in the war who were 41 and I was away at the first World War at the age of 16. This gentleman was adjudged too old for overseas service. He was offered an appointment for home service, which he declined, maintaining that he could do a better job on the industrial front.

Mr. Morris: So he did.

Mr. JESSON: Yes, he made a nice profit on the home front. I said last year that he made singlets that gave the Yanks the scrub itch and the Australians dermatitis. He made money out of it.

Mr. Morris: You know it is not true.

Mr. JESSON: There you have the lily-white who makes this statement.

Mr. Gair: Mandrake!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: So much for the statement by the hon. member for Windsor who got up and objected to something I had said and asked that it be withdrawn because it was offensive. His remarks were offensive to us all, particularly to friends of mine who lost their lives in New Guinea and the Middle East.

Mr. Sparkes interjected.

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member could have fought at the war; he was not too old. He has only just come back from the cattle sales. As I said earlier, the Queensland People's Party usurped the functions of the Country Party. As a matter of fact, I really believe that the Leader of the Opposition was virtually "kidded" into moving his amendment by the Queensland People's Party. He launched the amendment, but the hon. member for Windsor was away in Mount Isa and because of bad weather could not get back in time for the debate, but not to be outdone, the hon. member for Toowong read his speech in this House so that he could get it in. He read it word for word and I objected to his doing it on several occasions. Do not take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, that he read the speech. Here is the opinion of the "Telegraph" on it and the chap who wrote it does not write for our political side. He is a fellow by the name of Pellew, and he wrote this—

"Although Mr. Nicklin started off as the leading man in the elections allegation drama at State Parliament last week, Mr. Wanstall soon stole the show.

"Rumour has it that the role was to have been taken by the Leader of the Queensland People's Party, Mr. Pie, who, however, was delayed in returning from a visit to Mount Isa.

"Mr. Wanstall read the lines—he denied he was reading them when Mr. Jesson (Labour) rose to a point of order and said he was 'merely referring to copious notes'—and he did it so effectively as to draw angry interjections from the Government benches."

The hon. member for Toowong read the hon. member for Windsor's speech because he could not get back in time on the plane.

I cannot understand the attitude of the Country Party in allowing themselves to be used in this way. The Kennedy electorate is a country electorate and so is the East Toowoomba electorate, yet the Queensland People's Party took this matter out of the hands of the Country Party.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. JESSON: You could not take anything out of anybody's hands, a dill like you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I take objection to the remark just made by the hon. member for Windsor. If the hon. member and those hon. members behind him will allow the hon. member for Kennedy to make his speech the debate will proceed in order.

Mr. PIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I want to tell the hon. member that I shall be the judge of what I shall rule on this occasion.

Mr. PIE: But, Mr. Speaker, I can rise to a point of order. You said that I made an objectionable remark, but all I was saying to the hon. member for East Toowoomba was that he should object to the remark made concerning him by the hon. member for Kennedy, that he was a dill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If that is so then I must say in fairness to the hon. member that I took the remark to be directed to me, that the hon. member turned to me and said, "Check him."

Mr. Pie: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member did not say that then I am at fault.

Mr. JESSON: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to transgress any of the rules of the House, but I am certainly not going to allow any hon. member on the other side of the Chamber to say what they like about me without retaliating. I belong to the wrong breed to do that. I am not going to allow them to laugh and get away with all that without some reply. I only wish that I were a few years younger—I would give some of these guys on the other side a battle not with the tongue but in some other way. My life has been an open book ever since I was able to walk and I have nothing to hide.

Today the hon. member for Windsor made a speech in this Chamber and although he did not allude to me in any shape or form he handed this scurrilous declaration round and it was immediately picked up by his co-conspirator, the Leader of the Opposition, and passed on to the rest of the Opposition. They laughed and smiled and nodded their heads in a spirit of great complacency.

The only reference made to the hon. member for Windsor was that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." The hon.

member for Windsor then put the statutory declaration on the table and it became public property.

I will read this declaration for the benefit of the people of Australia and deal with it. The statutory declaration was made by one Thomas Byrne, of 14 Harold Street, West End, Townsville. Mr. Byrne used to work for Samuel Allen & Sons. Samuel Allens employed Mr. Johnston, my opponent. Samuel Allens were mixed up with the marketing of butter, and Johnston was in their employ at the time. If the Queensland People's Party want to get some sworn statements, let them go to the Rationing Commission and see the statements there on the black-marketing of butter. Samuel Allens were concerned also with the juggling of beer from one hotel to another in Ingham, in order to build up a quota so that they might sell to unwary buyers. Let them go and see the report. I saw it, and I did not allow it to be introduced in the election campaign. That is how fair I was. Mr. Byrne was accountant in Samuel Allens at the time, and then went into business on his own account. This is the lying statement made in the statutory declaration—

"I was present at a count of votes at the Belgian Gardens State School, one evening in the week following the Elections—"

The exact date was 7 May, 1947.

A Government Member: He does not say that.

Mr. JESSON: No.

Mr. Aikens: This is the statement the hon. member for Windsor read out.

Mr. JESSON: He didn't read it out; he handed it round. He was too big a cur.

Mr. PIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That statement was tabled at the request of the Secretary for Public Instruction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The time of the hon. member for Kennedy is running out, and he should be given the opportunity to say as much as he can in the time allotted him.

Mr. JESSON: I never interjected when the hon. member for Windsor spoke. I sat here all the morning and never opened my mouth.

Mr. Byrne in his declaration, proceeds—

"at which count the following persons were present, Messrs. Chandler, returning officer, Jesson (member for Kennedy), Morris (Labour Campaign Director for Kennedy), S. Church, and myself, Queensland People's Party representatives."

I want hon. members to take note of the name, Church.

"During the count of section votes, Jesson was opening the envelopes removing the ballot papers therefrom—"

What a great opportunity he had!

"and passing the ballot papers to Mr. Church on my left and the envelope to Mr. Jesson on my right. Mr. Church

passed the ballot paper to Mr. Chandler, on his (Church's) left, and Mr. Chandler marked thereon the number called to him by Mr. Jesson from the envelope I had passed to him, Jesson. There were six votes opened in A section that night, five going to Johnston and one to Clubley. The vote that went to Clubley was from a union organiser. When Mr. Church unfolded the vote it was apparent to all that the vote was for Clubley, the paper being folded in such a way that when unopened the name of the candidate was clearly seen. Jesson had the envelope in his hand when Mr. Church opened the vote. He (Jesson) said, 'I'll give this bugger voting against me. I will see he is transferred to hell out of it within 12 months.'

I wish to just refer to this. I have no power to transfer any union organiser. Furthermore, I do not use that sort of language.

"Another remark of Mr. Jesson's the same evening was concerning the Aitkenvale-Hervey's Range Road vote. The remark made by Jesson was this, 'I'll give these bastards voting against me the way they did. These bastards want a bloody road up there. I'll make certain they get no bloody road. I'll see them in hell first.' These remarks were made in the presence of Mr. Chandler,——"

that is the returning officer—

"Mr. Morris, Mr. Church, and myself."

It must not be forgotten that this statutory declaration is signed by "T. Byrne" and is witnessed by a J.P.

On the bottom of this declaration appears this note—

"Any person who wilfully makes a false statement in a statutory declaration is guilty of an indictable offence, and is liable to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for four years."

When I am finished with this I will insist that this man be taken up on an indictable offence because I can prove conclusively that he is a liar.

I want the House to note this: the declaration was signed on 17 August and is about something alleged to have happened in May—several days after Wanstall made his infamous speech that the member for Windsor should have made in this House—and he said he had it at that time. Here is the proof. Could anyone be so low and contemptible as to slander decent people? I have a family of six earning a living in this country and for the likes of these people to get up in this House and slander decent honest men who are prepared to stand up and fight for the truth and take anything that is coming to them, I think is damnable; it is not right; it is unfair. If I am spared I will take this evidence out to Windsor at the next election and paste the hon. member for Windsor out there with it, because it is a lying statement.

This document is dated 25 August, and reads as follows:—

"Sir,—

"In response to your request, I submit herewith a report on the allegations appear-

ing the 'Courier-Mail' of the 20th instant of malpractice on my part as returning officer for the electoral district of Kennedy.

"At the outset, I desire to point out that all these charges were instigated by an imported scrutineer from Rockhampton, Mr. B. Smithers, whose one intent, it is now evident, was to create mischief, as he boasted before coming to the recount that 'two pairs of young eyes would discover what old eyes failed to find.'"

This Mr. Smithers is another political gangster and storm-trooper going about the country paid by decent people's money who believe in the ideals—if they have any—of the Queensland People's Party which paid these gangsters to put out these lies and do these things.

The letter continues—

"It is difficult to reconcile the vindictiveness of these charges with the atmosphere of concord prevailing at the recount, and if he honestly believed them to be true his signing of the document (Form 19) certifying to the truth and accuracy of the statement of votes counted at the Kennedy poll constitutes him guilty of prevarication. The other scrutineers present at the recount dissociate themselves from the charges alleged.

"All decisions relative to the counting or disallowing of votes were given in accordance with the prerogative conferred upon me by the relevant section of the Elections Acts and were, therefore, not 'illegal practices.'

"My reply to the individual charges is as follows:—

1. This is not only a gross exaggeration and misrepresentation of facts but a malicious lie, prompted by a studied attempt on the part of one Q.P.P. scrutineer to place discredit on the local scrutineers as well as on the returning officer.

"Here are the facts—

"At the recount, the Labour votes were checked by the Q.P.P. candidate (Mr. Johnston), the Q.P.P. votes were checked by the Labour scrutineer (Mr. J. Morris), the Communist votes by a Q.P.P. scrutineer, while two other Q.P.P. scrutineers (Mr. A. Blackshaw and Mr. S. Church) and a poll clerk (Mr. N. J. Rains) gave general assistance.

"In the whole recount, the only apparent discrepancy was in a parcel of Communist votes, which the Q.P.P. scrutineer claimed to be one more than the original count showed. I did not personally recheck the parcel as it did not in any way affect the winning majority of 252, but, appealed to each of the scrutineers in turn as to whether they wished the return to be amended for this one vote. The unanimous decision was that the original count should stand. (N.B.—The total number of ordinary ballot-papers used at the whole election tallies exactly with the total number of ordinary votes counted and returned, the number in each case being 8,881.)

2. A salient omission in this charge is that one vote was cast for Jesson, the other for Johnston, so that the classification of them as "valid" or "invalid" did not affect the majority of 252. As there was no doubt in my mind as to the electors' intention, the two votes were allowed.

3. This was purely a matter of personal opinion. An objection was lodged but the two votes were allowed.

4. As a '3' was placed elsewhere, the marking plainly indicated the voter's intention.

5. The blacking-out of the squares against the names of the other candidates was a simple cancellation of the preference vote which the voter discovered he had wrongly used. As the primary votes remained they were counted.

6. I am not aware of any omission of mine by which the identity of a postal voter could have been ascertained, nor of the incident charged against Mr. Jesson.

"I strongly resent the allegations and claim they are ulterior in motive, malicious in purpose, and false in fact.

"Attached hereto please find a statement document from all the other scrutineers in support of these statements.

"As Mr. C. G. Jesson has asked for a copy of this report, I have enclosed an additional one for him, at your discretion, and have advised Mr. Jesson accordingly.

"Copy of a letter to the Press is also enclosed."

I will read from a copy of the statutory declaration. The Attorney-General has the original—

"We, the undersigned scrutineers, present at the recount of votes in the electoral district of Kennedy, dissociate ourselves from the allegations of illegal practices made in Parliament against the returning officer for Kennedy, and are in complete accord with his reply thereto.

"Signed: A. Blackshaw,
S. Church,
Q.P.P. Scrutineers.

"John Morris, J.P., Labour Scrutineer."

(Time, on motion of Mr. Dunstan, extended.)

Mr. JESSON: I thank the hon. member for Gympie and hon. members generally. I ask them to note that this declaration is signed by A. Blackshaw and S. Church. They will remember that I requested them to note particularly the name of Church—the man who is there all that time.

Mr. Aikens: For the Queensland People's Party candidate?

Mr. JESSON: For the Queensland People's Party candidate. He signs himself as Queensland People's Party representative, but remember that Church also signed the statutory declaration. Who is the liar? I ask members of this House and the general public: can they take any notice of statements such as this made in an effort to pull

down and lower the Labour Party in the eyes of the people of Queensland? These are nothing less than Fascist tactics used in an endeavour to undermine the confidence of the people in the present Government in order that some worse form of government could rise out of the ashes of the fallen Labour Government. These people will stoop to anything.

Now let me refer to the second part of the letter, that part of the letter in which according to these low heels I am alleged to have called these hard, struggling farmers a lot of bastards.

There is no need for me to point out to members of the Country Party, but it is necessary to do so for the information of others and the outside public that at elections a number of small places are put in groups so as to preserve the secrecy of the ballot. This applies to places comprising 10, 15, or 20 people. They are placed in a group and when the ballot boxes come to the returning officer all the ballot papers are tipped out on a table into a large bundle before being counted, so that nobody will be able to identify the voters at each small place. I might say that I have often wished I did know what happened in some of the small groups. However, this man signed this declaration and as I have said, I am going to press for the penalty; I am going to make use of every string I can pull to make this man stand in the dock before a judge and jury—the man who three months later will swear to these actual words. There is no such ballot box in the Kennedy as the Hervey Range. It is in a group and in that group there would be more than 200 votes. I do not suppose there would be more than 15 or 20 people in the Hervey Range.

I will now read a letter dated 20 August from the Thuringowa Shire Council.

It says—

"Dear Mr. Jesson,

"Your letter of 23 July—"

This is three months or more after I called these men a lot of bastards, according to Mr. Byrne, of Townsville—

"—is acknowledged, together with a copy of a letter written to you by the Under-Secretary of the Treasury Department on the representations made on behalf of the Hervey's Range and District Progress Association respecting gazettal of a farmers' access road to Hervey's Range."

I have been battling for that road for the last two years, and something is going to be done about it in the very near future, yet, for political reasons, these lily-whites, the Messiahs of Australia, will get a man to tell a pack of lies and swear out false declarations. I am asking the Attorney-General to treat this man as he should be treated, to make him prove his allegations.

Like the hon. member for Windsor, I lay on the table of the House a list of the groups. There is no such place on the roll as Hervey's Range, nor is there such a place as Peacock Siding, where they suggest a ballot box was missing. Anyone of doubtful

character can go to the mannequin for Windsor and get his support and he will get up and spew it all over the House, thinking he will put something over on the Government.

Let me say here, too, that Mr. Church was fined £25 in Townsville for masquerading as a soldier during the war years so that he could get on the railways, into picture shows, and into refreshment rooms for half price. That is the type of gang the Queensland People's Party gather round them. They had a convicted criminal in Ingham whispering from door to door until he was told he would be thrown into the Herbert if he did not get out, and he got out quickly. Now listen to this—

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. JESSON: Why does not the hon. member pay the Government the £280 he owes them?

The following is a statement from Mr. Johnston:—

“I expect to win the Kennedy seat with the votes yet to come from the country,” Mr. R. J. Johnston, Queensland People's Party candidate told the ‘Sunday Australian’ at midnight.

“I am 87 votes behind,” said Mr. Johnston. ‘So far,’ he proceeded, ‘8,420 votes have been counted in a total enrolment of over 11,000. Allowing for non-voters, that means that 1,000 votes may yet be expected to come in. These comprise group votes—’”

Remember, this is where the ballot box was missing—

“—and votes from the country areas which can hardly be expected to go to Labour. I have been in some of these country areas.’”

That is where the ballot boxes were missing. They were missing from the place where he had been, where he expected to get the votes to make up for that 87 overnight.

I said I would prove that these people indulged in plural voting, that they stacked the rolls and indulged in other malpractices.

Mr. Pie: Let us have an inquiry into it. That is all we want.

Mr. JESSON: The hon. member can have an inquiry into his own self. There should be an inquiry into that motor-car accident, too. That would be very upsetting.

Mr. Morris: Tell us more about it.

Mr. JESSON: No. I am keeping that up my sleeve. These lily-whites make me laugh. They have the memory and brains of an ant. They say something today and forget it tomorrow.

At the 1944 elections there were 10,514 people on the Kennedy roll and of that number I received the support of 4,297 and my opponent 4,174. At the 1947 elections there were 11,298 on the roll, a difference of 784, and of the number on the roll I received 4,331. As a matter of fact, my supporters

stuck to me; I got the same vote—about 25 more. Yet it has been said that I went down by 1,000 votes. Why, the hon. member for Aubigny worked himself up into a frenzy and almost had a stroke when he was talking about me. His blood pressure must have jumped up to 200.

Mr. Speaker, I retained the votes I had got in the Kennedy electorate despite the fact that these people were sending out “How to Vote” cards and getting people to vote absent—people who were in the district and who had never left the district. They would ask people to make application for postal votes and they would send them “How to Vote” cards. Why, I have one of them here. This poor devil put his postal vote into an envelope to send it back to the returning officer. Yet these people come here and talk about us! Why, we are only dunces in the kindergarten class compared with those who accuse us of malpractices. There is conclusive proof of what I have said. They went to people and got them to vote absent. They sent out pamphlets to every elector on the roll, with “How to Vote” cards with the numbers on them. None of these letters came back as unclaimed. The court house is notified of anyone who dies and anyone who comes into the district has his name placed on the roll. We have been accused of malpractices in a place where that section of the Act is observed. Only a few of the letters that went out were unclaimed and they are not worth bothering about. Another of their lying canards has been exploded.

Perhaps hon. members may want to know why my vote was not improved and I will tell them. Mr. Johnston was aided and abetted by an Italian called Molachino, who was not interned so that he could put others in. In conjunction with his agents he went among the people from farm to farm promising the farmers an extra ½d. a lb. for sugar.

Then there was talk about the pollution of the Herbert River, one of the finest rivers in North Queensland. It is polluted by the Tableland Tin Dredging Company. Owing to the shortage of tin in this country the Government have been reluctant about doing anything to cause an interruption in the production of tin. Tin is perhaps required more today than during the war. Something will have to be done and I am asking the Government that when the position is clarified they do something to stop this company from interfering with the lives and health of some 30,000 people. The company is associated with the crowd opposite and I will tell you who they are. I have here a list of the shareholders.

The first is Mr. E. M. Tooth. Do hon. members opposite know him? Then there is Mr. F. B. Ferris. Do they know him? Then Mr. J. M. Owen.

An Opposition Member: Don't know them.

Mr. JESSON: You know this one; Mr. T. A. Hiley, Deputy Leader of the Queensland People's Party. If they do not know him then they have a head like a pin-head

Chinaman. Then there is Mr. A. L. Nevitt. We all know him. They are the shareholders of this company that is polluting the river. While the Government are trying to make suggestions to help them, they are going round from farm to farm and house to house telling the people that they are going to improve the drinking water when they are returned as a Government.

I have here, too, Mr. Johnston's letter containing the same old snide tactics. It is published in the paper, one that is published tri-weekly. It came out on 1 May, the Thursday before the elections, it also came out at 11 o'clock on election morning. I suppose it was authorised by Storm-trooper Hall, Porter, and a few more. He published it on this Thursday so that I could not get a reply in. This is what is says—

“Will you please permit me to say, through the columns of your newspaper, a few words on a subject of burning interest to the residents of this district, namely, the pollution of rivers and streams by means of mining operations. This question has had the consideration of the Queensland People's Party and the Country Party.”

They are a lot of hypocrites and I am bringing this up to expose their hypocrisy. This company is poisoning the people. They own the dredge and at the same time they say they will clean the matter up if they get into power. They would sell their own mothers-in-law. (Laughter.) I know a couple of people in the Opposition who owe all they have to their mothers-in-law, and they would even sell them. That is why I made that remark.

This company is making between £19,000 and £24,000 a month profit.

Mr. Aikens: What is Hiley getting out of it?

Mr. JESSON: He is the secretary, and a bit more.

Listen to this part of the letter—

“These organisations are agreed that it is not right that any person should be permitted, for private gain, to befoul water on which other residents of the State are depending for domestic or other essential purposes. These organisations, if returned to power, do not propose to imitate the attitude of the present Government, which expects the ratepayers of the district and the general taxpayer to shoulder the burden of partly remedying the effects of the pollution of the Herbert River, which everyone knows is taking place, without even proposing that the persons causing such pollution should make any contribution towards the cost.”

The letter refers to the Country Party, but it appears to me that the Leader of the Opposition has been struck dumb. If I were to start talking about paying for pineapple tops he would be on his feet at once, but not with this subject.

The letter goes on—

“The Queensland People's Party and Country Party are resolved that if the electors see fit to return them to power next Saturday, they will place the burden of preventing the pollution of our rivers and streams where it rightfully belongs, that is to say, on those whose operations cause the pollution. They will do this by making an appropriate amendment to the Mining Acts so as to prohibit the pollution of any water which is being properly used by citizens of the State for domestic or other essential purposes. People who wish to exploit the irreplaceable mineral wealth of the country for their own gain will be able to do so, but not at the expense of the health and convenience of the general public. Thanking you,—Yours etc.,

“R. J. JOHNSTON.

“Ingham, 30 April, 1947.”

Mr. Turner: Did he use the word “exploit?”

Mr. JESSON: Yes. It shows the blatant cheek and audacity of them. On the one hand they go round to the people whispering from door to door and on the other hand they condemn the Government in order to gain votes and everything else. I was able to stand up to these nefarious tactics, and I consider my performance, with the assistance of the representatives of the A.W.U. in the district, was a very creditable one. I have had to fight all this lying slander, and not only during the election campaign.

How much money did Samuel Allens give them for their campaign? Let them go into all this sort of business. It was only done to get me out of the road. That was because when I get up in this House I speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I will fight this group while I have breath in my body.

I want to speak for a little while on the labour situation at the moment in North Queensland. In doing so I want to refer to a rather delicate question. The Leader of the Queensland People's Party went round among the Italian people in the Ingham district. He had a meeting at one little place. I believe that in some countries some people are employed to weep at the wailing wall, and also as “cheerers,” to cheer certain men at an opportune time. At this meeting, which was held at Bambaroo, the school teacher's wife at its close got up and began to sing, “For He's a Jolly Good Fellow,” but she was the only one who was able to sing it, as the rest of the audience was composed of Italians. (Laughter.) So there you are.

Mr. Pie: No wonder you were embarrassed.

Mr. JESSON: I was embarrassed listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Pie: You were.

Mr. JESSON: I want to know whether the hon. member took Garibaldi up with him to help.

The question of cane-cutters is a very vexed one in North Queensland. If one goes back to the period after the first World War one will find that the British cutter in the far-northern areas was gradually going out of the industry. Why, I do not know. Aboriginal cane-cutters in North Queensland are at present earning 30s. to £2 a day cane-cutting, and a good cane-cutter in the Ingham district can earn £3 and £4 a day. Nevertheless, you cannot get men to cut cane today. Prior to the last war 80 per cent. of the cane-cutters in the Ingham district were Italians. During the war many of them were sent to internment camps and subsequently were absorbed in industries in Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales. In the 1945 cane season they were brought back to Queensland by the Man-power Department. They worked in the canefields in 1945 and 1946 seasons, but this year they have gone back to the places where they worked after being released from their internment. They have left their wives and homes behind them, but as soon as the housing problem is overcome their wives and children will join them in the Southern States. When that time comes there will be some empty houses where these cutters formerly lived. They have been driven out of the place by the unfairness of people who live in the cities and who do not understand the situation.

I am talking about the second generation of Italians, people who have been brought into this world since their parents arrived in this State. Yet we have irresponsible people getting up and talking about Little Italys being formed by them. Why do they not be broad-minded? Scotsmen have their Caledonian Club where they can meet regularly, and the Irish have their club, too. Before the recent war there were German Clubs in various parts of the State where the old chaps met to talk about old times. Why, in London you can go to Australia House to meet Australian people. If you go to Sydney you can go to a certain place and meet Queenslanders every Sunday afternoon. We have also in Brisbane, Mackay, and Charters Towers associations where old residents of these cities meet and talk about old times. Yet these people I refer to were so maligned by the rest of the country that they are leaving the industry.

They have to find people to cut the cane. The member for Mirani spoke about the marvellous industry, but there will be no industry at all in North Queensland shortly—unless the party of hon. members opposite bring back kanakas—because these men are leaving the industry daily for better jobs, constant work with paid holidays and the amenities of the cities, because the people have been hounding them out of the place over a period of years. We are over 150 cane-cutters short in the Ingham district today and what will it be in 12 months' time? I ask the people to be a bit more tolerant. Even when the war was on they were interning Italians, both native-born and Australian-born, in North Queensland whilst at the same time American-born Italians were flying

planes from North Australia against the Japanese at Rabaul and fighting the battle of the Coral Sea. The whole thing is ridiculous and it is time that these people who malign useful people should leave them to do the job that they can do in the sugar industry.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) (3.1 p.m.): The debate on the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech is taking place at a time when the world is faced with very critical problems. Needless to say, it cannot be expected that any member in this House should be able to deal with all these problems or even a small number of them (in the time at his disposal in this debate). But I want to say this afternoon that I disagree entirely with those people in this House who have contended that the crisis in Britain is due to the Socialistic policy and measures of the British Labour Government. I believe the crisis in Britain is mainly a crisis brought about by the capitalist system itself. It is a legacy of the rottenness of the organisation of capitalist production and distribution. Unfortunately for the British people it is aggravated partly by the ravages of war that were inflicted on Great Britain from 1939 to 1945, but above all by the rapacious and greedy policy of the millionaire money-lenders of the United States of America.

Mr. Maher: The same Communist flapdoodle.

Mr. PATERSON: It is not Communist flapdoodle. If I wished, I could interject "Tory flapdoodle" during the speeches delivered by the hon. member for West Moreton. At any rate, I have never yet been guilty of lying as the hon. member, who on one occasion in this House, in order to raise the Red boggy, deliberately told a lie about the cause of the Victorian railway strike.

Mr. MAHER: I rise to a point of order! I take exception to the statement of the hon. member that I told a deliberate lie about the cause of the railway strike in Victoria. I deny that I ever told any lie. The statement is offensive to me and I wish it to be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with parliamentary proceedings, the hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. PATERSON: Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the Standing Orders I will accept the explanation; but hon. members will remember that at the time or about the time of the debate, after the hon. member made the statement, I quoted from Victorian papers; and I leave it to the judgment of hon. members who heard the full facts and those who read "Hansard" to say whether my statement was correct or not.

As I said, the crisis is a legacy of this rotten system. The British Government have been in power for only two years, and they have not introduced Socialism; they have merely introduced a few nationalisation measures, which might be more correctly described as a step towards Socialism. This afternoon, how-

ever, I do not wish to deal with the policy of the British Labour Government. I merely wish to reply briefly to what I believe was a false statement about the cause of the position over there.

Some hon. members in the course of this debate have attacked the proposed introduction of legislation to nationalise the private trading banks of Australia. I welcome the proposed step of the Commonwealth Government. My only complaint is that it has been left for so long to implement that plank of the Labour Party's platform. My time today would fail me if I were to attempt to show exactly how little is the financial freedom that can be exercised by the masses of the people under the millionaire control of the private banks, but I hope that before this session is finished I shall have time to quote facts and figures to show that it is a lie to suggest that the trading banks are owned and controlled by the majority of the Australian people. The private trading banks in this country are owned and controlled by a relatively small number of people. Not only are they owned and controlled by this relatively small number but they are closely interlocked with the big capitalistic monopolies and that interlocking enables the banks to direct their financial policy in the interests of the great millionaire companies and to the detriment of the mass of people of Australia.

Imagine critics of the nationalisation proposal suggesting that if all banks are nationalised we shall lose our freedom. I can remember after the depression meeting men in the West who were managers of stations and graziers who because of the bad financial position existing at the time were told by the banks just when they could visit the nearest town, how much petrol they could use in their motor-cars, when their wives and children could buy new dresses or other clothes, and what foodstuffs they could order. This dictatorship was exercised not by the Government but by the private trading banks, yet it is suggested in this House by the opponents of nationalisation that if the banks are nationalised we shall have a Government dictatorship.

A few days ago it was even suggested in this debate that Mr. Chifley, the Prime Minister, is a dictator because he is putting forward this proposal. I only hope that not only are the banks nationalised but also that the big monopolies in this country—the great B.H.P. iron and steel combine, the sugar monopoly of the C.S.R. Company, the big rubber and textile combines, and the breweries—are nationalised at the same time, or as soon as possible after the banks.

The hon. member for Mirani spoke about sugar and I take this opportunity of stating that I think he gave a very reasonable account of the position of the sugar industry. I agree with his remarks that it is time that the half-penny a pound taken from the industry in 1933 was restored to that industry, but I go a bit further and suggest that, when this half-penny a pound is restored, legislation be introduced to ensure that the whole of that sum goes to the farmers who actually

work their farms and to the workers who crush the cane, cut the cane, or do other work on the cane farms. I want to ensure that not one fraction of this half-penny a pound is given to those who live by exploiting the industry, whether they do so by their control of refineries and mills or in the production or sale of agricultural implements and fertilisers, or by lending money to necessitous farmers on the security of mortgages or crop liens.

At the same time I support the hon. member in his criticism of the constitution of the present Sugar Board. With him, I believe that the Sugar Board should be so constituted that it has on it one representative elected by the growers and one representative elected by the millers. That would be more in keeping with the democratic control needed on all primary producers' boards.

In the Governor's Speech mention was made of the coal industry—not much mention, it is true, but what was there was significant. The Governor said—

“ My Advisers have been busily engaged in planning for the development of Queensland's rich undeveloped coal deposits. A combined Commonwealth and State investigation has been made on the possibility of the use of Blair Athol coal deposits on a very large scale, and a detailed drilling campaign and topographical survey of the field is now in progress.

“ Investigations point to the fact that, from Collinsville to Callide, there are large quantities of coal which could be advantageously developed. Contact has been made with various British organisations which are contemplating large scale development of some of these resources, and it is hoped to announce in the near future plans for this work to proceed.”

I believe that the future of Blair Athol will be a test case for the policy of the present Government. The big issue confronting the people at present with regard to Blair Athol is this: Who is to control the enormous coal deposits of this State? In whose interests are they to be developed? Are they to be controlled by the representatives of the people or by the representatives of Big Business? Are they to be developed in the interests of the people of this State or in order to make profit for the millionaires of this or any other country?

It is true that up to the present the Government have made no official statement about their plans or proposals in connection with Blair Athol, but ominous statements have been published in the Press, and they have not yet been officially denied. If they are not true, then the Government have failed in their duty in not publishing a denial, and I cannot be blamed if I have interpreted that absence of denial to mean that there is a substantial basis of truth in the statements that have been made in the Press.

I want to make my position perfectly clear. My position at least is consistent. I believe that the coal deposits of Blair Athol should remain the property of the people, should be controlled by the people's representatives, through the Government, and should be

developed in the interests of the people. I am not going to suggest today that there is anything corrupt in what is being done in connection with Blair Athol, because it has been my practice, ever since I have been in this House, to make no suggestion or statement unless I have facts or reliable evidence to back it up, but, irrespective of what the motive of the Government is, even though it may be the purest motive possible, I assert that the Government are wrong and acting contrary to the interests of the people of this State and of Australia if in relation to Blair Athol they pursue the policy details of which have been published in our newspapers.

Mr. Hanlon: What is that policy?

Mr. PATERSON: The policy, according to statements in the Press, is that the mines are to be developed by a British company that is to spend £18,000,000 on Blair Athol and is to get a monopoly of a railway line to a port with the right to transport only coal and to refuse the transport of everything else.

Let me repeat, for the benefit of the Premier who has just come in and so missed the relevant part of my speech, that I do not know whether the statements in the Press are true, but I do say that up to the present they have not been denied, and it is the bounden duty of the Government to deny them, if they are untrue.

Mr. Hanlon: They are not true. They are very inaccurate.

Mr. PATERSON: I am very pleased to hear the Premier's statement that they are very inaccurate, but I say again that I think the Government made a serious mistake in not making a public statement earlier that they are very inaccurate. Blair Athol, I repeat, is a test case.

I listened to the hon. member for Mirani attacking the alleged proposals of the Government. I agree with the attack that the hon. member made on the basis of the facts that he accepted as correct.

I want, however, to make these comments in regard to his attitude. He is only a new member, and I believe the attack he made was based on his own genuine beliefs, but those genuine beliefs are incompatible with the policy of the party to which he belongs, because the party to which he belongs does not believe in the State control of coal-mines or State control in any other industry.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members cannot have it both ways, they must be consistent. Either they believe in the State control of an industry, including State control of coal-mines, or they believe in control by private profit-making enterprise. When the hon. member for Mirani gives further consideration to his case, he has to go further and not only attack in this House the Blair Athol proposals, because these huge deposits of coal are to be handed over to a private company for exploitation, but attack also the policy of the Country Party, which at all times has

fully supported control of industry, including coal-mines, by private profit-making enterprise.

Mr. Brand: You must not misrepresent him.

Mr. PATERSON: If I am misrepresenting him he has the right to correct me, but that was the impression I got whilst he was speaking. I might say that I listened carefully, and I was impressed by what he said in this respect about Blair Athol. I think also he made out a good case in connection with the sugar industry.

The coal-fields of Blair Athol are supposed to contain millions of tons of coal. We do not just know what its value is.

Mr. Hanlon: 200,000,000 tons.

Mr. PATERSON: But we still await information as to the purpose for which the coal can best be used. Coal can be used for steaming purposes, producing coke, producing oil and various other by-products. That is why I gave notice this morning of my question to the Premier, because I believe that this House should have the fullest information. We should have as much knowledge as possible about these coal-fields. However, now that the Premier has made the statement that what the Press published was incorrect—

Mr. Hanlon: I said it was inaccurate.

Mr. PATERSON: Now that we have the statement from the Premier that what the Press published was inaccurate, I trust that it will not be long before he will make a full statement so that all members of this House will be in a position to know just where we stand. After all, our time in this House is very limited. I worked it out the other day, and found that even if the House met for 50 weeks in the year and spent 40 hours a week on debate, and that time was equally allotted to the 62 members, we should have only 1½ hours each a fortnight for debate. That shows how we are limited in time. And as everybody knows, it would not be practical to meet 50 weeks in the year or devote 40 hours a week to debate, for we have other parliamentary duties to perform besides participating in debates. As time is limited, therefore, I think every member of this House has the right to know the facts regarding great questions of public policy, so that we shall not waste time criticising things which we honestly believe to be true but which we ultimately find out to have no foundation in fact. The Government have the knowledge, and therefore they are in a position to inform hon. members and the public of the true facts. When we have the true facts we can devote our time to dealing with these facts.

The question of Blair Athol development is linked up with the wider question of the control of the whole of coal production in this country. After all, I am interested not only in the coal of Blair Athol but also in the coal-fields at Collinsville, Scottville, Ogmoo, Ipswich, and Mt. Mulligan and other Queensland coal-fields as well as the

other coal-fields of the Commonwealth. I am opposed to handing over the development of the Blair Athol coal-field to a private company. I am equally opposed to the handing over of the development of any other coal-field to private companies.

Coal is one of the most important products of our national life. Without an ample supply of coal our secondary industries will languish and it is obvious that all wealth production will be interfered with seriously. Therefore, it is one of the most urgent tasks of any Government which claim to represent the people so to organise the production and distribution of coal that there are ample supplies available at all times. It is criminal to adopt the cheap and false argument that the miners are responsible for the shortage of coal, that the miners are lazy, that they are always on strike or so often on strike that insufficient coal is produced. It is necessary, if we are going to face up to this problem properly, that we understand clearly the conditions in the coal-mining industry, so that if they are wrong we can take appropriate steps to put them right.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Prime Minister was right the other day when at the Premier's Conference he said, according to a Press report, that the miners were determined never again to be treated as the outcasts of society. This is the attitude we have to adopt—that the miners, or any other workers must never again be treated as the outcasts of society. They must be treated as honourable and very useful members of society. The miners have every right to a full and abundant life. They work in a dangerous industry and the working conditions are very unsatisfactory. We never find the rich people encouraging their sons to work in coal-mines. If the conditions in the coal-mines are so good, and the pay is so good as some enemies of the workers say, why is it that there is not a rush of the sons of the wealthy to enter coal-mines to produce more coal?

Mr. Pie: Why do you not work there?

Mr. PATERSON: Firstly, because I do not like their conditions; I realise that their conditions are bad. I made the statement, after I had been down the mines at Collinsville and Scottville, that even if I was out of a job I would never compete with the coal-miners for their jobs so long as the conditions were as they were. Candidly, I was glad to get out of the two mines, and remember, when I was down the mines, I was not doing any mining work at all. I was down the mine investigating their conditions. As a matter of fact, if you were to put the choice to me, I should not be satisfied even if I were paid my parliamentary salary merely to stay down the mine each year during the working day, and even if I had not to work while down.

The miners have hard and laborious work, and dangerous work too. They are constantly confronted with risks. Contrast their lives with ours. Ours, it is true, is not easy, if we do our job properly; nevertheless we are

not subject to the risks daily faced by the miners. We are not confronted daily with the danger of losing our lives or meeting with serious accidents.

Mr. Plunkett: Every three years we are.

Mr. PATERSON: Every three years, the hon. member for Albert says, but the only risk we run then is that we may lose our seats. We do not risk losing our lives. Even if we do lose our seats, we still retain our faculties, strength, and ability to carry on afterwards. But that is not the position of the miner. Therefore, I say it is the duty of every Government to give serious consideration to improving the conditions of the miners and the amenities in the coal-mining towns.

I regret very much—and I say this advisedly, not in any spirit of carping criticism, because I do my best to advance criticism of a constructive and not of a destructive nature—I regret very much that the Governor's Opening Speech contained no reference whatsoever as to what the Government are going to do to develop existing mines or to improve the conditions in the mines and the amenities in the coal towns. Apart from the fact that there is reference to proposed legislation to improve workers' compensation, which I hope will benefit the miners, and a reference to a proposed amendment of the Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers' (Pensions) Act, which I trust will mean an improvement in pensions for the miners, there is no reference to any proposed legislation to improve the conditions of the coal-miners or to improve the amenities of the coal-mining towns.

One has only to visit many of these towns to realise how pressing this problem is. I have on the floor of this House before spoken of the conditions at Collinsville. I am pleased to be able to say that there has at any rate been some improvement in their amenities within the last three years, but much remains to be done. At last the miners' wives at Collinsville are able to light their houses with electric light. Strange to say, for years they produced all the coal for everyone else in North Queensland to light their homes with electric light, but they had no electricity themselves.

Mr. Pie: That is a State mine.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, I know.

They have at last got electric light. Those are not the only conditions that have been improved. At last they have a dentist, but they had to threaten to hold up production to get a dentist.

Mr. Hanlon: They had a dentist before the war.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, but for nearly two years during and since the end of the war they had no dentist.

That was not the only coal-mining centre without these amenities. Take Ogmoo, about 90 miles from Rockhampton. It has no dentist, no doctor, and no hospital.

Mr. Macdonald: That applies to dozens of places in the country.

Mr. PATERSON: That is no excuse. On the contrary, it should be more a cause for shame that those conditions apply.

Mr. Hanlon: You should not have allowed them to go to the war. You should have allowed the troops to go without dental and medical attention.

Mr. PATERSON: Omore had no dentist before the war. It was not war that caused a shortage of doctors and dentists at that time. They had none during the war also, and they have none now. Collinsville had no dentist for about two years and, although the war has been over for 2 years, the miners there had to threaten recently to go on strike to obtain dental services. I pay a tribute to the present Secretary for Health and Home Affairs for the very vigorous and quick way in which he acted. This solved the dental problem for the time.

Mr. Pie: You don't have to threaten the Minister to get action. You know that. (Interjections.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hanlon: What State in Australia has free dentists?

Mr. PATERSON: It would be interesting to discuss that question, if it did not take up my time. (Laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PATERSON: This brings me to the whole question of the control of coal-mines. I believe that the time has come when the development of coal-mining must be placed on a national basis, with provision for decentralised administration. While I am an ardent supporter at all times of the national control of industry, I believe the abuses that might arise from centralised national control of industry can be best eliminated by decentralising the administration. I am pleased to know that the miners' union of this State and the Government have at last been able to come to some agreement as to a scheme for the proposed control and development of the coal-mines of this State. Apparently they are to be under a board of representatives of the State Government and of the Commonwealth Government, with a majority of the representatives appointed by the State Government.

Mr. Hanlon: The Communist Party fought against that, you know.

Mr. PATERSON: No, the Communist Party did not fight against it.

Mr. Hanlon: They fought for the extension of the New South Wales Coal Board.

Mr. PATERSON: No, they did not, but they wanted similar provisions to those of the New South Wales Act extended to this State in order to have joint State and Commonwealth control.

Mr. Hanlon: They demanded that the industry here come under the New South Wales Act.

Mr. PATERSON: I will not interject when the hon. gentleman is speaking. He can deal with all those matters in his speech.

Mr. Hanlon: I will not have you misrepresenting the issue.

Mr. Gair interjected.

Mr. PATERSON: The Communist Party at Collinsville during the war backed the Government on the introduction of such mechanisation as the scraper-loader provided there were safeguards for conditions and future employment, but it was supporters of the Australian Labour Party who opposed it. The Minister will remember that I actually wrote a personal letter to him, which he read out at a miners' meeting in Collinsville, to back him up in his efforts.

Mr. Gair: In 1943 they opposed the introduction of mechanisation, and prior to that they forced a coal cutting machine to be taken out.

Mr. PATERSON: I believe that just after the depression the miners opposed the taking of coal out by machines, and rightly so, because they had had a bitter experience during the depression.

Mr. Hanlon: From fear of unemployment.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, and that is a very justifiable fear. But the miners do not oppose mechanisation, provided it is coupled with a guarantee of full employment and decent conditions. I do not think anybody can complain about that attitude. As a matter of fact, I suppose hon. members would be opposed to the introduction of talking machines into Parliament if it would mean that they were to be put out of a job, but they would not object if they were not put out of their job. Mechanisation of the voice, they would say, would not do any harm, provided it was coupled with a guaranteed job.

I support Government control of coal production, because I believe that the past history of private control of coal-mining presents a very sorry spectacle. The hon. member for Bremer, during the speech he made recently, referred to some instances of the disgraceful results of that control in the Ipswich coal-fields, and such examples can be multiplied, not only in this State but all over the Commonwealth. The tendency of private enterprise has been to rip, tear, and drag while the coal is there; rip it out irrespective of how badly or how detrimentally it affects the assets of the future; rip it out as long as the exploiters can make big profits. The greed and selfishness of these coal-owners is such that they do not mind even if future shareholders suffer. All they are concerned about is to make as much money as they can at the time. They are never concerned about using the profits

for providing amenities in the towns for miners' families or improving conditions for the miners.

I might remind the hon. member for Windsor, who seems to take a delight in interjecting approval when anything can be said against the Collinsville State mine, that that mine does not work under the same financial advantages as many of the private mines because, as the Minister for Mines told me in reply to a question some 12 or 18 months ago, the Collinsville State mine was compelled to sell its coal at below the cost of production under the coal regulations that existed at the time. In other words, the Collinsville State mine was forbidden to sell its coal even at the cost of production, but these restricting regulations did not operate against the private coal-mine.

Mr. Donald: And they got no subsidy from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. PATERSON: And, as the hon. member for Bremer interjects, the State mine got no subsidy from the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, if we are dealing with the difference between the financial position of the Collinsville State mine and that of the coal-mines under private control, we must bear those facts carefully in mind, otherwise we shall get a distorted picture.

The hon. member for Windsor in his speech today at one stage more or less eloquently said, "We have vast resources in this State, which await development." We all agree with that. I suppose there is not a single member who disagrees with that. But he left the basic question unanswered, Mr. Speaker: why have these resources not been developed? Private enterprise has had every opportunity of developing these vast resources, including our huge coal resources. But what has it done in this State? There has been nothing to prevent private enterprise from building a cement works in North Queensland, but it has not done so. There has been nothing to prevent private enterprise from building an iron and steel works in North Queensland, but it has not done so. There has been nothing to prevent private enterprise from building woollen mills in the various parts of Queensland, but except at Ipswich virtually nothing has been done. So that it is not right for the hon. member to get up and merely say "We have vast resources to develop in this State" unless he is prepared to go on and say who is to develop it. When he made that statement, did he mean that these resources should be developed by private enterprise or by the Government? If he means by the Government, let him come out openly as a champion of Government control and Government ownership.

If on the other hand he implies that they must be developed by private enterprise, which is in accordance with his own policy, then this Chamber is not the place to talk about it. We are here to talk about what we want the Government to do. If he wants to urge private enterprise to do it, there is nothing to prevent him from attending meetings of chambers of commerce, and employers' federations and urging such action.

A Government Member: And stock exchanges.

Mr. PATERSON: And stock exchanges—but as there is no production by stock exchanges he would be wasting his breath there.

Mr. Sparkes: Do you ever travel by aeroplane?

Mr. PATERSON: I have in the past.

Mr. Sparkes: Never by A.N.A.?

Mr. PATERSON: So far I have not had the opportunity of travelling by T.A.A.

Mr. Sparkes: It was A.N.A., I asked.

Mr. PATERSON: That is the only line which takes me to North Queensland.

Mr. Sparkes: Is not that a private concern?

Mr. PATERSON: Yes.

Mr. Sparkes: What is wrong with that?

Mr. PATERSON: I have not said yet that private enterprise never gave a good service; my objection is that it does it primarily to make profit for the few at the expense of the many and does not care how it detrimentally affects for the future the assets it is exploiting. As a matter of fact, I can go back further: if one had sat in the first Parliaments, of Old Simon De Montfort or Edward I., and the House was talking about the benefits of feudalism, one could say quite honestly that feudalism gave various benefits, too. That would be true, but as compared with the new system of capitalism it was something that had to be relegated to the museum of history and ultimately it was relegated to that museum. The same is true of capitalism. We admit that private enterprise has done great things.

Mr. Sparkes: You did not admit that, you said exactly the opposite.

Mr. PATERSON: I did not. We admit that private enterprise has done great things, but the principle on which private enterprise is run is such that instead of conferring benefits on the vast majority all the time it benefits the few and detrimentally affects the assets of the vast majority of the people.

As the bell has rung telling me that my remaining time is short—and this reminds me that I did not attempt by interjection to steal any time from the hon. member for Aubigny—I will draw my remarks to a close. Private enterprise was in control when we had the great depression, private enterprise was in control of the banks, yet hundreds of thousands of our people were starving in the midst of plenty. Not only was private enterprise in control but a private-enterprise Government were in control of the Commonwealth Government at the time when many of our young, best and most vigorous men were compelled to tramp the roads of this State and jump the rattlers of this State vainly looking for jobs which did not exist.

Mr. Pie interjected.

Mr. PATERSON: The hon. member this morning spoke of the dignity of the House of Commons, yet he frequently interjects. If he wants that dignity in this Chamber he should interject much less, talk less with his tongue in his cheek and set a better example.

I repeat then it was private enterprise that was in control during that depression which, as I said, forced hundreds of thousands of our best and most vigorous young men to tramp the roads looking for a job. We who stand for the principles of the Labour movement want to see the resources of this country developed in the interests of the useful people and not in the interests of the wealthy, exploiting parasite class, and we shall fight vigorously until the day comes when there will be no crises and no depressions, and when private profit-making enterprise will no longer control industry and finance. When every able-bodied person in this State and Commonwealth and for that matter in this world will be guaranteed full-time work on decent wages and conditions, when old age will have no terror, when sickness and weakness will have lost many of their terrors. I believe, like several other hon. members on the left side of this House, that this will come only when we have a new system, called socialism, displacing the present system of capitalism, when there will be no longer private banks to dictate the financial policy of the Government or of the people, when there will be no rich directors who can attend monthly meetings of directors for a couple of hours, sip whisky and other tasty drinks or drinks tasty to their own palate and draw more in directors' salaries for a few hours work a month than hon. members in this House get for the whole of the year's work.

These are the ideals for which the party I represent in this House stands, and these are the ideals for which I will continue to fight.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Hanlon, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 3.41 p.m.
