

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 1947

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Hon. J. LARCOMBE (Rockhampton) replied—

“(a) Total indebtedness at 30 June, 1947—(i.) to Treasury, £10,103,657; (ii.) loans guaranteed by the Treasurer, £25,838,667. (b) Total interest payable in 1946-47—(i.) to Treasury, £383,523; (ii.) on loans guaranteed by the Treasurer (not available). (c) Amount borrowed in 1946-47—approved by Treasury, £845,033; advanced by Treasury, £176,037; loans guaranteed by the Treasurer, £5,068,758. (d) Subsidies paid in 1946-47, £273,251. (The total amount of subsidies paid to local authorities by the Treasury from 1 July, 1932, to 30 June, 1947, was £6,978,317.)”

DROUGHT-RELIEF GRANTS AND LOANS.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“In reference to his statement in answer to my question on 19 August last that a grant by way of an additional payment of subsidy was made to dairy farmers by the Commonwealth Government, will he kindly state the period during which the amount of drought relief mentioned, namely, approximately £99,990, was distributed?”

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

“The amount was distributed between February, 1947, and the date the question was answered.”

FINANCING OF SUGAR CROP.

Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“1. Is it a fact, as stated by the hon. member for Mirani, that an assignment of the total make of sugar is made to the C.S.R. Company in return for finance?”

“2. What is the method of financing the sugar crop and what is the financial responsibility of the Queensland Government?”

“3. Was sugar railed, instead of shipped, an additional charge on the sugar industry as alleged by the hon. member for Mirani?”

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Cook) replied—

“1. The hon. member for Mirani has been misinformed. No assignment of sugar is made to anyone.

“2. The acquiring and financing of the Queensland sugar crop is the entire responsibility of the Queensland Government, which guarantees all the financial transactions and contracts of the Sugar Board.

“3. No. The extra charges were met by the Commonwealth Government.”

THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER, 1947.

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

QUESTIONS.

LOANS AND SUBSIDIES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. EVANS (Mirani) asked The Treasurer—

“Will he kindly supply the following information regarding Queensland local authorities, namely:—(a) Total indebtedness at 30 June, 1947—(i.) to Treasury and (ii.) ex-Treasury; (b) total interest payable for 1946-47—(i.) to Treasury and (ii.) ex-Treasury; (c) total amount borrowed in 1946-47; (d) total subsidies paid in 1946-47?”

1947—L

EXPENDITURE ON IMMIGRATION DEPOT.

Mr. LUCKINS (Maree) asked the Secretary for Labour and Industry—

“What was the expenditure on the Immigration Depot at Kangaroo Point for the years ending 30 June, 1946, and 30 June, 1947, respectively?”

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

“Alterations to buildings, furniture, and equipment—1945-46, £113 5s. 3d.; 1946-47, £15,309 13s. 9d. Establishment costs totalling £15,422 19s. are subject to 50 per cent. refund by Commonwealth.”

MITCHELTON STATE SCHOOL.

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

“Has a portion of the original school grounds of Mitchelton State School been sold? If so, what was the date of sale?”

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

“No.”

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

“1. Is it the intention of the Government to erect a new school at Mitchelton?”

“2. If so, have plans for the proposed building been prepared?”

“3. If not, will he give an indication when it is expected that this will be done?”

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

“1, 2, and 3. In view of the decision for the ultimate establishment of a post-primary school in this centre for which purpose a large site has already been acquired by the Government, the proposal for the provision of a new primary school building on the new site acquired for the primary school has been deferred. When the post-primary school can be established pupils of the higher grades at present attending the primary school will attend the post-primary school and this will have effect on any plans for any future primary school building. Plans have therefore not been proceeded with. Pending determination of the future full educational requirements of this area, adequate temporary accommodation has been arranged for to meet the present needs of the primary school.”

CONFERENCE OF DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION.

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

“Will he make the report of the recent conference of Directors of Education available for perusal by hon. members of the Legislative Assembly?”

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

“The matter is being considered.”

FEDERAL CONTROL OF STATE FINANCES.

Mr. RUSSELL (Dalby) asked the Premier—

“As all income taxation is now collected by the Federal Treasurer and payments to the States are entirely at his discretion; also, as all borrowing is controlled by the Federal Government, will he kindly indicate

(a) the extent to which future development of this State is likely to be dependent upon and restricted by the dictates of the Federal Treasurer, and (b) the extent to which the interests of this State in regard to tax revenues and borrowing are likely to be jeopardised?”

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

“The hon. member’s assertions are based upon hypothetical premises. In terms of the Financial Agreement of 1927, borrowings by the Commonwealth and all States are subject to the jurisdiction of the Australian Loan Council, on which the State of Queensland has able representation. The programme of works presented to the Loan Council are prepared with due regard to the full development of the State, and the requisite funds for such works have been made available by means of loan raisings approved by that body. The hon. member can rest assured that the interests of the State have been and will continue to be adequately safeguarded by its elected representatives.”

EX-SERVICE MEN IN BUILDING TRADES.

Mr. CHALK (East Toowoomba) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“1. Has his attention been drawn to figures publicly released by the Deputy-Director of Post-War Reconstruction, showing that for every ex-service man awaiting entry to a training school in ten building and allied trades, there are six whose training has been deferred because industry cannot absorb them?”

“2. Does he consider the building trades are already at capacity employment?”

“3. If not, what specific steps does he propose taking to increase the intake of ex-service men into the building trades?”

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (The Tableland —Secretary for Public Instruction), for **Hon. W. POWER** (Baroona), replied—

“1. Yes.

“2 and 3. As pointed out by Mr. Router, the shortage of materials is one of the main reasons why industry cannot absorb more ex-servicemen trainees in the building trades. Seeing that the production of these materials is the responsibility of private enterprise, the reason for the shortage of materials which is holding up the training of these men is that private enterprise has fallen down on its job.”

ROAD TRANSPORT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.

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

“With reference to a question asked on 20 November, 1946, with regard to the provision of free or assisted road transport for school children, particularly those attending State secondary schools and his reply thereto stating, *inter alia*, that the matter was receiving careful consideration, would he inform the House what steps, if any, have

been taken to grant the same privileges and travel concessions to pupils travelling by road to attend State schools as are enjoyed by pupils travelling by rail?"

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

"As stated by my predecessor on 20 November last, the Department of Public Instruction bears the costs of transport of pupils travelling more than three miles daily by road to State primary schools, provided that the transport service has been approved. No such provision has been made in the case of pupils attending secondary schools."

BLAIR ATHOL COALFIELD.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) asked the Premier—

"1. With reference to the statement in the Governor's Opening Speech on page 7 of 'Hansard,' 1945-46, volume 185, that an expert committee had been set up to examine the possibility of developing the Blair Athol coalfield, &c., will he inform the House what findings and recommendations have been made by the committee in respect of (a) the value of Blair Athol coal for the purposes mentioned; (b) the water and land resources of the area, large scale electricity generation, &c.?"

"2. (a) What discussions have taken place between representatives of the Commonwealth and State Governments regarding the development of the Blair Athol coalfield; (b) what proposals, if any, have been put forward by these Governments for the development of this field; (c) what decisions have been made regarding these proposals?"

"3. What companies have placed proposals before the Government for the development of the field and what are the details of the proposal?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"Full information on these matters will be made available at a later date."

Mr. PIE (Windsor) asked the Premier—

"1. Will he confirm or otherwise the report that negotiations with the British Electric Supply Corporation have been interrupted because of the company's disinclination to pay the State Government a royalty of 1s. a ton?"

"2. Will he undertake to keep this House fully informed of all stages of the negotiations on Blair Athol development?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"1. The Government cannot accept responsibility for the correctness or otherwise of Press reports.

"2. I cannot conceive of any business negotiations being brought to a successful issue if the hon. member's suggestion were applied to governmental or private business negotiations. Any agreement finally reached on the Blair Athol development will be submitted to Parliament in due course."

FORM OF QUESTIONS.

EDITING BY MR. SPEAKER.

Mr. RUSSELL (Dalby) (11.10 a.m.): In connection with Question No. 8, I wish to raise a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There can be no question of privilege on the right of the Speaker to edit questions, but I will make a statement setting out the position clearly. The hon. member cannot raise a question of privilege on my action in editing a question.

Mr. RUSSELL: I wish to know why you altered certain wording of the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member will allow me to tell him, I shall be delighted to do so. I want to mention for the hon. member's information that the portion of the question disallowed was, in my opinion, not necessary to make the question intelligible. As a matter of fact, on re-reading the question again this morning, I think that the hon. member should realise that I have been over-generous in allowing so much of it.

I want to add this comment too: the answering of questions directed to Ministers is a matter of courtesy; a Minister is not compelled to answer any question. I have been very jealous to maintain the rights of members so that they can exercise the privilege of asking questions. In accordance with the powers given to me I make it a practice of seeing that a question directed to a Minister goes to him in such a way that the hon. member can receive the necessary reply.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.11 a.m.): In regard to your explanation, I am of the opinion that you have exceeded the rights given to you by virtue of your office in excising this portion of this question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no motion before the Chair. Is the hon. gentleman going to move a motion?

Mr. NICKLIN: I am going to move a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is moving a motion it will be necessary to give the necessary notice.

Mr. NICKLIN: I give notice of a motion that I disagree with your ruling in regard to this question this morning.

Mr. KERR (Oxley): I rise to a point of order. I notice that the business-sheet does not include a question asked by me concerning E. J. Goldfinch & Co. and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, the reason for its elimination.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! At the sitting two days ago I ruled in relation to a question asked by the hon. member for Windsor that the information sought had already been tendered to this House by the Premier.

Mr. KERR: I desire to point out that the question I asked concerning E. J. Goldfinch & Co.—

Mr. SPEAKER; Order!

Mr. PIE (Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that your ruling in eliminating the question of the hon. member for Oxley in relation to E. J. Goldfinch Development Company be disagreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that it is not a question of disagreeing with my ruling. I did not give a ruling. I merely continued the practice that has been in force for some years.

Mr. KERR: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: I give notice that I will move that your action in eliminating the hon. member's question in relation to E. J. Goldfinch & Co. be disagreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

TRADE COUPONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. D. A. GLEDSON (Ipswich—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to Amend The Trade Coupons Act of 1933 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. D. A. GLEDSON (Ipswich—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to Amend The Friendly Societies Acts, 1886 to 1943, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

Hon. D. A. GLEDSON (Ipswich—Attorney-General): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to Amend The Legal Practitioners Acts, 1881 to 1946, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—NINTH ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 3 September (see p. 289) on Mr. Crowley's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Premier) (11.21 a.m.), who was received with “Hear, hears,” said: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I tender to you my congratulations upon your reelection to the high and honourable position you occupy in this House. The continued election of the Speaker, Parliament after Parliament, is indicative of the fact that the holder has been carrying out his duties in a manner satisfactory to all hon. members of this House. It is interesting to note that it is many years since there has been a contest in this House for the election of an hon. member to that office. Parliament after Parliament has gone by and not for many years have we had a contest for the occupancy of the position as Speaker, which shows that the duties of Speaker have been carried out in a manner well in keeping with the high traditions of that office. It is a very difficult post to hold, as the occupant has to deal with situations as they arise, members sometimes lose their tempers, and it calls for tolerance on the part of the Speaker to maintain good order and decorum within the House.

I want to say, in the time at my disposal this morning, that since the House met at the beginning of this session I have paid whatever attention I could to the debates that have taken place. I have not always been able to be present at the House myself, but when not present I have been able to go over the speeches made by hon. members. Looking back over the last couple of weeks, I am almost inclined to believe that I have been in Palestine within hearing of the Wailing Wall, because we have heard nothing but wail after wail coming from the Opposition since this session opened.

Hon. members opposite, in their innocence, thought they were going to win the last elections, and they were injudicious enough to boast about it. That remark applies not only to the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Country Party, but particularly to the men who today call themselves the Queensland Division of the Liberal Party. They were willing to bet that they were going to be the Government, but they are not of a standard whereby they can take a knock with a smile or with a stiff face. Ever since their defeat they have been wailing trying to explain away their defeat. Not only was the election fought somewhat dirtily by members of the Liberal Party but a number of untruths were told. The Leader of the Opposition does not escape on that charge. Untruths were told, misrepresentation indulged in frequently, leading articles in the Press were untruthful, and a savage barrage was levelled at the Labour Party during the elections.

Mr. Macdonald: And you were elected.

Mr. HANLON: I am not one of those jokers who jump from one sort of company to another to shed the sins of their previous association. I carry my political and other sins all my life.

Mr. Macdonald interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: Hon. members opposite have so often been ashamed of their political conduct that they rush off to the political baptismal font to get a new name so that they will not be recognised by the people. Hon. members opposite have in my time changed their political affiliations three times and they do it without a blush. On one occasion, one hon. member sitting opposite took the oath of allegiance to a new political party on Tuesday and on Thursday swore allegiance the other way when he saw how things were going. That is nothing to boast about.

The time of this Parliament has been taken up by hon. members opposite with continual wailing and bemoaning—alas! alas!—the defeat of their hopes at the last elections. They have been trying to explain why they were defeated instead of having the hardihood to accept the will of the people with equanimity and saying, "As an Opposition we have a job to do and we are going to do it." Instead of doing that they indulge in all kinds of fantastic charges about the conduct of the elections. Long before I came into Parliament, which was in 1926, you will see that election after election hon. members opposite, when they were beaten at the polls, continually raised these cries. First the distribution of the seats was wrong, and then the electorates were not equal, some had larger numbers than others, and then the voting was carried out very loosely, malpractices were indulged in by members of the Labour Party. All these things you will find in "Hansard" in the session following an election in which hon. members opposite were beaten and found themselves in Opposition. The only instance where that has not happened since I have been in Parliament, where that has not been the explanation of their defeat, was in 1929 when my party sat over there and took the decision of the people. We set about doing our job as an Opposition.

Mr. Brand: You whined, too.

Mr. HANLON: There was no whining on our part. The then Leader of the Labour Party, when twitted with something that happened in a previous Parliament, said, "The people have dealt with the previous Government. They have gone out of existence. We accept their decision and we are now here as an Opposition." That was the attitude adopted by the then Leader of the Labour Party, Mr. W. Forgan Smith.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the same attitude is being adopted elsewhere. It is happening in Hungary where the Commos are complaining about the result of an election. There is a wailing wall there, too, and a political party is bemoaning the result of the

elections. It is typical of hon. members opposite always to look for excuses, always trying to hide from the fact that the people have not believed them and that they will not have them. I should not mind so much if hon. members opposite stuck to the truth and did not introduce slander and falsehood into their campaign.

I am very sorry that the hon. member for Toowong is not here today. I understand that he is away on party business, as he is entitled to be. It is unfortunate that he is not here, because I wanted to have a word to say to him particularly for his edification. He makes serious charges of illegal practices here but he takes no action to have anything done about them. It is quite easy for anyone to get up and say that so and so committed such and such a crime at such and such a time but it is a physical impossibility for the maker of the allegation to prove it and it is also impossible for the accused person to prove the negative, and so the maker gets away with the slander. These things happen with not only one political party. There are people whose enthusiasm outweighs their discretion.

The hon. member for Toowong suggested that there was some dishonest or corrupt person in the Ithaca A.L.P. because a certain woman voted—was it nine years?—too late, that she had voted for the candidate who had contested the seat against me nine years ago. He suggested that there was some corruption because she had written the name of the wrong candidate on the ballot paper. I am going to suggest that that thing was planned before the elections took place because three weeks before the elections I was told that somebody had voted for Mr. Webb in the election by postal ballot. How would anybody know how that person had voted before the ballot paper was ever opened? That story was current three weeks before the elections—that a certain lady had in fact voted for Mr. Webb at the recent elections.

This was three weeks before the election was over and it was found to be so when the ballot box was opened. There was a ballot paper with the name of Webb on it. How did the Queensland People's Party know three weeks before the ballot was opened that a person had written the name of Webb on the ballot paper? It is an offence to see what name is written on the ballot paper. The members of the Queensland People's Party have no right to look at the ballot paper. The regulations say distinctly that any person attending to the vote must not know how the person votes or see the vote. Yet three weeks before the election the returning officer and quite a number of our canvassers heard the story that someone had written the name of Mr. Webb on the ballot paper. We can draw our own conclusions on that. No trick is too slimy for this party to use when it does this sort of thing.

Let us see some other instances that happened in Ithaca that were certainly wrong. A certain lady—I know the name very well but I do not wish to publish it, although if hon. members doubt my accuracy they can

see it—who was a full-time organiser and canvasser for the Queensland People's Party, collected a number of postal votes recorded for me and as a result of her action they were informal. No-one can say that it was accidental because she wrote her name on the ballot paper. The voter wrote "E. M. Hanlon" and then the good lady canvasser wrote her name on the ballot paper, making the vote informal. There again a serious offence was committed. Under section 14 of the Criminal Code that carries a sentence of two years' imprisonment. Will hon. members say that lady should be prosecuted? I do not say she should. Being a Queensland People's Party officer, of course, she was ignorant of her work, but she was not so ignorant of the ways of the Queensland People's Party when she wrote her name on votes cast for me. She proved her ignorance and innocence by writing her name on the ballot papers and rendering them informal.

Mr. Aikens: You have shown a profit on it.

Mr. HANLON: Yes, not by design of the lady but by her ignorance.

Mr. Sparkes: I wondered how you came here.

Mr. HANLON: If the Liberal Party sent canvassers of that kind to collect postal votes, it could only expect the result it does get.

Then we have this case. Another lady canvasser for the Q.P.P. known to us, sent in three applications for one person's postal vote. This good lady got an application for this gentleman—incidentally, let me say that he is a retired public servant and should know better.

The application was brought to the returning officer by the lady canvasser. A postal ballot paper was forwarded, but, later, the lady canvasser brought in another application from the same elector. She was told by the returning officer that a ballot paper already had been forwarded to the applicant and she explained that he had spoiled it and destroyed it. The returning officer informed the lady that he would not replace the ballot paper unless the original was returned. Later, however, a third application for a postal vote was received from the same elector, the lady canvasser apparently thinking that the returning officer kept no records and it might slip through.

I would not say that was criminal intent. Probably it was merely that her over-enthusiasm for the party outweighed her discretion. But the confirmed invalid on whose behalf the postal votes were sought came into the polling booth and voted himself.

These things will happen, but to suggest that the number of occasions these little irregularities happen affects the result of the ballot is too stupid for words. If you went through all the complaints about such things that occurred through the misguided enthusiasm of people there would be quite a lot of such cases. In almost every case there would be a prosecution of somebody who committed a breach of the law.

Now, that does not apply to members of Parliament. I do not think any member is justified in committing a breach of the law or doing anything mean or paltry or dishonest to an elector. I want to point out that the gentleman who raised the cry here on this matter, the hon. member for Toowong, probably was raising this cry of malpractices on the part of other people to hide his own guilt.

Mr. Aikens: Attack is the best means of defence.

Mr. HANLON: It is the oldest gag in the world. This gentleman paid a visit to the Kenmore Chalet, to the T.B. Soldiers' Home. He went out there himself and interviewed soldiers and himself participated in the collection of postal votes.

Mr. Aikens: For himself?

Mr. HANLON: I am going to prove that he was not trying for anybody else. He was self first, self second, and self third all the time. He went out there and probably took another J.P. or elector with him. He was doing this canvass for the postal votes himself. He received applications for postal votes for other electorates. When he got them back to his office he had letters sent to these people telling them they were not on the roll for the electorate for which they claimed a vote, but being soldiers, under section so and so they could get a vote for Toowong, as they were now living in the Toowong electorate. They were on the roll for the electorate for which they claimed to be enrolled. If he had been snatching votes from his opponent, the Labour candidate, perhaps we would say there was some excuse for trying to cheat his opponent, but do you know whom he was taking them from? His colleague, the member for East Toowoomba—he was catching his colleague. Never mind the dishonesty or indecency of the proceedings. What a great exhibition of loyalty! Toowong, I suppose, is the most conservative seat in the Commonwealth, with immense majorities; still, he was not taking any risk; if he could take a couple of votes from his comrade who was fighting a much harder fight, that was O.K. as long as he got his votes. I mention this because it is time we realised what stupid and senseless stories are being told. The person who raised the matter has less reason to be proud of his association with the elections than any person mentioned in the debate.

The Opposition make the charge that this is a minority Government. They put up a case for proportional representation. The Leader of the Opposition raised the cry that the Labour Party on the average had so many votes for seats in contrast with a greater number for each member of the Opposition. He did not bother to tell you about the contrast between his party's average vote and the average cast for the Queensland People's Party and the Communist Party, which would probably justify more seats for each of those parties.

With proportional representation you have to be factual. If there is one thing that

would destroy stable government in any country it is proportional representation. Proportional representation has generally made it impossible to keep stable government in most European countries. The system has never grown in British countries. It has been tried in Tasmania and is working well while there are two parties, but when there are five or six or seven it is going to end stable government in Tasmania. The strength of the British system of government, irrespective of the party in power, has been responsible government with control by Parliament, a Government responsible to the electors who have no excuse for not carrying out election promises and no excuse for doing things that are wrong.

There is no excuse for anything they do. The system of having two different parties in politics is the strength of the British system of government; there is not the slightest doubt about that.

What is happening in France, Belgium, Italy and in the European countries where there is a multitude of parties? Groups of party members get together and by sacrificing their principles to some extent or another make a compromise Government, who cannot stand up to the difficulties we are passing through. I venture to say that no country in the world has gone through and is going through a greater crisis today than Great Britain, but there is no talk of revolution and no collapse of government.

Mr. Barnes: There will be a revolution.

Mr. HANLON: There is no collapse of government. There is a Government capable of governing the country until the people in due course have the opportunity to either endorse their actions or destroy them.

That is the secret of the success of the British system of government and of governments based on our British system. Governments based on our British system followed over the centuries are the only Governments in the world that have ever stood up to any kind of crisis. Dictatorships come and go. They rise but because of lack of responsibility stable government is destroyed and they produce a situation that sooner or later becomes intolerable to the people. The change may be brought about by a sudden seizure of power without bloodshed or it may be brought about by bloodshed. Where it is brought about by bloodshed, where the people's wrongs have been so great that only bloodshed will save them, it has been found that bloodshed only feeds the flame of hate and makes the position worse. Sooner or later these big dictatorships, whether right or wrong, come to an end and the people's will comes to the surface.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member can have his opinion but it is a fact that our present party system of government always results in a Government who can carry on the government in times of crises. Take the outbreak of war. There was a coalition Government in the Federal Parliament. The

war went on for a year without much trouble. As a matter of fact, the Press, in the usual type of larrikin way the Press writes up crises of great moment to other people, was referring to it as a phoney war. The year 1940 arrived and the phoney war became a very bloody war indeed; 1941 broke with things looking serious and the war approaching Australia—not a war 12,000 miles away. What happened to the coalition Government? They threw up their hands.

Mr. Barnes: They did not in Britain.

Mr. HANLON: They did in Australia and I am talking of Australia. They threw up their hands and surrendered and a party, even though it had not a majority in the House, had to take over the government. This party had the support of a couple of Liberal Party members, who saw the necessity of getting some form of stable and strong government. That has happened repeatedly. In times of crisis all these Governments who live simply by concessions to one another, who live because of their lack of principles or ethics, sooner or later collapse when a crisis occurs. In England a coalition Government was created in war-time. There was no disagreement between the parties and no sacrifice of principles, because both parties were agreed on the one policy, and the only job they were doing was fighting the war.

This is an extract from the "New Statesman and Nation," London, 9 March, 1946—

"One of the peculiarities of English politics has always been the degree of influence that could be attained by private organisations, run usually by a single-minded secretary who did not doubt that the reform for which he worked would ensure the country's salvation."

"The other day we lost such an able and disinterested Secretary in the death of John Humphreys who lived for the cause of proportional representation. Thank goodness he failed to persuade either the Conservatives or the Labour Party that they would gain by a system of mathematically just representation that would have prevented us ever having a government with an adequate majority with which to govern. How important this British rejection of democratic logic has been I realised more clearly than ever when I was recently in Belgium. When a real issue arises, proportional representation prevents decision and condemns countries to political deadlock and often (prewar France is a classical example) discredits democracy by making all governments feeble and unstable."

That is an article paying tribute to the leader of a movement for proportional representation. It pays tribute to his honesty and sincerity of belief, but points out the result of experience during the recent war in Great Britain, points out the fallacy of this idea that you can get mathematically perfect representation of any people in an elected assembly and have anything like success.

I come now to the coal industry. Recently there has been quite an argument about the

control of the coal in the Commonwealth. Hon. members should know that apart from Queensland, New South Wales has been supplying the whole of Australia with the great bulk of her coal—New South Wales is the key coal-producing centre for the Commonwealth. Queensland has been able to supply all her own requirements. We have bought a little coal. Some of the northern cities buy gas coal from the south because it is a little cheaper than hauling it by rail from Styx, and some excellent gas coal is available in the South, but by and large, Queensland has been able to carry her industries with her own coal.

Two years ago the New South Wales Government and the Commonwealth Government came to an agreement to set up a Coal Board. The New South Wales Government realised that they had an obligation to the other coal-hungry States to supply coal, and the Commonwealth Government, as the Government responsible for the whole of the Commonwealth, felt that they, too, had a responsibility, but that they had not power to control industries in New South Wales. An agreement was reached whereby a combined coal authority was created. Identical legislation was passed through the Federal and State Houses, creating a Joint Coal Board on which the Commonwealth had the major and the State the minor representation. That board's duty was to try to increase the production of coal by mechanisation of industry, to solve industrial difficulties by the provision of better conditions of work for the men engaged in the industry—it has been the industry with, I suppose, the worst conditions of work of all industries—and to endeavour to distribute coal to the best advantage throughout the whole of the coal-hungry parts of the Commonwealth.

Very great powers were given to the board. The Commonwealth Government undertook to advance money to companies for the mechanisation of industry. They undertook also to see that amenities were provided, and they undertook to pay, £ for £ with the New South Wales Government, up to a maximum of £70,000 a year for the decent needs of life that had never been provided by the coal companies.

Mr. Pie: Was that only in the State-owned mines?

Mr. HANLON: No, it applied to the whole of the State of New South Wales. It took control of all mines. That board can open or close a mine. It has absolute control of the industry. It can direct the coal from any mine to any place. It can direct it to another State or to any part of New South Wales. It can tell a mine to close or it can order a mine to be opened up. It can compel the mechanisation of a mine. It has complete control, just as if it were the owner of the mine. As a matter of fact, the coal-owners of New South Wales are now in the position that they can play golf while somebody else runs the mines for them. All they have to do is receive the dividends. Obviously, of course, the dividends are not

as high as possibly they would be if these mines were allowed to go their own way at their own sweet will. The responsibility for the capital invested has been taken off their shoulders and they will get their dividends out.

I call attention to the title of the Bill the Commonwealth passed, which is as follows—

“A Bill to provide means for the securing and maintaining adequate supplies of coal throughout Australia, and for providing for the regulation and improvement of the coal industry in the State of New South Wales . . .”

That is the body to which the Communist Party wanted us to hand over the coal-mining industry in Queensland. It is a body created to look after the coal-mining interests of New South Wales; the very title of the Bill shows that it is to preserve the industry in New South Wales. The hon. member for Bowen made an attempt to join in the face-saving policy of the Communist Party by denying that. On every approach made to me and to my colleague who was the Secretary for Mines until the last few weeks, there has been the demand that we agree to the extension of the existing law. All along we have maintained that the Queensland Government—

Mr. PATERSON: I rise to a point of order. The remarks made by the Premier are incorrect and offensive to me. I did not attempt to make any face-saving. I was stating the truth, and if the Premier is honest enough to read the letter he received from the Coal-miners' Union written to the Labour Party in July or August last he will see that the union wanted similar provisions and not the same provisions.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member can look at the notes of repeated deputations to me, and he can look at the last letter I received from the Prime Minister on the matter, when he did make a concession pointing out that we could have the Commonwealth-New South Wales Coal Board with one representative of the State of Queensland on it when dealing with the Queensland industry.

In the week that I was at Canberra Mr. Williams, the Federal President, and another man whose name I do not remember, waited upon me. I gave them half-an-hour of my time. Again the request was made for the extension of this board to Queensland and again I told them that we would not hand over the control of the industry in Queensland to anybody outside this State.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HANLON: They were told time and time again that Queensland, which has led in the improvement of miners' conditions in Australia, would continue to lead, and anything that could be done in New South Wales would be done in Queensland by the Queensland Government. I went so far as to say that I believed that if the matter was put properly to the Prime Minister he would see the justice of our case and he would agree to the

formation of a board on which Queensland would have the majority representation so that the control of a Queensland industry would remain in the hands of Queensland people. I pointed out that if he did not we would find ways of financing everything in Queensland so that what was done in New South Wales could be done in Queensland—the mechanisation of our industry and the provision of the amenities that are being provided under the Joint Coal Board. I pointed out that whilst the coal industry was not of great magnitude here, it was going to be; all the new mines would have to provide the amenities and it would be a condition of their starting. They would have to provide decent conditions for the workers and, where housing is required, they would have to provide housing on a scale suitable—

Mr. Pie: Similar to Mount Isa.

Mr. HANLON: No, no more twin towns will be created. We will not make that mistake again. Anybody can be excused for making a mistake once, but it is inexcusable to make the same mistake twice. At Mount Isa at the time it looked all right, but the scheme has resulted in hostility between two sections of the people, and has not resulted in a good-class town growing up. Those mistakes will not be made in the future; everybody makes mistakes when dealing with new things.

We are going to profit by these mistakes and so on this occasion all the new industries will have to be up to the standard laid down in the Act that was introduced a couple of years ago by the Secretary for Labour and Industry.

Mr. Williams came here with the intention of trying to get the Queensland miners to buck against the Queensland Government's policy but a change of face came about when he found that the Queensland miners knew darned well that the job of protecting the Queensland coal industry was not likely to receive much consideration by New South Wales should we come into competition with that State, as we must. This State has immense resources and they will be developed.

Let us have a look at the stories that have been told in an endeavour to prevent the development of Blair Athol. When I first took over the leadership of this party I set out to have Blair Athol investigated so as to make good use of the coal deposits there; we wanted expansion and development in this country. We appointed a committee to have a look at the Blair Athol field to see what could be done. This is the position as it was and as it is today: the whole of the Blair Athol field is controlled by private companies. The hon. member for Bowen in his speech by inference suggested that we were handing over the field to a private company. We are doing nothing of the kind, as the whole of the Blair Athol field is in private hands now and the rights date back to 1891. The whole field is occupied by private companies and they have the right, if they can raise the money, to do exactly as it is proposed to do now. But the companies at Blair Athol could not carry on without Government assistance. Just

as the Government guaranteed the Bruce Pie textile industry, we guaranteed also the account of the Blair Athol company a few years ago to enable it to carry on. I do not think that it has paid it off yet. There is no harm in that; it is a perfectly logical business procedure. The people came along to us and we financed them to enable them to increase their output. We wanted more coal.

In addition, it costs us nearly 10s. to get every ton of this coal to the coast. The Commissioner for Railways informs me that the Railway Department loses about £80 on each trainload of Blair Athol coal taken to the coast and the average trainload is about 160 tons. That is all the department can take over that track.

Mr. Aikens: That is 160 tons net?

Mr. HANLON: Yes, 160 tons of coal. That means that we are subsidising every ton of coal taken from Blair Athol to the coast at the rate of 10s. a ton, but we cannot afford to go on doing that. And why should we? Why should the people of this State be putting their hands into their pockets for 10s. on every ton of coal taken from Blair Athol to the coast when the coalfield could be developed by someone else who will pay us a royalty? That would mean that instead of our having to pay a subsidy we should be getting a reasonable royalty—an entirely different thing.

The only way in which the Blair Athol coalfield can be developed by the open-cut method is by doing it on a great scale so that the price per ton will be cheap enough to enable the coal to compete with other coal overseas. The present people cannot do that. It is going to take an immense amount of money. Therefore I decided to have an investigation into the matter. Competent officers were selected and we sought the aid of the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government sent a man named Merritt, who, I understand, is the big man, the engineer, at Broken Hill. He is the man associated with coal supplied to Broken Hill and he was sent to give us all the help he could in the matter. He did not stay very long. He had a look over the show and saw all the information that we could give him. With Mr. Kemp, Mr. Colin Clark, and the engineering staff he went through the whole thing and tendered certain advice to me.

On an expenditure of £10,000,000 we could turn out from Blair Athol 1,300,000 tons of coal a year by mechanised production. The cost of bringing that coal to the coast and providing shipping facilities, as well as loading facilities on a big scale, would be in that vicinity. We are assured of the sale of 1,000,000 tons of coal a year in the southern States, and we should want about 500,000 tons a year for our growing trade in Queensland. We should, therefore, be sure of selling 1,500,000 tons a year. That is, for the expenditure of £10,000,000, including the building of a new railway, the putting in of machinery, and the erection of coal-loading

equipment at the port of shipment we should be able to turn out 1,500,000 tons of coal a year at the same price as Newcastle and Maitland coal is being sold, and it would mean a subsidy of £800,000 a year. I do not think it is quite fair to subsidise one industry by £800,000 a year, notwithstanding the other advantages. Of course, I look at the opposite side of the picture, at the advantage of getting cheap coal, building up another town, the creation of another port, and the increased population, but £800,000 subsidy would mean that there would be £800,000 less expenditure on account of hospitals, social services, and education. Therefore, I say, let someone else do it.

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

Mr. HANLON: I thank the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs and hon. members.

As I was saying, let these people who can put more money into it and produce coal cheaply undertake the risk. I was advised by my committee that if we could turn out 3,500,000 tons of coal a year by spending more money on a bigger plant Blair Athol might stand on its own feet. I have always found these reports optimistic. Everyone I have seen recommending anything on constructive lines has, to say the least of it, been optimistic in regard to expenditure. When they point out that with an output of 3,500,000 tons a year, Blair Athol would probably stand on its legs, it is possible that it would and it is possible that it would not. But here is the position. We should have to sell 1,000,000 tons of coal a year in the South, and 500,000 additional tons in Queensland, but what should we do with the other 2,000,000 tons? The State Government cannot possibly enter into the overseas trade. The firm that is offering to go into coal development in Australia has access to the coal trade in Asia and South America. New South Wales once had a big overseas coal trade, but lost it and it is all gone. These people can get this coal trade if they get coal at a reasonable price. They estimate that if they can produce 3,500,000 tons of coal a year they can supply 500,000 tons for our domestic use and sell 2,000,000 tons overseas.

Mr. Pie: And 1,000,000 tons to the South.

Mr. HANLON: They can sell 1,000,000 tons in the South. Thus they could keep costs down to a level that would be profitable. By this means we can get cheaper coal for our northern and central railways, and we can get cheap coal for electricity projects and supply the people with cheaper electricity, that is, if they can get the coal out as cheaply as they say. There will also be other associated industries if coal can be put on the surface at 5s. a ton. All over the world associated industries will be found where cheap and assured coal supplies are available. That is a thing we have to look at. Coal at 5s. a ton on the vehicles at Blair Athol will inevitably attract immense industries to this State.

Mr. Aikens: You are admitting the superiority of private enterprise to State enterprise.

Mr. HANLON: No, I am perhaps suggesting inferiority because the State Government could not go into the overseas coal trade. I am advised that in the contest for coal there are tricks that no Government can go in for. As the Minister for Mines has told me, there is what is called "squeeze." That is, when I pass my account over I put in £100,000 for "squeeze." That being so, I will keep out of it. That is not suggesting the superiority of private enterprise; it is suggesting that a higher standard of ethics are required in Government undertakings.

Mr. Sparkes: What is wrong with private enterprise making millions?

Mr. HANLON: The hon. gentleman should not say it. He is singing out for the Government to put their hand in the Treasury to help his own people in their private enterprise. Everything I have heard this session from hon. members opposite is that private enterprise is down and we have to go and help it; they are howling out for the Government to help private enterprise. If it is so good why do they want us to help it along?

That sums up the coal position. These people require the right to run their coal to the coast. They want a conveyor to carry the coal from the point of digging to embarkation. That will have to be given, if we are to get the thing done.

There has been no hitch on a royalty. They are not going to get any advantage as to royalty that is not available to everybody else in the State. Whatever terms are given to that company will be available to every coal-producer in Queensland. "No special favours to anybody" is our policy. We are not going to give a monopoly of coal in Queensland to anybody. Blair Athol is only a circumstance in the coal in this country, which has at its disposal as a coal area the whole of the region from Collinsville to the Callide Valley. The artesian bores in the Callide Valley went through 30 feet of coal not far from the surface. In the Ruby bore there was 30 feet of solid coal 340 feet underground. There is coal all over that country. Blair Athol is fuel coal and valueless for coke or gas. Other deposits have to be worked.

If these people can provide the ships that is an important thing. It would take 14 4,000-ton colliers to ship 1,000,000 tons. It would take a maximum of 16 ships to keep 14 running all the time. Where are we going to get them? We have not a chance. We have to look facts in the face. As a matter of fact, this is happening already: since the announcement of the Government's determination to exploit this coal and provide coal in North Queensland there is already a rush to take up mining leases, prospecting leases by people who know that coal will be available for the development of the resources. I can see the glory of the North

coming back as a result of making cheap coal and power available.

Before anything is done legislation will be needed. Every intelligent person knows you cannot conduct in public negotiations to invest the sum involved here. People want some confidential records in negotiating for anything they are going to spend money on, but eventually legislation will be required before these people can do anything. We have nothing to do with the companies that own the fields now; the newcomers will have to buy them out.

Mr. Evans: Will the other resources be taken into consideration with the route?

Mr. HANLON: I told the people from the hon. member's area when I was up there at election time that this was a great national undertaking and that the only thing that would be considered by the Government would be the success of the undertaking. It means a great deal to the State, and we are not going to allow any shark who wants to "tear a few quid" out of the side of it to interfere with it. No railway will be run to give advantage to any land owned by any of the hon. member's friends. He can tell them to keep off and not waste their money; they are all going to burn their fingers.

Mr. Aikens: Will you make this clear: who will determine the route, the company or the Government?

Mr. HANLON: I have had representations from all sorts of people who want the railway run here or there, but I tell them the railway will run where it will serve the industry that it is being built to serve. It will not be in any way diverted to suit capitalistic profit or gain.

Mr. Aikens: Who will decide the route, the company or the Government?

Mr. HANLON: The Government, of course. The matter will come to this Parliament.

But now let me get on; perhaps too much time has been given to that subject. I regret that members of the Liberal Party should have endeavoured to discredit the proposal, but apparently, from the statements I have read and the stories I have heard, they would prefer that the whole national project be a failure, rather than that a Labour Government should get the credit.

Mr. Pie: All we wanted is the information you have given us now.

Mr. HANLON: I wish to say a few words about the broad national outlook displayed by members of the Opposition during this debate. Hon. member after hon. member has pointed out the tremendous benefit that would accrue to the people of this country if something were done for his own immediate advantage, or to the advantage of an industry with which he himself is concerned. For instance, we have the hon. member for Windsor—the greatest problem he had to place before Parliament was the supply of

cotton. Admittedly cotton is an important commodity in his industry, but, Mr. Speaker, you notice that he is the only member of the Opposition who has been particularly concerned about cotton. The explanation is that he is the only one interested in the trade. It is to his own advantage.

Then we have the hon. members opposite from the pastoral districts. For instance, according to the hon. member for Dalby, the greatest thing we can do for this country is to chop the freight on wool, because he is interested in wool. Some other hon. member wants to export sorghum or something else. The hon. member for Aubigny wants something done about cattle—the hon. member is in the cattle trade. The hon. member for Toowong wants more litigation—he is in the law trade. One could go right through the whole box of dice of them, and find that each and every one sees the solution of the nation's problem in these days of stress to be something that he or his industry will obtain a few bob from. That is the broad view of hon. members opposite. I would suggest that they take their "Hansards" and read them, and they will be striking their breasts and getting onto the wailing wall in real earnest.

Another thing about hon. members opposite is their hypocrisy when they start to abuse the State Government about uniform taxation. If there is one sin I have not got on my soul, it is the sin of inflicting uniform taxation on this State. The hon. members for Windsor and West Moreton waxed indignant. I was really worried about the hon. member for Windsor. I thought he was going to have a stroke on this question; but I must inform him that this Government opposed it, whereas the hon. member for Windsor supported it.

Mr. Pie: During war.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member does not want it in peace, only in war! But that is typical of the hon. member. According to "Hansard" of 20 October, 1942, Mr. Pie (Windsor) said—

"I agree with the principle of uniform tax especially during war-time, but why not in times of peace too?"

What is the good of the hon. member's standing and assaulting this Government?

Mr. Pie: They would be hard to assault.

Mr. HANLON: I know it would be pretty difficult to assault them. Every member of the Opposition supported uniform taxation. Every member of the Opposition in his speech criticised the Labour Government because we went into litigation with the Commonwealth Government to protect the rights of the people of the State. We saw what it would inevitably mean—sooner or later this power going over to the Commonwealth Government from the State was going to restrict the liberty of the people of this State to manage their own affairs in their own way. We put up a fight in this House and carried on the fight in the law courts and, believe me, had there been a whole-

hearted and unanimous objection by the Parliaments of the Australian States that verdict would never have been given.

It was a war-time verdict, and even now I believe that if the Premiers and Governments of the other States would join in fighting this thing to the Privy Council we could still have it upset. Do not believe some of them when they tell you they want uniform taxation; they are only sham-fighting.

I had forgotten the hon. member for Sandgate. Being in the land business, he makes an annual contribution to this debate advocating the raising of the price restriction on land sales.

Mr. DECKER: I rise to a point of order. The Premier has charged me with being in the land business. I have assured this Assembly previously, and I assure the Premier again that I am not in the land business and have not been in it for eight years.

Mr. HANLON: I am glad to receive the assurance of the hon. member that he is clean at last. I hope the conversion is permanent and he will keep out of it. His idea is to allow soldier settlement to go ahead by raising the price of the land the soldiers are going to buy to settle on. The true purpose of settling soldiers is to give the men who go on the land an opportunity of making a living from it. The hon. member for Sandgate says we are wrong in preventing price rises. He says, "Why not make these fool soldiers who are going out on the land pay as much as we can get out of them for the land?" The hon. member for Sandgate wants a removal of the restriction of price rises. This can only mean that the price of land will increase and if the price is to increase the debt of the soldier will increase and the prospect of his being a successful farmer will decrease accordingly. That is inevitable.

Then the hon. member for Windsor and other hon. members opposite want all restrictions removed. They want price restrictions removed. One of the most amusing contributions to a debate I have heard in this Parliament was that made by the hon. member for Windsor the other day when he stated that he wanted all price controls removed. He became really funny that day.

Mr. Pie: I did not say that.

Mr. HANLON: The removal of price controls means inflated prices.

Mr. Muller: Not necessarily at all. What happened in America?

Mr. HANLON: I am just about to tell the hon. member what happened in America; it takes him all his time to understand what happens in Fassifern. The hon. member for Windsor told us the other day what happened in America, and he did not tell us the truth, and the hon. member for Fassi-

fern is probably still running round Fassifern telling the same falsehood. In America prices have spiralled.

Mr. Muller: Of course they have, but they are falling again.

Mr. HANLON: Is it not a terrible thing to think that hon. members come into this Parliament to govern the State and they are too lazy to read the daily newspapers! If the hon. member had read the "Courier-Mail" last Monday he would have seen that the whole of Europe is alarmed because the price of wheat is spiralling again. They must not forget that the unfortunate hungry people of Britain are paying 16s. a bushel for their wheat, and it is going higher. They say, "Remove price controls and get as much out of the hides of the hungry people of Britain as you can," I suppose. Is that their idea of helping Britain? They want to remove price control so that prices can go to tremendous heights.

Mr. Muller: Your control has not kept prices down.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Windsor was absolutely wrong when he told us what happened in America. He said prices went up for a while and then they came down. He has a private pipe-line, from President Truman, I suppose.

Mr. Pie: I have information that comes out of Washington every week, and you can have a look at it.

Mr. HANLON: Lots of things come out of Washington. This great boast of his that he has a special pipe-line of information from Washington that is available to nobody else reminds me that the other day a leading Liberal Party man said to me, "Do you know the best definition of inflation that I have heard?" I said, "No, what is it?" He said, "Buying Bruce Pie at your estimate and selling him at his." Here he has a special pipe-line of information that is not available to Kings or Governments but is available only to Mr. Pie. Mr. Speaker, he reached a new top the other day when he congratulated God on having sent the rain down in Australia.

Mr. Aikens: He conveyed the impression that he arranged with God for the rain.

Mr. HANLON: There must have been great rejoicing in heaven when the congratulations reached the Almighty. What struck me most forcibly was the fact that he put God in third place because he congratulated you, Mr. Speaker, first, then the 12 new members, and then God. He boasts about the source of his information. He made a statement in this House in August and I want to refer to a copy of "Time," dated 25 August.

At 12.21 p.m.,

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

Mr. Pie: It was just recently.

Mr. HANLON: Well, isn't August recently? I am speaking of August of this year. This is the copy of "Time" and here is the first column on the first page headed "The Nation"—

"No Cheers.

"Prices climbed—and went on climbing. Last week the Bureau of Labour Statistics gave another altimeter reading: On 15 June its consumers' price index reached its highest point ever: 157.1 per cent. of the 1935-39 level. In a year, food costs in large cities had risen 31 per cent., clothing was up 18 per cent., house furnishings 17 per cent. The national pattern was not uniform, but almost everywhere in the U.S. the postwar dollar was worth only about 50 per cent. of its prewar value in purchases of essential consumer goods. The retail price ceiling was not in sight."

On Monday of this week it was reported that wheat was still spiralling and hungry Europe was looking at this rising spiral in terror because there was no control of prices.

Mr. Muller interjected.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. members for Aubigny and Fassifern in their ignorance believe that prices are coming down.

Mr. Muller: Of course they are, and you know it.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Fassifern is crying out for the removal of prices control so that he can reap increased profits under the guise of helping Britain. If he had any decency he would try to keep prices down. Every three-penny bit sweated out of the hides of the people of Britain he will take.

Why do they want price control removed? In July, 1946 there was a record sum of £90,000,000 deposited in the Commonwealth Savings Bank in Queensland. Now, the bulk of that money is the savings of the working people made during war-time because during the war they could not buy furniture, nor could they buy linen or clothes or crockery or homes; their money went into the savings bank. They will, when consumer goods are available, want to replace their worn-out linen and household equipment, just as we shall want to replace our worn-out railway rolling stock. Private enterprise comes in and asks for the removal of price control, saying, "If price control is not removed we shall have to give £90,000,000 worth of goods for the £90,000,000 in the savings bank, but if you remove price control we shall have to give only £45,000,000 worth of goods for the £90,000,000." If prices go up then they get the savings of the people for a lot less goods and services.

Let me now quote the opinion of the late leader of the Queensland Liberal Party, Mr. J. B. Chandler, who in his policy speech—

Mr. Pie: The ex-leader, not the late leader.

A Government Member: He was nearly always "ex," if not late.

Mr. Brand: He is still alive.

Mr. HANLON: He is alive, I understand. **Opposition Members** interjecting,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hear hon. members on my left talking a good deal about the dignity of the House. I hope they will try to maintain that dignity.

Mr. HANLON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a well-deserved rebuke.

The ex-leader of the Queensland Liberal Party is alive and well, I hope, but so far as I know he has become lost in the wilds of Manhattan. This is what he had to say in his policy speech:—

"There has been much talk during the past years of 'post-war planning' and 'post-war reconstruction.' So much emphasis has been placed on this matter that it may well be questioned whether we are not more likely to over-plan than to under-plan. Many thoughtful persons now believe that if industry is allowed to follow as nearly as possible its normal course when war ceases, if irksome and harassing regulations and restrictions are removed as soon as possible, the demand of the public for goods and services will be adequate to provide employment for all who need it."

Quite true, and I agree with him. He goes on to say—

"There has been a good deal of loose thinking on this subject. In the minds of many people the end of the war and the last depression are completely linked together. While it may be that the 1929 depression did stem from the war, it should be remembered that it occurred more than 10 years after the cessation of hostilities. What we should be ready to guard against is a recurrence of the conditions of a depression period some years after this war when the abnormal demand created by war scarcity has been to some extent satisfied."

Exactly what I said. As soon as private enterprise has collared this £90,000,000 worth of people's savings, then let them go on Government relief, let us get ready for a depression.

That is the policy of the party opposite. It is their policy to supply all the consumer goods at as high a price as they can, but it does not matter what the price is, the volume of money in the hands of the people still remains the same. You cannot get more out of the people than the total volume of their savings, no matter how much goods you supply. Therefore, the whole art of government today is to see that the people get full value for their savings, whereas the aim of private enterprise is to see that it gets as much of the savings as it can for as little goods as it can supply; hence you have the demand for the relaxation of price control.

Before I close, I want to make one important statement to the Chamber. During the recent Premiers' Conference, a report of

which will be printed and circulated amongst hon. members so that they will have a full knowledge of what happened there, I interviewed the Prime Minister. I took a deputation from the sugar industry to him asking for the restoration of the $\frac{3}{4}$ d. a lb. cut in sugar that was made during the depression years. I think we were able to make an excellent case, and in fact so good was it that I had a telephonic communication from the Prime Minister just before I came into the Chamber to say that his Cabinet had approved of the increase in price and that legislation would be introduced as speedily as possible to give effect to it. This alteration in the price of sugar will mean that legislation will have to be introduced both into the Federal and State Parliaments, and naturally we are eager to have our Bill prepared right away.

There is one further piece of information that he gave me, and it was in relation to the subsidy on the sulphate of ammonia that has been going to the North for some years. Last year this subsidy cost the Commonwealth Treasury £90,000. The Prime Minister now proposes to put a limit on that subsidy of £100,000 a year. The subsidy will be at the same rate as now prevails, which is £3 10s. a ton, until the amount of £100,000 is reached. He will not go over £100,000 in a year.

Mr. Brand: That is all right.

Mr. HANLON: It is providing adequately for our present needs. In the next year or two, as more becomes available, we shall get more. We shall not get a greater subsidy in that respect than £100,000.

Mr. Brand: That is satisfactory.

Mr. HANLON: It is an excellent thing for the sugar industry to have the cut in the price of sugar restored.

Mr. Brand: Is there any other provision?

Mr. HANLON: No. The Federal Government are removing the 10s. a ton shipping subsidy on sugar. We included that in our case. We cannot take exception to that.

Mr. Macdonald: Is that subsidy on sulphate of ammonia solely for the sugar industry?

Mr. HANLON: No, for the benefit of everyone who uses it.

The removal of the 10s. a ton shipping subsidy on sugar was included in our case. That will now be regarded as part of the increased cost that the industry will bear. The increase of $\frac{3}{4}$ d. a lb. in the price of sugar will mean a great deal to the sugar industry.

Mr. Brand: It will cost us nearly £200,000.

Mr. HANLON: The decision of the Federal Government is good news to the sugar industry generally.

That is all I have to say. A full report of the Premiers' Conference will be circulated among hon. members as soon as it is printed.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert) (12.32 p.m.): I should like to join with other hon. members who have preceded me in congratulating Sir John Lavarack on his appointment as our Governor. I do so for a special reason. He has been a very worthy son of Queensland. It is very good indeed to see a man who has given such valuable service to Australia appointed to the very important position of Governor of this State. I join with other hon. members in wishing Sir John and Lady Lavarack health and happiness, during their term of office as Governor.

I should also like to congratulate the Speaker on again being appointed to that high office without any opposition. I realise that the office of Speaker is onerous in some cases and that the occupant is called on to use a good deal of judgment and be very firm in conducting the business of this House as it should be conducted. I shall be ready at all times to help Mr. Speaker to maintain the dignity of Parliament because once the dignity of Parliament goes we shall start to slip back.

I think the new members have done very well in their maiden speeches. It is pleasing to see, and we can all agree, that the new members have established the fact that they are men of some standing in the community and possess knowledge that will be of benefit to Queensland generally.

I want to bring up one matter in regard to the statements made about the conduct of the recent election, because I have been in seven contests and this election is the first time that I have felt it my duty to write to the returning officer and congratulate him and his officers on the conduct of the election. It was conducted without any fuss. The returns were prompt and so far as I could see nothing could have been more efficient. The returning officer was a stranger to me but I was so struck by the way he organised the election that I thought it was fair to congratulate him on it. As I have said, I did that for the first time in seven contests.

When I came into this House I was alarmed and astounded to hear the charges made on the conduct of the elections in various parts of Queensland. Those charges and counter-charges are from one side of the House to another. I am a bit alarmed because if we get to the stage when we are not going to trust the administration of our Elections Act and we are going to cast aspersions on the people appointed to conduct secret ballots our people will lose faith in the secret ballot, they will also lose faith in the men elected, and naturally they will lose faith in Parliament.

If the people are going to lose faith in Parliament they will lose faith in themselves and their State. I say in all seriousness that if there is anything in these charges, somebody should be appointed to go into the matter. The Premier has dealt with the matter, and he says there is nothing in it. If there is nothing in it, why not have the

whole thing exposed? The people who read the papers become suspicious that the election is not aboveboard, and it is important, if people are to honour Parliament and observe the laws, that these suspicions should be removed. Some authority should investigate these charges and counter-charges.

We have heard many speakers during this debate, and they have dealt with all sorts of questions. I listened with interest to the Premier's speech—he spoilt it to some extent by dealing with trivial matters—and I compliment him on the stand he took in the coal business, because I feel that unless Queensland stands up for her rights against the combination of southern interests we may easily find somebody else controlling our State and everything we have in it. I compliment the Premier on his work in this connection.

It is not much use talking about the recent elections. I feel that the position throughout the world today is one that should give us food for serious thought. If we endeavour to visualise the difficulties that exist and the possibility of greater difficulty in the future, we may be guided in our efforts to meet possibly adverse conditions. We are a very important unit in the British Empire, the welfare of which is our welfare. The nature of the legislation that has been introduced in Britain is an indication of the acuteness of the position there.

We must realise the financial embarrassment, the cut in foodstuffs, and the possibility of greater shortages and we must give our utmost consideration to all these things. We are here living in the lap of luxury while our own kith and kin over there are likely to suffer more than they have done in the past, although the war is finished. We know the suffering they endured during the war but they, like us, expected to live in a new world and enjoy greater happiness when the war was finished. But it is certainly not a new world; actually, it is a deteriorating world. Moreover, we are altering our economic system by changing Governments who we find impose new policies on the people that do not work to their advantage.

I emphasise that our welfare is so combined with that of the British Empire that we must give every consideration to what is happening in Britain. Everybody must feel that things over there are not as right as they should be. Realising what Britain has suffered and what she is likely to suffer, we must realise the repercussions that will occur here, and they may occur sooner than we expect. We must remember that we are primary producers and have reaped the benefit of the trade Britain has given us, not only in the present but in the past also. Today we are living on the contracts she made with us, but the position over there might easily get so bad that she might not be able to meet her obligations under those contracts, which extend over a few more years. Then where shall we be? We must remember what Britain has done for us. She has sent us men and money and laid the foundation of this great dominion. She has bought our surplus pro-

duction when nobody else would. She has given us transport. She sent ships to build up this great country. Above all, she has set us a very good example of democratic government, which in turn has created decency in the people served by it and they and their offspring have shown by their courage and ability that nothing better can be found in the world. We must do something to endeavour to protect the British Empire from deterioration.

The success of Britain and Australia has been achieved by democratic rule. A few million people have been able to win two defensive wars—wars forced on them: a very small number of people have successfully defended themselves against a very large number. Our democratic form of government has been the basis of our success. Perhaps not understanding the problems to be faced in the aftermath of war, the people by their will changed the Government and the economic life of the country has been altered from social-democratic to Socialism, the Government taking over this, that and something else and depriving enterprise of its businesses. This has not brought the desired results. On the contrary, the position has deteriorated. Now, in Australia, where we really have nothing to complain about in our standard of living, it is proposed to nationalise the banks. It seems to me that when the Government take charge of the people's money they will be taking charge of the people, directing them as to what they should or should not do, and so do this country the greatest injury it has ever suffered, in that the people will be robbed of that great freedom of democracy that they have enjoyed for so long. It is no wonder that our political outlook is not what it was before the war.

This country, like all other countries, is suffering not from a shortage of money but from a shortage of foodstuffs and production in general. Many people who have money are starving today because they cannot buy goods. That being so, it is our duty to increase production, but we find that in Queensland we are to have a 40-hour week, a matter I hope to have an opportunity of discussing when the proposed Bill is introduced.

To my mind we are approaching the problem from the wrong angle. We are a great producing country, we have the opportunity to sell at a reasonable price everything we can produce, the demand for that production is likely to remain for the next three or four years, we have an obligation to help the people overseas who cannot help themselves, yet we do nothing but hold up our ships and have strike after strike. When we do attempt to send foodstuffs overseas to meet the shortage we find them held up by a small section of our people.

Why do we allow such a small section to hold up the commerce of the whole country? If I do not pay my tram fare I am brought before a court and fined, but if others join with me to hold up the commerce of the country nothing is done about it if enough

of us are involved. The whole trouble is brought about by weak government.

Australia cannot afford to tie up industry for a moment. Instead of introducing a 40-hour week we should extend the hours, not necessarily at the same rate of pay, but we should work longer hours, for the greater the production we have the more we shall pay, and the more we pay the people the more satisfied they will be because they will be able to afford to buy more. Nobody realises more than I do that it is no use having production unless we can sell it.

It is no use selling it unless you can get a reasonable price for it. You cannot get a reasonable or a proper price unless the industrialist is getting a good price or wage for what he is doing. To my way of thinking we are all living one on the other, and it is no use one section of the people making a tremendous lot of money if the rest are starving. I am satisfied that party politics has sectionalised the people to such an extent that we are frightened to let people think that we are living one on the other.

Then we find the agitation by the industrialist that the capitalist is his enemy. The capitalist has to pay him the wages he is ordered to pay him, and so I say it is all eye-wash and humbug. We have an Industrial Court that lays down the hours and conditions of employment and the wages to be paid; we have a system of income tax which taxes the people on the profits they make, and how in the name of goodness can we have these great capitalists or millionaires hon. members opposite talk about? The hon. member for Bowen spoke about millionaires the other day, but all my life I have been looking for one.

The Industrial Court provides that the man who employs has to pay his employees a certain amount of money. What is wrong with that? These people who will have to raise £10,000,000 for spending in this country will have to obey the laws of this country. The laws of this country will see to it that the State is not robbed and that the employees in the industry will get their fair and reasonable share of production, and also that the employers will get their interest on capital expenditure. Why should this State try to raise £10,000,000 or £20,000,000 to develop an industry when you can get somebody else to put that amount of money in and when you have the power to control that enterprise in every shape and form? I heard a new hon. member say that if the Government are going to put in electric light in any of these schemes, for goodness' sake don't put it in until the Government control the land, because we do not want these people to have a monopoly of the land and make money out of it. That is not the right outlook. We have great possibilities, great mineral resources, we have a great country, but as the hon. member for Aubigny remarks, it takes money to develop it. I do not see why the Government are obliged to spend money in developing it. Their obligation is to see that the people

in the country have a market for the stuff they produce, that there is employment for the people and it is their job to make laws and it is their job to encourage people to come into the country to start industries so that employment will be given. The Government can lay down the conditions of employment so that people will get adequate payment for the work they do. We shall thus be a prosperous State, and if we are prosperous we shall be happy.

I do not see how the nationalisation of banks and the granting of a 40-hour week is the right thing to do while there is a shortage of foodstuffs and other things. I agree that prices must be controlled and I think the case in favour of it is based on sound reasoning, but I do not see how the shortage of production can be made up with a working week of four hours less. If four hours a week less work is done in industry obviously there will be less production. The only way in which you can pay for production under that system is by increased prices and these increased prices will cost the worker much more than he is going to gain by the shorter working hours.

The majority of the people, I should say 90 per cent. of them, want work; they want good wages so as to be able to make homes for themselves and their families. They do not mind doing extra work so long as they are paid for it, but the greatest tragedy in this country is that they have not been able to get full value for their work, taxation having taken a heavy toll of it. And so they have slowed down in their efforts. Taxation takes such a heavy toll of their earnings that there is no incentive for them to work harder. And what is the employer's viewpoint? Naturally he likes to keep his hands together, even though he knows that they are going slow and not earning the money that he gives them. Still, he gets some slight consolation from the fact that he has less taxation to pay because it is based on the profits they make for him. All industries have slowed down and that comes about because there are no incentive and no encouragement for the people to produce more, although millions are waiting for it. Taxation is to blame. Very frequently people become fed up with the heavy burden of taxation and take a risk on the race-course, knowing that if they are lucky enough to win £5 or £6 or £50 or £60 or whatever the sum may be the whole of the winnings are theirs and not subject to taxation. They will continue to go to the races while the present burden of taxation remains. I hope that some relief can be given in this direction.

Many speakers have referred to the heavy stock losses that have occurred throughout the State and the Commonwealth and it is a tragedy that the assets of the country—and I am not now referring to the assets of the individual—have so seriously declined. They have fallen so alarmingly that we shall be faced with a depression if we are not very careful. The proposal to nationalise the banks, to introduce a 40-hour week, and

to do similar things will only accentuate the difficulty and before we realise it we shall be faced with a man-made depression. Let us take the long view, so that we may prevent this from happening. We have been blessed with good prices and great opportunities for development since the cessation of hostilities. We have had great opportunities for the introduction of new money into this country, but for some unknown reason the proper authority, and I suppose it is the Government, will not take a hand in preventing the strikes and hold-ups that take place from one end of the country to the other. Today not one section of the community is satisfied. Everyone is complaining and someone is either going on strike or wanting to go on strike. What is wrong with the country?

Mr. Muller: The unions are running it; that is what is wrong.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I think only a small section of the community can be blamed for that. I listened very attentively to the hon. member for Bowen but such is the political set-up of the country that if he says something is white then I say it is black.

As I said, the assets of the country are declining and stock numbers today are below what they were 30 years ago. Remember that 80 per cent. of our wealth comes from these national assets. But they will have to be replaced and that will cost money. Where is there any incentive or encouragement to the people to do this? It is time that the Government co-operated in the matter.

At 2.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Contrary to what the Premier said, we find that Britain is prepared to pay more than we are able to pay for our own foodstuffs. All that our producers ask is something to which they are entitled, and that is the cost of production. Since the war the cost of production has altered because of varying conditions. Until we get a price for our produce to cover cost of production, then our industries, which are the assets of the country, will be depreciated to such an extent that production will cease. If there is one State more than another that cannot afford to let the price of products be reduced below the cost of production, it is Queensland. Therefore, we hope that the cost of production will be given for what we produce. We should not look for any help from Britain. My view is that on the contrary we are not doing enough for Britain. The welfare of Britain is our welfare. It does not matter whether Australia is prosperous in every respect if the British Empire fails. I say that definitely. I say it with the idea of trying to inculcate into our people the conviction that it is our business to see that the British Empire is kept together because we are an integral part of it. If we appreciate what Britain has done and is doing for the Dominions, we shall surely recognise that we owe some obligation to her.

We should analyse the position from an Empire viewpoint instead of an individual one. If we have been following events in Britain, the soul of the Empire, we should know that 45,000,000 people are endeavouring, by means of subsidy and every other available means, to grow enough foodstuffs to feed themselves. We have only to look at the position to see why that is essential. Before World War I. and before World War II., Britain had credits in nearly every part of the world, built up over a number of years. When the first World War began, Britain found those credits of great value because she was able to go on to the world's markets and buy foodstuffs for her people. The reverse is the case today and Britain is not producing sufficient foodstuffs to feed her people. Markets that were available to her before the war because of her overseas credits are now closed to her. She can buy foodstuffs on the world's markets only at exorbitant prices. In my opinion Britain cannot produce sufficient to keep her industries going and to feed her own people.

Australia and New Zealand are very important parts of the British Empire. We are primary-producing countries and we are suffering from lack of population. We have a vast country with resources greater than most other countries in the world and with better climatic conditions than those that obtain in most countries. If you analyse it you will find that Australia is the best country in the world in that it does not suffer from the handicaps that other countries suffer from. On one hand we have England, the soul of the British Empire, suffering from a lack of food because she cannot feed the people she has got there, while on the other hand we have Australia, which is running a great risk, trying to carry on with 7,000,000 people when there are millions not far from our coast who live under inferior living conditions. Recently I read that certain coloured people made a survey and explored Australia, with what idea I do not know.

The one important thing that matters to us in Queensland and Australia is the welfare of the British Empire. It would be well for us to take a wide view of the position and look at our difficulties from that angle and see what we can do to save the Empire, which is the greatest the world has ever known. We should view the position from the point of view of the whole of the Empire. We suffer from a lack of people in Australia and we have to encourage people to come here because the natural increase in population is not sufficient for our requirements. In that part of the Empire where there are too many industries or too many people, they could be transferred to another part. It would be a masterly step if, instead of worrying about socialisation and nationalising the banks, we were to make a pact with Britain tomorrow to encourage her to establish some of her industries in Australia. Once those industries were established we should have an immediate source of employment for their people and we should have the right type of people in the Dominions, and we should have the balance

between the Dominions and Britain that is essential to our welfare generally.

The Governor's Speech said that the Government have a 10-year plan. Let us take a longer view and make it a 100-year plan. Even though the plan I suggest takes 100 years, it is essential that we should have it. When one section of the Empire has more people than it can feed and employ economically they could be transferred to another part of the Empire where they are required. It is somebody's job to investigate the position to see how far we can help each other. I know it has nothing to do with the State Government, but I mention it because I am very interested in the welfare of the Empire. I realise the difficulties that confront the world today, when whole structures may turn over, for whatever we may do we have to see to it that peace on earth will obtain. It can only obtain when one is prepared and strong enough.

We all know that it was only the short distance of 21 miles separating France from Britain that saved Britain from the devastation of war and the loss of the Empire, which would be our loss, too. We remember also that Australia is isolated and it would take probably much planning to do what I am suggesting, but the present position is such that it must surely give food for thought so that we may ascertain whether such planning cannot be done.

I know it has been said that our trouble is that we talk so much about things and do so little. Instead of talking here on our political troubles and instead of having one political party castigating another for something that is done or not done or should have been done, we should be much better employed—and by "we" I mean all men in public life—in giving consideration to a plan, not merely for the next 10 years, but for a much longer period.

(Time expired.)

At 2.27 p.m.,

Mr. HILTON (Carnarvon) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. DAVIS (Barcoo): Mr. Speaker, in this our 31st Parliament of Queensland the people of Queensland have had a singular privilege, in that we have had a distinguished member of the Commonwealth and a native-born of this State to open our session. Naturally, snipers, as usual, have been at work. I was very interested in the address of His Excellency in this Chamber, but again these snipers became active and to some extent intimated that the Governor's Speech to this House was simply one made by his advisers. I think it has been evident to you and me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to most hon. members and the people of Queensland and Australia, that the courage and honour of His Excellency, Sir John Lavarack, are such as would not enable him to accept anything that he thought was not in the interests of the people of this State. I think our general knowledge of Sir John in all spheres of life

tells us that he would display a courage more than favourably comparable with that of his critics.

To the Speaker who has been re-elected to this House I tender my congratulations. I think that at all times he has commended himself to this House by his unflinching impartiality, patience, and tolerance. He has given all sections of the House the opportunity to carry out the business to be done.

To the Premier I extend very hearty congratulations on his leadership in again making possible the government of this State by a body of men with a policy for its development, not for the privileged few, but in the interests of the people as a whole.

The plan submitted by the Premier in his policy speech and outlined in the Speech of His Excellency is proof that it is the intention of the Government to make possible in the future something that will make this a State comparable in conditions with those existing in the more closely populated States of the Commonwealth; that will at least place it on an equal footing.

To the mover and seconder of this Address in Reply I offer my congratulations. I congratulate also the new hon. members who have spoken on the motion before the House. Admittedly some of them appear to me to be very old stagers in the political field; nevertheless their contributions have been of value to this Assembly.

The seconder of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Nundah, struck a note we should all bear in mind when he said, "I am the representative of Nundah, but primarily I am the representative of the State of Queensland." I believe that we representatives of electorates sometimes forget that we do represent the State as a whole. We are inclined somewhat to take hold of the handle of the parish pump and work it to the greatest possible extent in the interests of our particular electorates.

As a member of this Labour Party, I tender very sincere thanks to one of our industrial leaders. I am not unduly singling out his organisation from all the other industrial organisations that have given service in the return of Labour to the Treasury benches of Queensland, but I do wish to mention particularly our campaign director in the last election. I refer to Mr. Fallon, branch secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, who rendered great and unselfish service. Prior to this election, Mr. Fallon had been selected as a delegate to the Geneva Conference, a position holding a good deal of prestige, I assume, but he refused it because we were on the eve of an election in the State to which he belongs. There is no-one on the Opposition benches who would have denied himself the privilege of being a delegate, with the prestige attached to it, to the Geneva Conference. And, to be quite candid, I should refrain from taking a Gallup poll on this side of the House on the

question whether hon. members on this side would refrain from accepting the position of delegate to the Geneva Conference.

I believe the only thing that would cause us to refrain from being a delegate to the conference would be the possibility—and this applies to hon. members on both sides of the House—that somebody would usurp our position in Parliament during our absence. Mr. Fallon, however, had none of those fears. We on this side of the House must to a great extent be very grateful to the branch secretary of the Australian Workers' Union and Labour's campaign director at the last State election for his decision to give his services to the State, and refuse the prestige that would have been conferred upon him as a delegate to the Geneva Conference.

At the beginning of my speech I said that an extraordinary thing happened in that we had the privilege of hearing a Governor born in this State open the first session of the thirty-first Parliament. At a later stage another very extraordinary incident occurred in this House. We had the spectacle of the Leader of the Opposition questioning whether this Government should continue as the advisers to His Excellency the Governor, something that is unprecedented in the history of a British Parliament. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that before again bringing forward such an amendment he should study the "ekker" of his own political party in the matter of the adjustment of boundaries and the gerrymandering of electorates. If that hon. gentleman had taken into consideration what is happening today in Victoria and South Australia I believe that he would have refrained from bringing his amendment before the House. Let me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quote from the Melbourne "Age"—and no-one will say that that paper is a journal that writes in the interests of Labour. It is one journal at least that is truthful—a rather extraordinary fact amongst the Press today—and places the facts before the people. With your permission I will quote from the "Age" about the gerrymandering of electorates in Victoria. That paper in an article headed "One Vote, Many Values," published the following analysis of the voting:—

	Seats Won.	Votes.
Labour	15	279,274
United Australia Party	21	279,034
Country Party .. .	15	102,224

As I said, if the Leader of the Opposition had studied the "ekker" of his own political party in the matter I believe he would have remained silent on this occasion. The Melbourne "Age" goes on to say—

"... Although the Labour Party hold slightly more votes than the United Australia Party, the latter party won six more seats. Is that not a gross injustice to Labour?"

"Still more scandalous is the next comparison. Labour polled 177,050 more votes than the Country Party (or nearly three times as many) yet the latter party won the same number of seats.

"That is gerrymandering in excelsis.

"Averaging the results for each party, we find that it took 18,618 votes to elect the Labour member, 13,287 votes to elect a United Australia Party member, and only 6,814 votes to elect a Country Party member."

"Comment on such unfair conditions would be superfluous."

That is what the Melbourne "Age" says. It also gives a number of choice examples of the way in which the gerrymandering works. It says—

"If comparisons are carried to separate electorates the injustice of the system is emphasised. The support of 4,869 electors ensured the return of Mr. Lind, in Gippsland East, but 13,000 electors in Oakleigh could not put the candidate they favoured into Parliament. Nearly 12,000 supporters of Mr. Herring were insufficient in Brighton but in Upper Goulburn 5,000 voters gave Mr. Mackrell a handsome majority and a safe seat in the Assembly."

The accusation is made in this Chamber that the Queensland Government have gerrymandered the seats in this State in the interests of the Labour Party, but this is what the Melbourne "Age" has to say about Queensland—

"Surveying the situation in Victoria, Queenslanders can congratulate themselves that they have a democratic form of Government in this State, with the people as the real rulers and no House of fossils to thwart their will."

It is not necessary for me to comment any further on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. If there has been any gerrymandering it has been by the Opposition ever since the upsurge of the industrialists in this country who sought political benches in order to obtain redress of their wrongs. As to the amendment, I am not very much concerned, but one hon. member opposite saw fit to take advantage of it to vilify and scandalise responsible officers of the people of this State. I say "responsible officers of the people" advisedly, because, after all, our public servants are not officers of the Government; they are officers of the people. And so this opportunity was taken, and I was disagreeably surprised that it should have been taken by the hon. member for Toowong, as I thought something much better would have emanated from him than that he should have thrown open the manhole of the sewer, taken off his coat, dived almost up to his shoulders in the filth, stirred it and sluiced it about this Chamber in an endeavour to befoul the minds of the people of this State. I did not think such statements would emanate from the hon. member for Toowong or that he would take the opportunity afforded him by a simple amendment that was before this Chamber to do so.

Much has been said from the Opposition benches on the proposed nationalisation of banking by the Federal Labour Party. After listening to their vapourings on the proposed legislation one would conclude that a national calamity would hit the nation if that

legislation became effective. The only stabilised economy that can ever arise in the history of this nation will be through giving the control of it to a national bank. The hon. member for Toowong likened the Prime Minister to a brigand and a Ned Kelly, recalling the old saying about Ned Kelly with whiskers and riding horses. As a member of the public I have heard, and I am sure other hon. members, too, have heard, the profession he belongs to called Ned Kellys, sharks, and by all sorts of names suggesting that its members were guilty of robbery from the public.

The hon. member for Maree also joined in the vilification of the Prime Minister. I understand the hon. member for Maree was for many years a petty official of some exploiting firm in China. If anyone should know anything of pillage I am sure that the hon. member for Maree would—he should be quite conversant with it. Concerns such as the one of which he had the honour or the dishonour to be a member have pillaged not only the bodies but the souls of the Chinese through the years, and therefore, when he speaks on that subject in this House he should know something about it.

It should be remembered that we have men of wider knowledge of international financial affairs than these hon. members to advise us on the nationalisation of the banking system, not only in Australia but throughout the world. I have here a quotation about a bank that rose from a very humble beginning. It is the Bank of New South Wales. In 1817 it started with a capital of £20,000, and in 1933 it set the rate of exchange between Australia and other parts of the world.

Mr. Kerr: In accord with the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. DAVIS: At that time the Commonwealth Bank was not a bank but a chattel of the great trading banks.

Mr. Russell: It was an advantage to the primary producers of that time.

Mr. DAVIS: The hon. member for Dalby has the impertinence—I say that advisedly—to speak to me and say that it was to the advantage of the primary producers of that time. The hon. member for Dalby and his fellow graziers know full well the imposition placed on them by the banking system, if they would only admit it.

Mr. Sparkes: Very few graziers have not cause to thank the banks for their existence today.

Mr. DAVIS: The hon. member for Windsor stated in this House that he was compelled to go cap in hand to the Government for financial assistance to carry on his business during the period 1929 to 1932, and the hon. member for Gregory disclosed facts about the practices of the financial institutions that ordinarily financed the pastoral industry. I knew a man who was afraid to come to town and on one occasion when he did come to town against the orders of the institution with which he was involved, it

caused an indignity to be placed on him in Longreach by placing a chain round the wheels of his car. That was a great indignity to be placed on the client from whom the institution concerned extracted in interest over the years an amount perhaps greater than the amount of his debt to it at the time the indignity was placed on him.

Mr. Sparkes: You can imagine the Commonwealth Bank being more generous to that poor grazier?

Mr. DAVIS: To the hon. member for Aubigny I would say this. The Bank of New South Wales started with a capital of £20,000. Whatever qualifications the hon. member has as an expert breeder of stud stock I would say that in the period 1929-1932 he never received the return that the trading banks received from those who were involved with them over that period. I have the statistics for the percentages of interest the trading banks paid over the period of depression, and not one of the whole of the trading banks in the Commonwealth in the year 1932 paid a dividend of less than 5 per cent., and the highest was 9 per cent. That was during a period when virtually the whole of the people of this nation were suffering hardship, yet these monopolies paid their usual dividends.

In the year 1900, and for some years afterwards, a devastating drought had destroyed all prospects for the people, but from 1900 to 1946 the trading banks of the Commonwealth of Australia had extorted from the people the colossal sum of £140,000,000.

Mr. Sparkes: Do you not think you would have a better chance of getting a few quid from 10 people than you would have of getting it from one?

Mr. DAVIS: It is not a matter of getting it from one, because the amalgamation of the banks made it impossible for one to compete against the others.

Mr. Sparkes: I never believe in a monopoly and you should know that.

Mr. DAVIS: Hon. members should listen attentively to the statements of overseas authorities on nationalisation. For their benefit I will quote Congressman Wright Patman, who said—

“We are farming out the credit of this nation and paying a tribute to people who do not have anything in the world to offer us. They have nothing to give us we do not already have, and we are paying more than a billion dollars a year for this idiotic system.

“I believe the time will come when the people will demand this be changed, and when they realise what is happening they will blame you and me and everyone else connected with the ‘racket’ for sitting idly by and permitting it to continue.

“From the banker-financier’s outlook, it would never do for the people to discover that a prudent and scientific governmental credit creation could supply them with an

entirely sound and stable medium of exchange, without adding a pound to their national debt. The only sure way to keep the people from finding this out has been to frighten them with 'sound finance' propaganda, such as the bankers' usual bogeys of 'Inflation,' 'Hands off the people's money,' 'The poor widow bondholders,' 'Money must be protected,' 'Banks only lend their depositors' money, lodged with them for safe keeping,' and so on.

"These slogans must be exploded!"

The majority of hon. members will give credit to Mr. Wendell Willkie for being a statesman of some consequence. This is what he had to say in a recent broadcast—

"As we look forward to the future we face ironically this tremendous risk—we shall lose in debt the victory we have gained in blood."

Mr. Sparkes: How long ago was that broadcast?

Mr. DAVIS: It was not so long ago. It is still in existence.

Mr. Sparkes: He is not.

Mr. DAVIS: No. I am somewhat concerned with the stocking methods used in the pastoral areas of the State, although to a great extent I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Dalby: the fluctuations in our sheep population proves that over the years, although we may overstock for short periods, the losses that have occurred through drought and other means have been such that that over-stocking has not been a great detriment to the soil.

Mr. Sparkes: That is not what the former hon. member for Mirani said, although I agree with you.

Mr. DAVIS: I agree that one of the factors operating in the destruction of the soil, especially in the closer-settled areas of the State, is the fact that too few watering facilities are provided by the landholders. I know that it costs money to provide watering facilities, but I think the hon. member for Aubigny, the hon. member for Dalby, and other hon. members who represent western electorates, will agree that they have noticed in the West that where watering facilities are situated five or six miles apart an area of perhaps 2,000 or 3,000 acres surrounding them is so trampled by stock travelling to water that it has become virtually unproductive. Of an area of 20,000 acres it is safe to say that possibly 2,000 or 3,000 acres would be completely destroyed. I suggest to the Government that it would be a really good investment if they could see fit to help to provide watering facilities on these properties. They could do it either by long-term loans at nominal interest, or add the cost to the annual rental.

Another thing that has given me some concern is the fact that under our resump-tions we are restricting our stud-breeding areas. This has a grave effect on the stable

economy of the State. At the present time we are bewailing the fact that stock are travelling from our State to southern States while at the same time we are importing into Queensland tens of thousands of pounds worth of stud stock from other States. Instead of restricting the stud-breeding areas we should extend them, and I believe the Government will give due consideration to my suggestion on this matter.

There is a good deal of talk today of the drift to the cities of the western people. Much of that talk is well-founded. Perhaps a good deal of the fault is due to the fact that graziers have not been prepared in the past to provide for their employees the amenities to which they are entitled. Perhaps this is one reason why they are unable to get the labour they need. I trust that we shall hear hon. members opposite admitting that the humble station hand living in a hut in the outback is just as much entitled to a refrigerator as the gentleman who resides in a mansion and either owns or manages the property.

I listened to the dissertation of the hon. member for Mundingburra, who made a frenzied attack upon the Government. He said that the people of the North were fighting mad, and that the Government had given no consideration to the North. The lack of amenities provided for the people of the West has brought about the drift of those people to the cities. The population of the western parts of the State has decreased instead of increasing. I shall deal later with his arguments that the State have done nothing for the North.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SMITH (Carpentaria) (3.6 p.m.): It gives me pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to offer my small contribution to this important debate, but before expounding my views on matters relating to the State, particularly the part of it I have the honour to represent, I desire to offer congratulations to our Governor on his appointment. My mind goes back to the time of the retirement of Sir Leslie Wilson, and I remember the outcry we heard to the effect that we must have as Governor of Queensland a man who came from the British Isles. At that time I said I did not see anything wrong with the appointment of an Australian, or a Queenslander in particular, to this high office. I was pleased at the reception given Sir John Lavarack on his recent visit to the North, and I look forward to his intended visit to the North West of Queensland at a future date. I feel that he will receive a welcome as warm as that given to his predecessor, Sir Leslie.

I offer my congratulations also to the hon. member for Fortitude Valley on his appointment as Speaker of this House. I feel that we have done a good job in appointing that hon. gentleman to his office.

I have listened attentively to the speeches made in this debate, and I find that many hon. members who have spoken have dealt

with the drift from the country or western parts of the State to the cities and the coastal area. There are many factors in this drift of population to the coast. Emphasis has been given to the fact that to keep our people in the West we must provide them with amenities, but I say preceding those amenities we must give the people security and the security we must give them is work. If they have the security of work the breadwinner can get up in the morning with a security of a job to go to, and when he knocks off he knows he has the security of a home to go to; when he goes to bed at night he knows that when he wakes in the morning he has the security of his job that day.

I can advance many reasons for this drift from the country to the cities and the coast areas, and not much of the blame can be laid at the door of the Government. The mechanisation of industry is one of the main causes. In the past local authorities permanently employed between 20 and 30 men and after heavy rain these men, with 10 to 15 horses and drays, would go out to repair the roads and fill in the washaways. What is the position today? Instead of there being 10 to 15 horses and drays in the council yards and from 25 to 30 men to do the work, one man goes out with a patrol grader to repair 20 to 30 miles of road in a day.

Another cause is the stranglehold the financial institutions have on the small sheep- and cattle-growers. Years ago when I was a lad Richmond was one of the most thriving towns in the north-western part of the State, but today it is almost a ghost town. What is the cause? In those days the Government in their wisdom subdivided pastoral holdings into blocks of 20,000 to 30,000 acres and made them available to small selectors at reasonable rentals, but it was not long before the financial institutions got a stranglehold on these new settlers. Today the selectors and their wives are only slaves for financial houses. Every day I get letters from these small sheep and cattle men asking me to take up their cases with the Treasurer so that they may get financial help for them from our Agricultural Bank. Over the years, because of drought, bad seasons, and low wool prices, they find themselves in a very unsatisfactory state financially. These men, who were given this land 25 to 30 years ago at a low rental, now come back to the Government for help, and for the purpose of developing the land and for the purpose of getting release from the stranglehold placed upon them by the financial houses. In this part of the State even the women are virtually slaves. These financial organisations make the wives of the selectors do the cooking on the stations and even do the cooking in the shearing sheds while shearing is going on.

Mr. Russell: There is no-one else to cook.

Mr. SMITH: I have listened to the hon. member during the debate but he is in a happy position. He has finance, he has a home and a property that is a payable con-

cern, but let him come with me to my electorate and see the conditions there. Does he believe that women should be slaves? That is the type of hon. member who represents the Dalby electorate, a man who believes in making slaves of women. He said that there was no-one else to cook. There are plenty of old shearers and station cooks about.

The financial house will not let that man and his wife live their lives in a normal way. It forces the man to become a slave on the property and it forces his wife to do the cooking for the station hands and shearers. I have seen wives of these men out mustering because these financial houses would not give the owner the right to employ a man to do that work.

I see the hon. member for Dalby laughing. Let me read him extracts from a few letters from graziers and small selectors in my electorate. I will not divulge the names of the writers because if I did they would be persecuted by these financial houses. (Laughter.) Hon. members opposite may laugh. Let me read them part of a long letter written to me from a man in the Croydon district on 16 August last. He asks me to take up his case with the Agricultural Bank and endeavour to get him financial assistance to enable him to get out of the grip that one of these financial houses has on his property. In concluding his letter, he says—

“Monopolies don't want one to get out of debt while they can pay interest.”

That man is on a cattle property. His wife is doing stock work. He cannot afford the cost of educating his own children, who also help in the stock work. The wife has also to cook for the musterers. I took the matter up with the Agricultural Bank in order that it might help this poor devil. Let the hon. member for Dalby go for a trip with me.

Mr. Russell: I have been up there.

Mr. SMITH: Yes, but the hon. member has not stayed there. If he comes with me I will show him the condition under which these poor devils are living.

I can tell him of another case. A man owning a sheep block of 20,000 or 30,000 acres who was heavily indebted to one of these financial houses wanted to go and fight for his country. I made representations to the Man-power Department to assist him in joining up with the A.I.F. or R.A.A.F. Who opposed his release? None other than this financial group. They said, “No, you cannot go; we cannot get anyone to replace you.” This lessee got into financial difficulties through drought and low prices for wool. They put him in a devil of a position. Yet they refused him permission to go and fight for his country. All they wanted him there for was to keep on earning simple and compound interest for them. In effect, they tied him down to a slave life. His property is outside Nelia.

Mr. Barnes: What did the Agricultural Bank do for him?

Mr. SMITH: I will tell the hon. member. He was indebted to this financial house for £50,000. This financial house, on the payment of £10,000 by the Agricultural Bank, wiped off the remaining £40,000 of debt which had accumulated under the principle of compound interest.

That man today has his own property. He has two musterers, he has a governess giving his children an education, and he has a cook on his property. That was the result of his being released from this financial house.

Another man says—

“The debt has become so heavy that the consequent interest bill has become a crippling factor with the debt as it stands. I see no opportunity of making the place financially sound.”

That is a quotation from another letter showing what a stranglehold the financial houses have on the pastoral industry, particularly the small sheep and cattle men in the western parts of the State.

The hon. member for Aubigny blew his bags out wide the other day, but I challenge him to come up and oppose me in Carpentaria in the sheep and cattle areas at the next State election. I quote from another letter dated 26 July, 1947. This man in 1925 bought a property for £35,000, and in 1946 he was in debt to the financial houses to the extent of £70,000.

Mr. Russell: How much did he put in?

Mr. SMITH: Never mind what he put in.

Mr. Russell: It is important.

Mr. SMITH: He put in £35,000 when he bought it. (Opposition interjections).

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SMITH: In 1925 the Government broke up these big areas and gave him this property. The financial houses had a stranglehold and they said that if the man could get £18,000 of good solid Treasury notes from the Agricultural Bank they would wipe off £52,000 of his debt, that is, interest and compound interest—money not earned by the financial institution.

Mr. Sparkes: I should like to get in on this.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member is one of those lucky individuals.

Mr. Sparkes: Not lucky enough to strike that sort of thing.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member must have been lucky, because his wife was not out cooking for shearers and musterers in all kinds of weather.

That is the position in the West. The Government gave these men the land but the financial houses got control of it, and got a stranglehold on them. One of the great graziers of this State, Mr. Hugh McMaster, who has a property at Longreach, when addressing a meeting of graziers and citizens

in Cloncurry in 1936, said that it was time this State Government of Queensland did something for the small selector in this State to relieve him of the stranglehold and octopus grip that these financial houses had on him. He is one of the pioneers of the State and he said that something must be done to break the stranglehold and octopus grip of the financial houses on the small graziers and small selectors in this State. I have known many cases, and what was stated by the hon. member for Gregory was quite true. I know one man who went to Julia Creek and gave an order to a store there, and he showed me a letter he got from the financial house telling him that in future he was not to buy from that storekeeper but was to send an order to Townsville and it would decide what would be railed to him in return.

Mr. Aikens: It would decide what food he would be permitted to eat.

Mr. SMITH: It decided what food he would eat. It refused him all kinds of amenities. That is the position in the West today. The sooner the State Government, through their financial institutions, can relieve the selectors of this financial octopus grip that is strangling the selectors of the West the better it will be for us all.

Mr. Sparkes: Ghost towns.

Mr. SMITH: There will not be any ghost towns. I will take the hon. member if he will come, but I know he will not go where I want him to go. He will not go to the selectors' places and laugh as he is laughing today. If he went there he would see their suffering as I have seen it. I am proud to represent them, and while I am able to stand on my feet I will represent them as ably in the future as I have done in the past.

Mr. Barnes: You must get a Tory vote.

Mr. SMITH: I get a vote that the hon. member does not get. We do not want ratbags in our country. I do not lay the whole of the blame but I do lay much of the blame for the present conditions in the West on our present Federal Government. (Opposition laughter.) I am broad-minded enough to do that, but look how hon. members on the Opposition benches laugh now! I knew I should trap them. I was speaking of the suffering selectors' wives working under slave conditions cooking for shearers and station hands, the women who are unable to employ a governess to educate their three or four children and who have to rely on the Correspondence School for their education. I am speaking on behalf of these suffering people in the western parts of the State. You will have noticed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how immediately I began to talk about the present Federal Labour Government they cheered. But let them go to the West and see the sufferings of the selectors, small sheep and cattle men in those parts.

Mr. Sparkes: All on a Labour Government.

Mr. SMITH: Not at all. Twenty-five years ago when large pastoral holdings were broken up a Labour Government gave these selectors the properties at a reasonable rent, but since then they have got so much into debt with private financial institutions that the State Labour Government have had again to come to their assistance and make finance available to them at a reasonable interest and with no mortgage attached to the land. I am speaking on behalf of the people who are suffering from the strangle-hold and the octopus grip of the financial houses in the North-West.

Mr. Russell: The Commonwealth Bank could not have offered any better terms, otherwise they would have taken them.

Mr. SMITH: What is the Commonwealth Bank offering today? Interest-free loans up to 5 years of amounts of £1,000 to £5,000 to improve properties.

Mr. Sparkes: We only want competition.

Mr. SMITH: They want competition but at whose expense? At the expense of the small man and his wife battling in the West, with the women working like slaves. That is their policy. In the time of the Moore Government I saw women walking on the roads in order to get a ration, and if hon. members opposite had the power today they would make women walk again. I repeat that I am broad-minded enough to stand on the floor of this House and speak on behalf of the people I represent.

Mr. Muller interjected.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member for Fassifern has a head that is as vacant inside as it is bare on top. Much of the blame for the position of our sheep men in those parts is the Federal Government's failure to give help in the eradication of the dingo that is creating such havoc to the flocks in the West. The Federal Government took from the sheep men about £7,000,000 or £8,000,000.

Mr. Sparkes: Pinched it off them.

Mr. SMITH: I do not care how they got it, I put the case for those people I represent. I wrote to Mr. Riordan, the Federal member for the area, asking him if he could not persuade the Prime Minister to make part of this £7,000,000 available to help in the eradication of the dingo in the western parts of the State. I have with me Mr. Chifley's reply to Mr. Riordan and I will read part of it. I am in disagreement with it. Today I am speaking for the men in the sheep industry whom I represent and who are being thrown out of their business by the ravages of the dingo. I have said it every time I have stood on the floor of this House and I repeat it.

Mr. Chifley says—

“Dear Mr. Riordan.

“Some time ago you made representations on behalf of Mr. A. J. Norman Smith, M.L.A., who made suggestions concerning financial assistance by the Commonwealth for destruction of dingoes.

“It has always been accepted that the control of pests was both constitutionally and practically the prerogative and responsibility of the States.”

We know that the Federal Government are taking large sums of money from the sheep industry, and why cannot Mr. Chifley put some of it back for the preservation of this industry in this State and in this Commonwealth?

Why do they not make part of that money available for the eradication of the dingo and the preservation of our great wool industry? They say they propose setting up research stations. Before establishing research stations we should do everything possible to preserve the industry.

When I speak about the slave conditions that have been forced upon the selectors of the West by the financial houses, I am referring to the small selectors and their wives and families.

Mr. Sparkes: You know the financial houses have done much good in this State.

Mr. SMITH: They have done no good at all.

Mr. Sparkes: At one time they wrote off £50,000.

Mr. SMITH: Let me quieten hon. members opposite once and for all. I have kept back something for the final knock-out. I have particulars of a case in which the financial houses would not allow the owner of a property to carry more than 7,000 sheep although 50,000 was the capacity of the property. He is allowed to carry only 7,000 sheep, and that only if he can make a reasonable living for himself. With the people of Europe clamouring for warm clothing, it is only reasonable to expect that these financial institutions should allow the owners of such properties to carry more stock. I do not propose to mention the name of the selector concerned, because I know the victimisation to which he would be subjected.

Mr. Sparkes: Why do they not go to the Commonwealth Bank for money?

Mr. SMITH: They are going to the Agricultural Bank of this State to be released from the octopus grip of the financial institution. When his application is dealt with next week by the Agricultural Bank, the owner of this property will be able to put 50,000 sheep on his area and so give to the world a great deal more of the wool that is needed so much today.

Furthermore, much of the drift to the cities is caused by the Federal Government's apathy in connection with road-making plant for western local authorities.

I have made applications on behalf of the local authorities in my electorate and I will read, for the benefit of the House, a letter I received from the Under Secretary of the Treasury dealing with the plant required by the McKinlay Shire Council to make roads and work for the people in the outback parts of the State—

“With reference to your representations relative to the desire of the council of the shire of McKinlay to obtain a loan of £3,200 for the purchase of a tractor with hydraulic trailbuilder and hydraulic scoop, I have to inform you the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works has advised that the Department of Works and Housing indicated that applications based on higher priorities than those of local authorities would have preference as regards the release of a new machine.”

Mr. Sparkes: Who has a higher priority?

Mr. SMITH: That is just what I want to know. I say that nobody has a higher priority than local authorities in the north-west part of the State.

An Opposition Member: Is not the Co-ordinator-General under your control?

Mr. SMITH: The Treasurer has agreed to the shire's borrowing money but the Federal Department of Works and Housing says that the local authority has no priority. I want to know who has a greater priority in this State than local authorities in the north-western parts of Queensland, particularly those that I represent in the electorate of Carpentaria.

Let me say some more about this department. A sewerage scheme is being put into effect in Mt. Isa and the department is building quarters for the postal officials. Only a few weeks ago information was sought as to how far this building was to the nearest point of the sewerage system. This Department of Works and Housing hired a special aeroplane at a cost of £200 to take four men from Townsville to Mt. Isa to find out how far a 6-inch pipe would go across the street. These are the people who say that we have no priority in connection with plant.

Amenities in the West are no good, as I said before, unless we can provide work and security for the people in the West. They have not had that security in the past and I feel that we should fight on the floor of this House and on the public stump to see that these people get security. What do we get from hon. members of the Opposition when we speak about these people? One can imagine the class of man in these high Commonwealth offices that we have to deal with. They are similar in style and outlook to hon. members opposite.

Mr. Sparkes: You do not blame us for that.

Mr. SMITH: When the men and women of the West were being made slaves by these financial houses hon. members opposite laughed and ridiculed them but when we spoke of the apathy of the Commonwealth Government

towards the eradication of the dingo they said, “Hear, hear!” They do not say that when I speak on behalf of the women who are being made slaves by these financial houses and put into the kitchens of the mustering camps and the shearing sheds. I shall say this as often as I can.

Mr. Decker interjected.

Mr. SMITH: I might have to say it 500 times to drum it into the thick head of the hon. member for Sandgate.

I am also concerned at the apathy shown by huge mining interests in the West that have been holding mining leases for many years without taking the trouble to develop or even prospect the rich ore that lies underground.

I am happy to say that as a result of my representations to the then Secretary for Mines, the Hon. V. C. Gair, this company, the Mount Elliott Company, which owns so many thousands of acres of mineral leases in the Cloncurry district, has been informed that no further exemptions from the working conditions of the leases will be granted. It is not necessary for this company to seek any further reserves of ore because at the moment it has reserves of copper and gold-bearing ore in excess of the known combined reserves of Mount Morgan and Mount Lyell. The Mount Elliott company has 2,500,000 tons of 4.62 per cent. copper, carrying 4 dwt. of gold to the ton, lying idle and only awaiting production.

On my representations the then Secretary for Mines asked the Mount Elliott company what it intended to do, and in its reply from London the company tried to hoodwink the Minister. Bear this in mind also, that the Secretary for Mines inquired from the company what financial aid the Government could give it along the lines of that given to the Mount Isa company for the development of its field. This is what the company said in its reply—

“In reply to your inquiry we are pleased to inform you that, at the time your letter reached us, our engineers were actively engaged, and are still engaged, in formulating a scheme for the resumption of mining operations at Cloncurry. You will appreciate that such a scheme will, of course, involve the expenditure of considerable finance which can be made available as required.”

This company has for 27 years been sitting on millions of tons of approximately 5 per cent. copper ore and millions of pennyweights of gold, and in reply it says that its engineers are preparing a plan. The Minister has informed the company that no further exemption from conditions will be granted after the expiration of the three months already granted, and I understand that the company wrote to the Government seeking a further exemption. I understand, also, that the Minister and his Cabinet have wisely decided to refuse any further exemption from working conditions, that the company will have to work the leases or forfeit all right to them, as I understand finance is available for that purpose. If the company fails to

work the leases they will be forfeited to the Government. I believe that in a very short period we shall see mining activity in this mineral field equal to that at Mount Isa.

Let me give hon. members some figures to show the mineral wealth that is controlled by this company and the number of men who were employed some years ago. Frequently headlines are published in the daily papers to the effect that Mount Isa employs 1,000 men and that this undertaking is worth £1,000,000 a year to the State. The Mount Elliott company absorbed the Hampden-Cloncurry copper field, the Mount Cuthbert copper field, and various other leases, but it has sat on them for 27 years and done nothing. In 1918 the mineral wealth from these fields was worth £1,491,342, and it employed 2,172 men. That is what I am fighting for—fighting to have these mineral fields restored to the prosperous state of a few years ago. The Mount Isa company was forced to work its leases because of the financial help given to them by the Government.

Mr. Sparkes: Forced to work them?

Mr. SMITH: The Government gave the Mount Isa company certain concessions and the company was obliged to spend a certain sum of money so as to bring the mine to a certain stage of production. That is what is going to happen with the Mount Elliott leases in the Cloncurry district. This ore is badly needed by Australia and the Empire, and are we not justified in calling upon the company to work the leases or forfeit them so that someone else may work them?

I feel that my agitation, since I have been in this Parliament, will be rewarded in a short period by the mere fact that the mining leases in the Longara, Malbon, Kuridala, and Selwyn areas will be leased to a concern that is prepared to work them and that leases in the Ballara, Kajabbi, Dobbyn, Mt. Oxide, and the Duchess-Mt. Hope districts will also be working in a short period on a production scale.

I feel that with these remarks that I have placed the case of the people whom I represent before this House and that I have done so irrespective of the resentment it may receive from the Opposition. I do believe, though, that my electors in the Carpentaria will be thankful for what I have done in this House, and thankful for the lead I have given on their behalf, and that my efforts will be rewarded by seeing prosperity established in the north-western portion of the State and in the Gulf district. I believe, too, that when I go before my electors at the next election I shall receive at their hands as handsome a majority over my opponents as I had at the last election.

At 3.46 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. CLARK (Fitzroy): Like other hon. members, I wish to congratulate Sir John Lavarack on his appointment as Governor. I have always believed that we had gentlemen in this State as capable of carrying out the duties of that high office as efficiently

as an appointee from overseas, and I am very pleased that on this occasion we had the opportunity of welcoming a Queenslander who has been appointed to that post.

To you also, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations on your re-election as Speaker. I have had a few years' experience in this House under your Speakership. I am quite convinced, after 12 years in this House, that you have carried out your duties as well as any other occupant of the office I have sat under.

I want to congratulate also the mover of this motion, the hon. member for Cairns, and the seconder, the hon. member for Nundah. In these two hon. members we have men who will be an asset to this Chamber. They have shown what can be produced in this State. They realise that there is work to be done in this Parliament if we are to overcome some of the difficulties confronting us.

Last but not least I want to congratulate the Premier on his success in leading the Labour Party back to the Treasury benches for a further term of three years. A great deal has been said about election matters, and some of the Opposition, particularly members of the Queensland People's Party, have been very critical of the way in which they say the election was conducted. You all remember that prior to the election, and during the election campaign, my electorate, the Fitzroy, was one of the electorates that the Queensland People's Party was going to wrest from the Labour Party. I am happy to say that my campaign was carried through, so far as my opponent was concerned, without any ill-felling, but the Queensland People's Party had in its ranks and on its committee in Rockhampton some men who were capable of doing anything. They had a man who was imported from New South Wales, where he belonged to the John Lang party. The Queensland People's party picked him up and appointed him as campaign director for the Central District.

This gentleman was suspended by the chairman of the Queensland People's Party at Rockhampton before the election campaign was over on account of some of his actions. The party used the Rockhampton "Bulletin" by writing letters to it under the names of other people. Eventually this gentleman wrote a letter over the name of a certain person in the Central District, and when this gentleman read it in the paper he approached the Queensland People's Party on the matter and this man was suspended. Those are the tactics the Queensland People's Party used in the Fitzroy campaign and I am pleased to be able to say that the people of the Fitzroy electorate refused to be hoodwinked by the promises it made. The same thing applied throughout the Central District; not one of the Central members was displaced; Labour was returned in the five electorates. That is proof that the people of the Central District at least will not have anything to do with the Queensland People's Party.

I am going to warn the Country Party here today that if it is not careful the Queensland People's Party will try to displace the

Queensland Liberal Party or Country Party. I am giving the Queensland Country Party or the Liberal Party that advice this afternoon.

I do want to congratulate the electors of the Fitzroy on having enough sense to return a Labour man. I am pleased they did me the honour of giving me the opportunity of doing something for the Fitzroy electors, and that they have placed their confidence in me again.

We have heard much today about our problems. I recognise that there are great problems in front of us. It is now two years since the war ended and our difficulties are not over. I believe that the production of new wealth in this State will be enhanced within the next three or four years because the programme of the Government will go a long way towards attaining that objective. I believe it is the duty of any Government to push on with settlement and development. The Labour Party has put forth every effort to reach that goal. We have been doing much work and I am satisfied that within the next three or four years, with the programme we have in mind, the production of new wealth will be greatly increased.

I believe one of the first things that we as a Government should do is to see whether it is not possible to populate some of the vast areas which today are not populated, because if we are not going to do it it will not be many years before some other nation will be trying to do it for us. I believe that this country is worth keeping and we as a people should see to it that its vast areas are populated. In order to make that possible we should have development, so that the people living in our country will have security of employment.

If we do, that alone will be an achievement, but in addition it will assist in the bringing of new wealth to this country. In the past the Queensland Government have done a good job and recently we read in the Press that already immigrants have reached Queensland under the joint Commonwealth-States scheme.

The Government believe that the first essential in settlement and development is to increase water supplies, so that primary industries will be freed from the menace of drought. Already work has been done, and the Government are doing everything possible to implement the scheme.

Another essential is the supply of a cheap and convenient electrical energy. Too long have the people on the farms in the back blocks of this State put up with the primitive hurricane lamp for lighting and the oil-engine for machinery. A supply of cheap and convenient electricity would improve the lot of the farmer, the squatter, and even that of the kangaroo-shooter and the dingo-poisoner. It would be an incentive to people to go into the back blocks of this State and there set up their homes. It would therefore help in stopping the drift from the country to the city.

Another essential is a sufficient supply of labour in the back parts of the State. A proper type of immigrant can be selected,

and I believe the majority will be willing to go into those parts of the State. If they are given the amenities of the people in the cities that will be an enticement to them and I am satisfied that if they settle in the outback and are able to enjoy there some of the amenities of the city dweller, they will not look towards the city.

Another need of the people in the outback is transport. They must be given the convenience of rail, road, or sea transport. Queensland has been lacking in transport, but since the passage of the State Transport Facilities Act I think that the system in Queensland is better than it was previously. In parts of my own area there is still a lack of transport; however, people in localities 6 to 10 miles from Rockhampton have families working in and around that city. It has not been possible for them to get to their work and back in the evening by rail transport, and if it is not possible to give them this form of transport some other form of road transport should be brought into operation. If that is not done, these families will drift from their farming centres to the city, and they will be lost to primary production. The people on the land in my electorate are very good farmers.

They have no desire to live in the city, but they have told me that if it is not possible for their boys and girls to travel to and from their employment in Rockhampton they will have to go to that city to live. I am sure no hon. member wants that to happen.

One of our greatest problems today is housing. Before the war there was a shortage of houses, nothing was done during the war either in Australia or anywhere else in the world in the way of home construction, and the result has been that the position today is acute. The Housing Commission set up by this State Labour Government has done much good work in easing the situation, and the Government are doing everything possible to increase the supply of materials. Another factor that has kept costs high and led to long delay in the building of homes has been the shortage of carpenters. If this position is not improved costs will go even higher.

It has been suggested that private enterprise has played its part in building homes. That is true, but in doing this private enterprise has done nothing more than it should have done in that it has just as great an obligation as have the Government to do these things for the benefit of the State. If private enterprise fails then the Government will have to do it all themselves.

When travelling through the North recently I was amazed at seeing the wonderful timber available there. One thing that gave me concern was the amount going to waste. I do not refer to logs but to the waste of limbs that are of greater dimensions than some of the trees themselves in the South. I suggest that some action should be taken to control the taking of timber from our northern forests. This could be effected by making it compulsory to plant two trees for every one taken out. If some such policy as this is not

adopted we shall find that within a very few years the timber supplies of Queensland will be cut out.

Another revelation to me was the excellent quality of some of the land in North Queensland. In my opinion it was equal to the soil on the Darling Downs. From what I saw of it I am convinced that it is not only suitable for cattle and dairying but it is also capable of growing any of the crops grown in the South. I went as far as Dimbulah and had a look at the cotton-growers in that area. I was there for a couple of days and saw a few of the tobacco farms. On first glance one would form the opinion that the soil there would not grow much but I am satisfied, after seeing the land and seeing what the people can grow, that it can grow almost anything. Besides tobacco, I saw peas, beans, eschalots, lettuce, cabbage and other crops that are grown in this part of the State.

I also went to the Walsh River and inspected the weir that is being built across the river so that tobacco farmers will be able to get water at the required times in the planting and growing of tobacco. I was pleased to hear from these people that with water they could make tobacco-growing a fine industry. I saw the tobacco-growers at Mareeba, who are determined that besides growing the tobacco leaf they will manufacture tobacco for the use of people in Queensland and Australia. I give them credit for their endeavours. I believe it is a good move and one that protects their interests. They gave me to understand that they are confident they can manufacture tobacco up there.

What is more, I had a look at the Atherton Tableland and there I found another tract of land equal to, if not better than, the Darling Downs. From what I could see the people there go in for production of maize in a big way. The size of the silos close to Atherton amazed me. If the farmers of Queensland were to go in for the co-operative building of silos where required, they would be doing the right thing. I believe that the farmer of today can help himself a great deal more than he is doing. I remember that at one time there were two farmer members of the Opposition who used to grow fodder and store it. When fodder got to a reasonably good price these farmers decided that they would sell their stored fodder, but not many months passed before these two gentlemen had to buy fodder and pay a greater price for the fodder they bought to keep their stock alive than they got for the fodder they grew themselves.

I was pleased this morning to hear the Premier on the coal question so far as it concerns the Blair Athol coal and timber country and the open-cut. I believe that the Blair Athol coal deposit is one of the greatest assets in the world today and that is surely saying a big thing. We have hundreds of millions of tons of coal up there and the development we should have had has not yet taken place. When we realise the advantages of the open-cut system of mining we must realise the cheapness with which the

coal can be broken. I believe, after hearing the Premier, that he is doing the right thing. I know that we do not like giving away anything that belongs to us, but I honestly think that the Premier has done the right thing for the Blair Athol coal and timber country with regard to the British company's endeavours to get possession of that coal.

It was suggested by an hon. member the other day that certain people were buying up land or timber rights in the area that the new railway line from Blair Athol to the coast was likely to serve, but in my view this line will not benefit them very much, as I understand that this line or endless belt, as you might call it, will be used solely to convey coal from Blair Athol to the coast.

Mr. Morris: I hope you are wrong, because I should like to see the country developed.

Mr. CLARK: We can develop the country without handing over the whole of it to any firm, English or other, but I do not think that this or any other Government could do what the British company is prepared to do, without reducing social services, such as hospital benefits, and I am not willing to do that. So long as the people generally are protected and the rights of the coal-miners are preserved, there is not a great deal wrong in entering into an agreement with an English company for the expenditure of £10,000,000 to £16,000,000 in this State on the development of a coalfield. Coal is badly needed today, and at Blair Athol a greater quantity of coal could be produced than could come from all the other coal-mines in the State. The coal-miners fear that when Blair Athol is fully developed they will have to resort to short time as they did some years ago, but we can disabuse their minds of that fear. We can point out to them that if all the other mines of the State are properly developed by means of mechanisation a greater amount of coal can be mined than is mined today and that this coal is badly needed, not only in Queensland and in the other States of the Commonwealth, but overseas as well. Therefore, the coal-miners can rest content on that score.

It has been said that the coal-miners earn very good money, but no-one in the world more richly deserves the money he earns than the coal-miner or metalliferous miner. Every day the coal-miner has to go down into the bowels of the earth, perhaps into a gassy mine, and he may not return. He may be killed in an accident. I heard the hon. member for Bowen say that he would not be willing, for the equivalent of his parliamentary salary, merely to go down into a coal-mine and remain there during the working days of the year even if he did no work at all. It is not everyone who can content himself with working as a coal-miner or a metalliferous miner. It is a happy occupation for the men who like it, but, especially in metalliferous mining, they do not last very long.

While on this subject I should like to devote a little of my time to metalliferous mining. We have great mineral resources in this State.

Minerals of every kind can be obtained throughout the State. If properly taken in hand—and I believe the Government are willing to help—there is a possibility of a greater production of gold as well as other minerals. Gold has taken a bit of a rise during the past few years, both as regards price and production. The following figures will indicate that:—

	Production.	Value.
	Fine oz.	£
1944	51,223	538,187
1945	63,223	676,739
1946	62,733	675,164

The total production for the first half of 1947 was 36,086 fine ounces, of a value of £388,374.

Mount Morgan, which is in my electorate, is one of the greatest copper, gold, and silver mines in Australia. The following figures show its gold production in fine ounces in recent years:—

	Fine oz.
1944	40,043
1945	50,454
1946	49,168
1947 (six months)	29,096

Both production and value of metals produced during this period have increased, and the Department of Mines has been called on but little to assist in any way.

I believe that we should help the prospector in the first place. I have a scheme, which I have mentioned in this House previously, under which instead of an individual's receiving 25s. or £2 a week to go out and prospect, a party of six men, after having been given some instruction by a warden or inspector in the principles of prospecting, should be taken out into certain parts of the State where gold, copper, silver, lead, or other minerals are likely to be found. That is the better method. I remember that years ago, when the late Hon. Alf. Jones was Minister for Mines, the Labour Government of the day adopted such a system. In certain parts of Central Queensland it had good results, and I should like to see some such method again in use. Good results would accrue from it. We have many minerals waiting to be produced. I believe that only the surface of many of the old goldfields in Central Queensland has been scratched. With good men at the head of such a party of prospectors I feel certain that something worth while would result.

I do not wish to detain the House much longer but I do want to say that I should like to see some of our underground water supplies turned to account, not for the benefit only of the man on the land but also of some of our towns and cities. It has been impossible to locate a catchment area sufficiently large for a water scheme for Mount Morgan. I am happy to say that quite recently an underground supply was fortunately discovered within 12 miles of the town and it will be sufficient to give it an adequate supply and if required in a dry season, when the mine itself is short of water, to supply it also and overcome the difficulty experienced in

the past of having to cart water there by train. I hope that this underground supply that has been discovered will prove to be an economic one.

Before closing, I want to touch on some of the new Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech. The first is an Industrial and Arbitration and Conciliation Acts Amendment Bill. I take it that the Bill will deal with the 40-hour week that is to be introduced in this State. I want to make it plain that I am one who has been fighting for the 40-hour week for a long time. I believe the workers are entitled to it. There is a 40-hour week in operation at Mt. Morgan, where the men have enjoyed it for many years, and you never hear the Mt. Morgan Company complaining about it—it is more concerned about wages and holiday pay. I am satisfied that production will not drop as a result of a 40-hour week. I am inclined to believe that instead of production dropping it will be increased by a very great margin. If the workers of this State do that, I believe that is all any employer, whether the Government or private employer, can expect.

I am wholeheartedly in support of shorter working hours in industry. I am familiar with many of these industries. Sawmill work is pretty hard, and the same applies to main-roads work. I believe a 40-hour week is quite sufficient for the men on these jobs. If they are doing that work for 40 hours a week they have had enough when the week-end comes round.

The Workers' Compensation Act is to be amended. I hope that when this Bill is being considered the old stalwart miners of Queensland who are suffering from industrial diseases will receive consideration.

There will also be introduced a Bill to amend the Apprentices and Minors Acts. I believe that we cannot do too much for the apprentices. I believe that if a boy is honest and fulfils his obligations to the Apprenticeship Committee and to his employer there is nothing for him to fear during his career. It is our duty to see that the apprentices get a fair deal while they are being trained, and I think great benefits will be conferred on these boys as a result of the Bill.

Another Bill mentioned is the Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill. That is another Bill under which we can do a little more for the coal-miner pensioners in this State. I am pleased to know the coal-miners were agreeable to paying a certain amount of money into a fund so that they would get pensions when they had to retire from the mining industry. They are entitled to a pension also if they are injured in the industry. I am pleased to know there is one section of this community that is prepared to pay a little, so that it will get some benefits in future years.

Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera) (4.24 p.m.): I heard many members congratulate His Excellency on his appointment, but I think we should congratulate this State on having a man in the person of Sir John Lavarack to take over that position, which is a very

important one. I think we are extremely fortunate to have as Governor of this State a man with such a fine war record and a man who has done so much for this country.

I should like also to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on having been appointed to the very important position you occupy.

I must confess, of course, that I had hopes of seeing you decorating the benches on this side but I realise that I have to look forward now to another 2½ years before seeing that. (Laughter.) However, while I am on this side I am very pleased that you are still occupying your position.

I should like also, if I may, to congratulate the new Minister for Transport. I believe the hon. gentleman to be a man of great ability and I think he will bring to this office much new thought and constructive thought and the development that will follow will be to the advantage of this State. I am pleased also because he is one of the young men who represent returned soldiers.

Now I should like to make brief reference to the election irregularities that have been dealt with so much in this debate. Charges and counter-charges have been made and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to join with me in considering for a moment where the position stands at present. It is this: we on this side of the House have described what we believe to be a series of grave irregularities that have occurred. We have named the electorates in which we believe these irregularities occurred. Frankly, we have presented many charges and they cover particularly the electorate of Kennedy. We have told the Government in no uncertain terms that we have statutory declarations supporting every charge we have made in this House.

Mr. Gair: A lot of humbug.

Mr. MORRIS: There is no humbug about it. Those statutory declarations are now available. The only humbug about it is that the Premier talks about these things as being very minor matters. That is the humbug. They are not minor matters; they are serious irregularities, and action of some sort should be taken. All our witnesses and the deponents of these statutory declarations are honest men and of good standing. Not one thing has been said by a member of the Government party to disprove the standing of any of the men who have given evidence in support of the charges we have made. Not one bit of evidence has been brought forward in that regard.

Mr. Gair: Your own scrutineers in Kennedy dissociated themselves from the charge.

Mr. MORRIS: No matter how much it hurts the Deputy Premier—and I know he is hurt about it; he is hurt to realise that we have discovered the many irregularities his own colleagues have put into effect—I cannot help it. I must go ahead.

At 4.28 p.m.,

Mr. HILTON (Carnarvon) relieved Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. MORRIS: Not one fact has been produced that disproves any of the statements made by the members on this side. When the hon. member for Kennedy began his speech he said he would disprove the statements made as far as Kennedy was concerned, but he did nothing whatever to disprove them. All the hon. member did was to make a scurrilous attack on certain people. He said the man who signed the statutory declaration tabled was a liar. He drew a red herring across the trail by producing a letter that had no bearing whatever on the charges made here by my colleagues. We have stated all the charges and not one has been disproved.

But the matter goes further than that. Members on the Labour benches have also made grave charges. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove spoke at some length and made grave charges against officers of the department who were conducting that election. He said he had been sabotaged by a presiding officer in his electorate. That is a very grave charge indeed and one that most certainly should be investigated. Incidentally, that charge made by the hon. member was replied to in the Press by the candidate who represented our interests in that electorate, but this has received no reply.

Another member of the Government Party, the hon. member for Keppel, also made grave charges against my party in his electorate. Again these charges were replied to through the Press by the candidate who represented us, but the challenge was not taken up by any member of the Labour Party or by the hon. member for Keppel himself. He would not come outside this House and take up the challenge that was issued by our candidate in Keppel.

Further, we made charges in the Kennedy electorate, and the hon. member for Kennedy came into this Chamber and also made grave charges. Even today we had the Premier himself making a charge against the hon. member for Toowong. He said other members may have done it because of their over-zealousness, but the hon. member for Toowong, who should know, has committed a grave irregularity. The position is that we on this side have made charges, and not only the back-benchers of the Government side but the Premier himself has made charges of irregularities. Surely, in justice to the people of Queensland and for the honour of this House, the Premier cannot allow the matter to stand at that! Further action must be taken. Certainly the Premier says that the irregularities could not change the result of the election. We know that, but that does not mean that they are not grave charges.

Mr. Hanlon: They were nearly all just dumb stupidity.

Mr. MORRIS: Then the charge by the Premier himself evidently comes within the same class. If they are dumb stupid charges they have no right to be made in this House, but further action should be taken to prove whether those charges are correct or not.

Mr. Hanlon: We did not raise the question.

Mr. MORRIS: The Premier certainly did raise it. He, the hon. member for Kelvin Grove, the hon. member for Keppel, and the hon. member for Kennedy all made charges, and the matter cannot possibly be left where it is at the moment. The only thing left to the Government is to see that there is a full judicial inquiry into all the charges that have been made so that they can be either proved or disproved.

One point that I wish to bring to the attention of the Premier in particular is that if the charges we have made are incorrect, who is going to suffer? He is not. Ours is the only party that will suffer if our charges are incorrect, yet we are urging him to have an inquiry to prove whether they are correct or not. If the statement he made in this House today is correct, then we are the ones who will suffer. But no, he will not, and he will not do it because he knows in his heart that the charges that we have made are correct, and he is afraid to face a full judicial inquiry. We are anxious to see it. If he can prove to us that there has been any irregularity by any one of our officers or any one of our assistants, then we are prepared to clean our house, because that is what we want. Evidently he is not prepared to do it because he has not the courage to give us a judicial inquiry.

Mr. Hanlon: Did you see a copy of the letter from Mr. Wanstall to the T.B. case at Kenmore?

Mr. MORRIS: The Premier has had his opportunity. He mentions a letter. If he had wanted to, he could have tabled it. If he still wants to produce the letter, let him produce it at a judicial inquiry. This is his opportunity. Let him, with the power he has, give us that inquiry. I call his bluff, and I wager 2s. he is not game to take it. I only hope that he will be prepared to face up to the challenge I have given him.

I want to speak also regarding recent proposals that come from Canberra to nationalise banks, and if much notice could be taken of the remarks of the hon. member for Brisbane the proposal is to extend nationalisation to insurance companies and, presumably, go on and on. I regard that step as probably one of the most serious ever taken in the legislatures of this country. Mankind would need to have a very short memory to accept the proposals with equanimity. I am certain that the vast majority of the people of Queensland and Australia believe that the legislation proposed to be introduced is the greatest attack on their personal liberty and freedom ever made in this country.

The best parallel I can give is the legislation brought forward by Hitler in Germany in the early 1930s. I propose to trace the steps in the introduction of National Socialism in Germany, and to show how we are headed towards the same thing. I see the Premier laughing, but he will

probably remember that in 1930, when this legislation was introduced in Germany, Hitler was the idol of the population. He was rising to power and everybody said, "Oh, he is a great man." The people would not accept the view that Hitler was going to introduce National Socialism and finally kill Germany. You know that Mr. Winston Churchill almost killed himself trying to tell the people of England and the world just where they were headed, but they took no notice of him.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. MORRIS: I speak of Mr. Churchill as being one of the finest of men, but I will tell you what one of the Premier's party in the person of Senator Collings said about Mr. Churchill in December, 1939. He said—

"I would not negotiate with that scoundrel Churchill. I regard him as a mad dog let loose for the purpose of spreading hatred where previously none existed."

Mr. Winston Churchill tried to tell the people of the world where they were heading, but nobody took notice of him. I know that Senator Collings is a colleague of the Premier and he is keen to see National Socialism introduced in Australia and they will see it introduced if they have their way.

We have recently concluded a war in which we were fighting the evils of National Socialism. I have seen at that war men prepared to sacrifice everything to overcome its evils, I have seen men go through actual hell in their efforts to overcome them, and if I did not say in this House what I think we are heading for, I believe I should be letting these men down and I would not be worthy of a continuance of my fellowship with them. I believe that we are headed in Australia for something similar to what took place in Germany. In Australia people may say, "Oh, that happened in Germany; it cannot happen here." That is where they are far from the truth. It can happen here, and it is happening here today.

I will show the various steps in the introduction in Germany of National Socialism and show how we are running over parallel routes. Step No. 1 in Germany was that Hitler and his crew were elected democratically to the Government of Germany.

Mr. Aikens: They were not.

Mr. MORRIS: They were. They were elected democratically, in the first place, to the Government of Germany. Similarly, in Australia the Labour Government have been elected democratically but what the hon. member for Mundingburra apparently overlooks is the fact that later on Hitler refused to allow the elections to be conducted democratically and saw to it that he retained his power in an autocratic way. The same thing is happening in this country. The very people who want to introduce National Socialism have also been elected democratically.

In Germany Hitler took step No. 2 in 1933 when he went forward to obtain financial control of the country. He got that control and here in Australia in 1947 we find the Federal Labour Government taking exactly the same second step as was taken in Germany.

At 4.42 p.m.,

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

Mr. MORRIS: What was the third step in Germany? Hitler went out to find a suitable boggy to frighten the people and here in Australia we have exactly the same step. The Labour Government have produced the boggy of the banks and the insurance companies. They are referring to the dreadful banks, the dreadful insurance companies, and dreadful private enterprise.

What was the fourth step in Germany? Hitler centralised all Government functions in Berlin. Today Chifley is doing exactly the same in Australia at Canberra. He has entirely disregarded the comradeship of the States, as the Premier knows as well as I, and perhaps to a greater extent because he had to fight Mr. Chifley—and I congratulate him on fighting for Queensland. However, the Premier knows that with Mr. Chifley in power he is fighting a losing fight. That is the position of the Hon. the Prime Minister, to give him his full title, although I should like to call him something else. He is dictating the financial policy of Australia. He tells the Premier what he can do and what he cannot do and the Premier just has to obey.

The fifth step in Germany was the building up of a huge and powerful bureaucracy. And so it goes on. Hon. members here know that exactly the same thing is taking place in Australia, that there is being built up a powerful bureaucracy so that these people who want to introduce National Socialism will have the tool and the power in their hands to do that which they wish.

Mr. Aikens: Hitler rode to power on the Communist boggy.

Mr. MORRIS: The hon. member for Mundingburra has reminded me of one thing. There is only one difference between Hitler and Mr. Chifley and that is that Hitler at least had the courage to write his book, "Mein Kampf" in which he told the world what he was going to do, but the world laughed at him. Mr. Chifley is a little bit too shrewd for that. He has not gone to the trouble to write any book, he is keeping his plans secret and quiet, but, my word, we know that they are there all the same.

The people of Australia say that it cannot happen here, but they are not aware of the danger that is facing them. It is happening here and it is happening here day by day.

The road to Berchtesgaden via Canberra has already been surveyed, marked, and laid down, and if you were to listen carefully you could hear the rumbling of the tanks along the road and the marching of the Gestapo with Mr. Chifley in his Prussian arrogance leading them along. That is what is happening here today. Most hon. members know that what happened in Germany in 1930, 1931, and 1932 is taking place now. The German people were warned of the danger but they disregarded it.

Mr. Aikens: Where will they build Belsen?

Mr. MORRIS: They will build it somewhere. It is a serious business when we realise what this country is facing at the present time, and one wonders why there can be such levity and ridicule on the Labour benches. It shows one the brains that are there. They know that they are the chattels of the Federal Labour Government.

(At 4.46 p.m., Mr. SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

Mr. MORRIS: I propose now to deal with the subject of education for a few minutes. The Premier made a remark during his speech that hon. members on this side were dealing with matters that they were interested in, not matters of State or of grave importance to this country. I do not agree with the Premier, but at least he must admit that the subject of education is one of extreme importance to this country and State. I propose basing the remarks I wish to make on the statement made by Graham Balfour, when he said that all educational administration—

"Is to enable the right pupils to receive the right education from the right teachers under conditions which will enable the pupils to profit by their training."

If we take that definition as being sound—and there is not one of us who will not admit that it is a very sound one—we must agree that the important basis for education is that we must have teachers of a quality and in a quantity suitable to our requirements.

We must have also a correct classification of pupils, and it is obvious that to get a correct classification of pupils our examination system must come under review and there must be some consideration of vocational guidance.

The next most important thing is that the curriculum must be a suitable one, suitable from every point of view.

Lastly, we must have equipment and amenities within our schools that are suitable for the right training to be given to the right pupils. In equipment you naturally admit that one of the important features is visual education.

Let us consider the position of the teachers in our schools today and the possibilities of the future. If we do, we must agree that this Government have failed absolutely to provide the Department of Public Instruction with sufficient teachers to do the job required of them. I alone do not make that statement. I refer the House to the statement made by the Director of Education, Mr. Edwards, in his last report to Parliament, which is available to any hon. member—

“Despite the return of so many ex-servicemen to teaching duties, the staffing position has not improved, and will be acute during the years 1947 and 1948.”

He also said—

“Replenishment has not been sufficient to match wastage. At the end of 1945, the department offered a teacher's scholarship to every suitable applicant who had qualified at the University Senior Public Examination. Many of those who apply for Senior Scholarships are apparently not serious in their applications. Evidently they will take up teaching if nothing ‘better’ offers.”

That is what the Director of Education said in his last report to Parliament. The position is getting no better, as we would hope, but on the contrary is gradually getting worse and worse every year. For instance, during 1946 our total intake of teachers was 221, but in the same period the resignations totalled 392, a net loss of 171 teachers.

During the period 1 January, 1947, to 1 August, 1947, our intake was 335 and resignations totalled 208, a net gain of 137. If we take the two periods, from 1 January, 1946, to 1 August, 1947, we find a net loss of 34. At first glance we should be inclined to say—and we should be justified in saying—that during this year 1947 the loss of teachers is rapidly righting itself, but that is certainly not so.

Mr. Moore: Will you give us an analysis of the resignations?

Mr. MORRIS: I will certainly give you an analysis; that is a point I am coming to.

It is universally admitted by people who know anything about education that the pupils at the Teachers' Training College require a minimum period of training of two years. In fact, this Labour Government gave an assurance to the teachers that these youths who were attending the Training College would get training for two years; but they have broken their promise again. Instead of allowing these student teachers to remain for two years, they have taken them out after they have served 18 months and sent them out into schools. That is the reason why the figures are so much better for 1947 than is the actual fact.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think they should have been left to complete their two years' training?

Mr. MORRIS: The Premier asks me whether I think they should be left to complete their training. I maintain that this

position should have been rectified five or six years ago (Government laughter) and if the Government had any foresight—they may laugh—they would have done what the New South Wales Government did. You have only to look at the figures of the pupils attending in New South Wales to see that they foresaw this danger and legislated for it and they are not faced with the great shortage of teachers that we are faced with in Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. MORRIS: While the Premier will mumble I shall have to disregard him. If he has a sensible interjection and speaks up I will take notice of him.

The loss is still a very severe one and it is just as bad as it has ever been over the past few years in Queensland. If hon. members like to refer to statements by people who have studied education in Queensland and who are authorities on the subject—and I will give you the statements later on—they will learn that we are facing a chaotic position in the next few years unless something is done to introduce more teachers into the service than are being introduced at the present time.

Mr. Turner: If they have to serve two years at the Teachers' Training College how can that happen?

Mr. MORRIS: How can what happen?

Mr. Turner: How can more teachers be added to the State?

Mr. MORRIS: If the hon. member waits for a while I will show him how it can happen. The loss of teachers in the last two years has been approximately 150 a year and if this goes on we are going to be in a terrible state.

Before I go on to explain how the position can be overcome let me tell hon. members something more. I have given you a fairly grim picture as far as teachers are concerned, showing that we are losing up to 200 more teachers a year than we are gaining. That would be serious enough if our population remained the same; but the position is much worse than that because our population is increasing and our net enrolment is becoming greater and greater every year, so that we require not fewer teachers—as we are getting under the Labour Government—but more and more. These are figures that have been supplied by the State Government Statistician. I have got the number of extra teachers required year by year.

	Net enrolment per year.	Increase of Number over previous year.	Additional Teachers required.
1947 ..	136,100	3,300	80
1948 ..	138,900	2,800	70
1949 ..	144,400	5,500	137
1950 ..	151,100	6,700	167

But we are losing teachers at the rate of 200 a year. What we want is an increase of teachers by at least 100 a year to cater

for this position alone, without taking into consideration the urgent necessity for the reduction in the size of the classes.

Another promise that obviously will be broken by this Government is the raising of the school-leaving age to 15 years. It is impossible to implement that promise because of the tragic bungle they have made in the intake of teachers over the past few years. The Government Statistician also says—

“If allowance is made for reasonable immigration then the primary figure for 1950 might rise to 153,000, the intervening years being affected to progressively lesser extents.

“It seems likely that the primary school numbers will continue to rise until 1960, then slightly decline until 1970 and thereafter show a steep rise. If immigration is allowed for, the rise up to 1960 will be steeper and from 1960 to 1970 there will be a small increase instead of a slight decline.

“The State Government is committed to the raising of the school-leaving age to 15. This reform will mean, on a conservative estimate, an increase in the school population of some 12,000 and the employment of 300 additional teachers.”

The Director-General of Education states—

“The staffing position will be acute during the years 1947 and 1948.”

The article in the “Queensland Teachers’ Journal” continued—

“Even if the school-leaving age is not raised, and it is quite clear that it cannot be raised for some time, the position for, at least, the next ten years will be chaotic unless a courageous approach is made to the whole problem.

“Teacher recruitment has failed even with the falling school population. We are now faced with a rising school population for the next ten years or so. Those two sentences show the gravity of the position, and are a clear indication that the day for palliatives and mild approaches to this urgent problem has passed.”

To sum up the present position, we find that schools are at present insufficiently staffed according to the requirements. We see no indication of any hope of reducing the present size of classes, which is admittedly too large.

There is no possibility, I repeat, of implementing the other of the Government’s promises, that of raising the school-leaving age to 15. According to the report I have read, we see also the great danger, in fact the certainty, of the chaotic position that will present itself within the next five years.

If this problem is severe—and it must be admitted by the most empty-headed person that it is severe—we must look for the solution of it. To do that, the first thing to be done is to make up our minds as to the

basic cause for this shortage of teachers, because surely there must be a basic cause. I believe that the first and most important basic cause is the inadequate salary scale and unsatisfactory training.

I have heard much talk of the professions and trades considered important to the country and I concede they are, but no profession is more important to the future of this country than the teaching profession, unless it be the medical profession, but we find in many skilled trades, semi-skilled trades, and a great number of unskilled trades people receiving infinitely more money than are school teachers.

That was proved by the Secretary for Public Instruction only yesterday, when he said that Mr. Stockwell, who has been appointed to the teaching profession without passing any qualifying examinations whatsoever, has to lose many pounds a week to become a teacher. He was previously an A.W.U. organiser or sleeper-cutter, but he is going to drop pounds and pounds a week to become a teacher. Does not that show what a tragically poorly paid profession teaching is?

Mr. Farrell: Why not be fair to Stockwell and say he was reduced from £590 odd to £280 odd?

Mr. MORRIS: That is exactly what I am saying. Before he was appointed a teacher, he was a sleeper-cutter, an A.W.U. organiser, and he was getting a much larger salary than he is getting as a teacher. It shows the ridiculous scale of salaries being paid to teachers at present. In Queensland our teachers leave the Training College and go out to a school. While there, they have to study very hard and pass an examination equal to a two-year course at the University, an examination embracing six subjects. Then, after having served for 16 years as teachers, they are capable of rising to a salary of £490 a year.

What do we find just over the border? The pupils who attend the training colleges stay there for two years, pass their qualifying examination at the Teachers’ Training College, and are then sent out to a school and, without any further study whatsoever, are able to rise after eight years to a salary of £500 a year. So long as we have this cheese-paring parsimonious system of payment of teachers in Queensland we shall always be in as bad a position as we are at the moment.

Mr. Aikens: You are on the right track. I am with you for once.

Mr. MORRIS: I never get up and speak unless I am on the right track. New South Wales cannot possibly accept all the pupils offering, while here we cannot get enough people to enter our Training College.

Let me quote from the “Queensland Teachers’ Journal,” the official organ of the Queensland Teachers’ Union. This is what

they think of conditions operating in Queensland—

“Education in the Commonwealth has not stood still. What was true in March, 1945, is not true in July, 1947. There have been notable advances since 1944 in the other States, especially New South Wales. Mr. Bruce, twice Minister for Public Instruction, is, presumably, well aware of the advances made in the other States, and he is, presumably, also aware that Queensland has fallen behind and is now, in several important respects, one of the backward States in education.

“In New South Wales, which has good salaries and conditions, in comparison with Queensland, there were 1,200 students in the training college at Sydney in 1946, 390 in the college at Armidale, and 215 in the college at Balmain, making a total of over 1,800, 500 more than the number in training in 1945.”

The position is that there are 500 more in training in New South Wales in 1946 than in 1945, and that is what we have got to have here, but we shall never do that unless we improve the standards of the teaching profession, unless we see to it that they are paid a wage commensurate with the work they have to do and responsibility they have to shoulder.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (5.5 p.m.): In the last remaining minutes allotted by the Government to this debate, I wish to be as brief as possible with the usual courteous formalities associated with the Address in Reply.

Firstly, I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on the dignity with which he entered this House at the opening of Parliament and also on the pleasing manner in which he read his Speech from the throne. My only regret is that the subject-matter was not more inspiring to the people of Queensland and calculated to give them the idea that the future is not as black as it looks today.

I take this opportunity of complimenting you, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election. The fact that you were unanimously elected to your office indicates that hon. members generally believe you will uphold the dignity of the Chair throughout this Parliament and take every care to see that justice is done to all members of the House.

I also particularly wish to congratulate the new members who have spoken in this debate. All indicated that they have come into this House for the purpose of helping this State. They are all Queenslanders, and some of the new members on this side of the House were outstanding in their speeches, and made some hon. members opposite bite the dust. Good luck to them! I feel we shall hear much more from the young members during the life of this Parliament, particularly when it gets into full going order in the second and third sessions.

I wish to speak briefly this afternoon, because my time is limited, on some of the things affecting us today. During this debate there has been an expression from hon. members sitting behind the Government of hostility towards the financial institutions and people engaged in private enterprise. Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that the almost £100,000,000 wool clip in Australia this year has been a gilt-edged security to Labour Governments in their financial affairs? This gift is coming from private enterprise. Everything that assists Queensland, Australia and the Empire comes from the operations of private enterprise. I can well understand that Premier Hanlon as an astute business man recognises that he must not play too close to that nationalisation and socialisation, as some of his colleagues wish him to. As he put it today, it was time this State gave greater consideration to private enterprise.

Mr. Hanlon: I would nationalise coal-mines cheerfully if we were capable of doing it.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. gentleman knows that the Labour Government in Great Britain are drowning their people in a sea of nationalisation, but with what result? There is a financial and economic crisis in Great Britain, and the hon. gentleman knows that workers have voluntarily agreed to go back into the coal pits in Great Britain because the socialisation of mines is not providing sufficient coal for industry.

I emphasise that the three outstanding announcements made by the Premier this morning indicate that we must look to the industries carried on by private enterprise for the welfare of Queensland. He told us that he had completed negotiations so far as he was concerned for a British firm to take over the activities on the Blair Athol coal-field. I compliment him on recognising that it is necessary for Queensland to develop her great mineral wealth. For too long have we allowed our great mineral wealth to lie dormant. We must develop it if we are to win the wealth necessary to maintain the financial strength of Queensland. I feel that whatever is done in this matter the Government will pay due regard to the welfare of the people.

I quite agree with those hon. members who have said that we must not give any concessions to any outside authority or company that in the long run will be detrimental to the people of this State, and I take it from the remarks of the Premier today that he has not done that.

He also refused to allow the control of the coal industry of Queensland to pass to New South Wales and I congratulate him on that stand, too. It would be calamitous to the coal-mining industry of Queensland should it be handed over to the control of New South Wales. The Premier did a great service in that respect, in that he indicated to the extremists who wish to see the nationalisation of the coal-mining industry that Queensland was not going to have any of it.

The hon. gentleman then made the very important announcement that the Commonwealth Government had at long last agreed to the restoration of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a lb. in the price of sugar, which was taken from that industry during the depression in 1933. That announcement gives a great deal of relief to the large body of people engaged in the industry. The hon. member for Mirani, who came into this House after a signal victory in a sugar-growing constituency and is recognised as being an authority on the industry, convinced hon. members that he understands the industry thoroughly and gave solid reasons why the industry should press its claim for the restoration of the half-penny.

I desire to take this opportunity of congratulating the Premier on his strong leadership of the delegation that went to Canberra for this purpose. I was a member of that delegation, and I know that the Premier made very strong representations to the Prime Minister in support of the case, and with such success that he was able to announce today that the Prime Minister has indicated that the $\frac{1}{2}$ d. will be restored. I am sure that the Premier will join with me in extending our thanks to Senator Courtice, the Minister for Trade and Customs, on his long and arduous job of preparing the ground for our submission to the Prime Minister. Over the years I have found that Prime Ministers who began their careers as opponents of the sugar industry, have finished by becoming its greatest champions, and amongst them I number Andrew Fisher and William Morris Hughes. That has been our experience, dating from the days of those men right through to the present time.

Mr. Theodore: And especially Labour Prime Ministers.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member knows that Prime Ministers generally have been very good to the sugar industry. I shall have something to say about the hon. member's remarks in relation to the sugar industry at some future time.

The Prime Minister indicated to our delegation that he had studied the sugar industry of Queensland, that he knew it thoroughly, and that the industry could quite confidently make him their advocate. As a result of these negotiations Mr. Chifley has at last become a warm advocate of the sugar industry of Queensland, this great national industry, this great key agricultural industry, the only cane-sugar industry in the world carried on with white labour, paying a high standard of wages and producing sugar for the people at the cheapest rate in the world. That is a fine tribute to this industry, which had of necessity to approach the Prime Minister for this relief.

We know that this fight has gone on since 1943, and that it was fought because of the very difficult position of the industry during the war, together with the mounting costs of production that have taken place since 1938-39. This was a very trying period for the industry. If we take 1936, 1937, and

1938, which were recognised as three normal years, we find that the average production of sugar was 761,907 tons, whereas for the years 1946 and 1947 it was only 531,000 tons. In other words, the crop was actually down 230,000 tons, which, on the export value alone, today is worth £5,885,000 sterling. The industry has gone down and down until it was forced to make this claim.

In an endeavour to try to belittle the speech of the hon. member for Mirani, the hon. member for Herbert made some comments that indicated that the sugar industry makes its claims only to a Labour Government. I do not want to misquote him, so I will quote what he said from "Hansard." The hon. member for Windsor interjected to him—

"Why was it not done?"

meaning why was not the $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a lb. restored. The hon. member for Herbert replied—

"Why was it not done? Because of Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden. That was why it was not done. I can tell the hon. member that during the 10 years when Lyons, Menzies, and Fadden were in power no representations were made to them for either an increase or a restoration of the $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a lb."

Mr. Jesson: What is wrong with that?

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member knows what is wrong with that. The implication is that the industry does not make its applications to non-Labour Governments, but immediately a Labour Government are in power it does so.

Mr. Theodore: That is exactly what happened.

Mr. BRAND: Let us tell the truth about it. The hon. member, as a representative of the sugar industry, knows that during those 10 years the Hon. W. Forgan Smith was the Labour Premier of this State. He knows that he agreed to review the Sugar Agreement.

Mr. Hanlon: That is not true.

Mr. BRAND: He did agree.

Mr. Hanlon: No, the sugar industry agreed.

Mr. BRAND: No, the sugar industry asked him and he agreed.

Mr. Hanlon: You asked him.

Mr. BRAND: Is that not what I am saying?

Mr. Hanlon: You surrendered and we fell into line.

Mr. BRAND: You were a party to it.

Mr. Hanlon: No.

Mr. BRAND: The point I want to make is: in every such renewal the matter was finalised two years before the agreement expired. Mr. Forgan Smith arranged for a renewal of the agreement, and the sugar-grower had not an opportunity of asking for

a restoration. The Labour Government assisted the sugar industry to go to Canberra when Mr. Fadden was Prime Minister to ask for that restoration in 1943.

Mr. Hanlon: A year ago you asked me to intercede with the Prime Minister not to have an inquiry.

Mr. BRAND: I will tell the hon. gentleman what he does not know. When Mr. Curtin, in 1943, was asked to have a Tariff Board inquiry on the industry, that Tariff Board, when it left Canberra, had no intention of looking into the industry with a view of increasing the price. Its one and only idea was to get all the information it could for the purpose of nationalising this industry. When the members of the board left Canberra they had no intention of looking at the increased price and told the industry so in Queensland. When I came to the hon. gentleman I knew very well that he appreciated that point of view. I knew very well that he would make the representations that I had asked him to make. I said it was in the interests of the industry that he should do so.

The hon. member for Herbert knows perfectly well that when we went to the Labour Government Prime Minister we did so at the request of the Queensland Labour Government.

I only regret that Menzies was not Prime Minister because if he had been we should have had the half-penny restored at that time. At all events, it is now restored to the sugar industry and that industry will endeavour to rebuild itself and make up the 230,000 tons of sugar that it is down below normal production, and endeavour to bring to this State an additional £6,000,000 a year. That will be the objective of the sugar industry.

I believe, as the Premier believes, that it was necessary that this industry should benefit by the expansion in values that has taken place because of increased cost of production all round. This expansion in values warrants some inducement to the industry not only to continue to exist but also prosper and find employment at remunerative wages for the people who work in it. This industry is in a worse position than the fruit-growing industry, which it supports each year with a contribution of £216,000, which was agreed to many years ago when the fruit industry was in a parlous condition. The Leader of the Opposition will remember the period when it was impossible to sell the whole of the fruit crop and gluts took place. The sugar industry has been able by that contribution of £216,000 to help this great industry. For instance, during the past 15 years the statutory contribution made by the sugar industry to the fruit industry amounted to no less than £3,289,580 and the ex-gratia contributions have added a further £435,285 to that sum.

What was the result of this help? Take for instance Australian jams and fruit jellies. In 1926-27 the export of jams was 2,423,000 lb. in weight and in 1945-46 the export amounted to 41,182,000 lb. in weight,

a remarkable development in the production of jams for export. The total production increased from 85,000,000 lb. to 150,000,000 lb., which shows that the help given by the sugar industry to the fruit industry has been very good.

Take Australian canned apricots, peaches, and pears. In 1926 the trade exported 140,147 cases and in 1941, the last year for which there were reliable figures—owing to unknown exports for Allied forces—the figure was 1,272,176 cases. The amount of canned pineapples exported in 1927 was 10,887 cases and in 1941 60,423 cases, which again shows the value of the assistance rendered by the sugar industry. After all, it is a Government responsibility, but we have played fair with them. Our own pineapple production in 1½ bushel cases has increased from 478,304 cases in 1926 to 1,224,205 cases in 1946.

Mr. Hanlon: No other primary industry subsidises a secondary industry.

Mr. BRAND: No other industry is subsidised by another industry.

Mr. Hanlon: No other primary industry subsidises a secondary industry.

Mr. BRAND: No. We made a valuable contribution that cost the producers 1s. a ton on their cane production, which is a heavy contribution from men who are producing 500 and 600 tons of cane.

Nevertheless, we are not complaining. I would point out now that the Commonwealth Prime Minister has not permitted any further inroads into that fund, because approximately £700,000 is standing in reserve for the fruit-growing industry today. All that has been provided by the sugar industry of Queensland. We are truly a very great industry but I would emphasise that all is not well with it; that whereas the Commonwealth Government have come to our aid in price we require from the State Government the continued vigilance and help that are necessary to preserve it.

Some remarks were made by an hon. member about the Sugar Board, and I would point out to the hon. member for Herbert that the clamour for direct representation on that Board does not come from a section of the cane-growers of Queensland.

Mr. Theodore: Who makes the claim?

Mr. BRAND: The claims are made by the unanimous wish of the industry as expressed at their conference.

Mr. Hanlon: Not unanimous.

Mr. BRAND: Yes.

Mr. Hanlon: You would have to take a vote.

Mr. BRAND: All the delegates who come to the conference are elected on a democratic franchise provided for by the present Labour Government and they unanimously decided to ask the State Government—

Mr. Theodore: They represent Mackay.

Mr. BRAND: They do not represent Mackay. They represent Tully. And let me here tell the hon. member that his own representative strongly supported the representation from the industry on the Sugar Board.

Mr. Hanlon: The people who have to put up the money and take the financial obligation are adequately represented.

Mr. BRAND: The people who put up the money?

Mr. Hanlon: And take the financial obligation for marketing the sugar are represented on the board adequately.

Mr. BRAND: Do you mean the C.S.R.?

Mr. Hanlon: The State Government.

Mr. BRAND: The State Government? Of course they take no risk at all. They merely turn over their responsibility to the C.S.R. Co. as their agents. They say to them, "You finance this crop and you can charge interest on the amount of finance."

Mr. Hanlon: But what if they say no? Who is going to carry the baby?

Mr. BRAND: We know the Government will not. The Government only guarantee the Sugar Board against loss.

Mr. Hanlon: Is that all?

Mr. BRAND: In all the years, 30, that the Government have been commandeering the sugar in Queensland they have not lost a penny.

Mr. Hanlon: No?

Mr. BRAND: It is a very good bet.

Mr. Theodore: You have always complained about representation on the Sugar Board.

Mr. BRAND: We have heard that story too frequently. I think the hon. member is stinging under the lash. The hon. member knows that the Premier is game enough to fight for the raw-sugar industry of Queensland, and I compliment him on it. He would like to see the industry satisfied. All it wants is to have a representative on the Sugar Board, because every penny paid to the farmer has to be paid by it.

Mr. Hanlon: What objection have you to the personnel?

Mr. BRAND: I have no objection to the personnel, but I have certain objections to the principle. The hon. gentleman is not going to catch me that way. Here I should like to say in all fairness to the Premier, because the hon. gentleman knows, irrespective of what extra charges are put on or what losses take place in the refining of the product of raw sugar, that the producers pay for the lot. Who pays any increases in the refining charges? Not the Queensland or the

Commonwealth Governments, but the sugar producers of Queensland and they are entitled to some representation on the board that deals with the sale of their products in Australia and overseas.

Mr. Theodore: What is wrong with the present representation?

Mr. Pie: You are not on the board.

Mr. Theodore: Only that you don't have the right to appoint them.

Mr. BRAND: No. The hon. member for Herbert knows, and so does the Premier, that that is not all that is wrong.

Mr. Hanlon: You could not improve on the representation on the board.

Mr. BRAND: Why should the industry have to submit to solely Government representation? Every other commodity board in Queensland has the representation we desire.

At 5.30 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BARNES (Bundaberg): I rise to voice my protest at not being allowed to speak on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BARNES: There will be no order until I have finished speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BARNES: I have finished speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will have to obey the call to order.

Mr. BARNES: I told you I have finished speaking.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: Can I not rise to a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Not at this stage.

Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, and of Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 7 August last, I shall now put the question for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. Barnes: Are you afraid to hear me speak?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the Address in Reply be agreed to.

Motion (Mr. Crowley) agreed to.

Mr. Aikens: Give him a go, just the same.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! On the point raised by interjection by the hon. member for Mundingburra, I want to say that he agreed without protest to the Sessional Order under which we are now operating.

Mr. Aikens: But I did not think the hon. member for Bulimba and the hon. member for Bundaberg would be choked off.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

SUPPLY.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.
