

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1948

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

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

“(a) Where unoccupied post-primary school sites can be used to supplement the sports ground facilities of existing schools, their development will proceed as circumstances permit, provided the exact location of the future school buildings can be definitely determined; (b) I am advised that this is not possible at present with respect to the Holland road-Cavendish road site, but I shall give some consideration to the proposal; (c) a number of post-primary school sites have already been leased to sporting bodies; (d) we have not yet acquired a post-primary school site at Eagle Farm.”

BANNING OF COMMUNIST WORKERS.

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

“1. In connection with the published suggestion made by the organiser of the State Labour Party (Mr. E. J. Walsh) on 21st instant that workers should consider whether the time had not arrived to refuse to work beside any avowed Communist, will he state whether this is the policy of the present Government?

“2. If so, will he consider introducing legislation to permit of workers refusing to work beside avowed Communists, and include in any such legislation authority enabling employers to order avowed Communists off their premises?”

THURSDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER, 1948.

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

DEATH OF MR. H. M. RUSSELL.

REPLY TO MOTION OF CONDOLENCE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received a letter from the widow of the late Mr. H. M. Russell, conveying thanks for the motion of condolence passed on 17 August.

QUESTIONS.

USE OF SCHOOL RESERVES AS SPORTS GROUNDS.

Mr. HILEY (Logan) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“In view of the acute shortage of sports and recreation grounds, will he consider using sites acquired for the establishment of Post-Primary Schools as sports grounds, and to this end will he consider the following proposals:—(a) That the positions of school buildings and playing fields be defined now by the Department of Public Instruction; (b) that the playing fields be laid out now; (c) that such playing fields be then leased to local sporting bodies until the school project proceeds; (d) that the foregoing be considered, particularly in relation to the sites already acquired by the Department at the corner of Cavendish road and Holland road, Coorparoo, and at Eagle Farm?”

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

“1. and 2. As the hon. member should know, it is established parliamentary practice that statements of Government policy, or of proposals for legislation, are not to form the subject matter of parliamentary questions.”

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FOURTH ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 21 September (see p. 464) on Mr. Burrows's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. JESSON (Kennedy) (11.6 a.m.): At the outset I add my measure of congratulation to the mover and seconder of this important motion, both of whom made very good speeches appertaining to their electorates and Queensland generally. I should also like to add my meed of praise to the appointment of Dr. Evatt to the chairmanship of the General Assembly of the United Nations. That is a great honour conferred on Australia, despite the criticism of the Russians and Communists. I think that the appointment shows that Australia has been recognised by the countries of the world as being a nation and much good will accrue from the chairmanship of Dr. Evatt of the General Assembly.

I now wish to deal with the speech made a day or so ago by the hon. member for Enoggera, who got all "het up" about the Communist Party. I agree totally with much of what he said about the Communist Party but when he indulges in personalities and states that the party to which I belong was put into Parliament at the behest of the Communist Party, I must protest, as it is well known that the Queensland People's Party is very closely allied with the Communist Party.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. The statement that has been made by the hon. member—

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

Mr. MORRIS: The statement that has just been made by the hon. member is completely and utterly incorrect and he knows it himself to be incorrect.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I rule that there is no point of order. I feel that hon. members are entitled, when not indulging in personalities, to state their views and after such views have been put forward it is the right of an hon. member to rise and refute those views.

Mr. JESSON: When the hon. member made accusations in this Chamber I rose to a point of order and so did several other hon. members on this side, but the hon. member for Enoggera wants that fact to be suppressed. As I develop my argument I shall show where the hon. member belongs to the New Guard.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. The statement is totally incorrect. I do not know of any New Guard. I do not belong to any New Guard and I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has the right to refute it and I think that is as far as I can go.

Mr. MORRIS: I still rise to the point of order. That statement is offensive to me and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member for Kennedy to accept the assurance of the hon. member for Enoggera.

Mr. JESSON: I will not accept his assurance but I will withdraw the statement.

Mr. MORRIS: You ask the hon. member to withdraw, because the statement was offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will decide what procedure I will adopt. It is usual to ask an hon. member to accept the assurance of the hon. member protesting and I am asking the hon. member to accept that assurance, that the hon. member for Enoggera is not a member of the New Guard.

Mr. JESSON: I accept, but I should like to have the time taken up with these points of order not included in the time allotted to

me for my speech, as a considerable number of points of order have been raised by members of the Opposition, who cannot take it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Morris interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Kennedy!

Mr. Morris: You know that is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Morris: You know that is not true, and I will prove it to you some day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Kennedy.

Mr. JESSON: One thing I can say is that the person who runs the "Can you take it?" show would be ashamed of the hon. member.

I desire to teach the hon. member for Enoggera a lesson. I agree up to a point with what he had to say about Socialism. As a matter of fact, the first part of his speech, in which he traduced and trounced the Communist Party, was good, but he spoilt it later by trying to be smart at the expense of the Labour Party.

Let us examine the record of the party to which he belongs, the Liberal Party. Let us trace it back for a few years so that the people of the Commonwealth will appreciate why the workers were forced to form the Labour Party and adopt Socialism as their goal in order to save themselves from being exploited, pushed around, robbed and battered on by the avaricious and vicious employers. Why, it is not so many years ago that the big emporiums in London and other cities locked their employees in their business premises at 8 o'clock at night. It is not so long ago that they expected their employees to work from early morning until midnight and then locked them in their rooms at night.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: How many years ago?

Mr. JESSON: Not 50 years ago.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: I thought it would be about 100.

Mr. JESSON: It was not even 25 years ago. If the hon. member had seen one of the English films that came out recently he would realise what a great blot those days were on the great name of England. In those days employees worked under poor and filthy conditions from daylight till dark. Little boys who should have been going to school were kept down in the pits and were blind when they came from the bowels of the earth to the sunlight. All this exploitation in the olden days brought together those workers who had the guts to fight for themselves, and led to the creation of what is now known as the Australian Labour Party. Yet we have hon. members here who were born with silver spoons in their mouths backing up those exploiters and still exploiting the public in their own particular line of business.

The hon. member for Enoggera made accusations against good men in this House and no-one took points of order; they let him develop his speech. I propose to throw back into his teeth some of the lies he told. He mentioned the Australian Labour Party Convention in 1921, and spoke about the socialisation of industry and so on. He did not tell the truth. He had a brief handed to him by some Labour-hater. This is what happened at that convention:—

“Mr. Theodore (Queensland) moved as an amendment that the existing objective be retained with the addition of the words ‘the emancipation of Labour from all forms of capitalist exploitation, and obtaining for all workers and producers the full reward of their industry by (a) the nationalisation of those agencies of production, distribution and exchange used under capitalism to despoil the community; (b) co-operative action in the financing, marketing and distributing of primary products.’”

Mr. Wanstall: What are you quoting from?

Mr. JESSON: It is not the “Tribune.” The quotation continues—

“He asked could any two of those present agree on what socialisation meant. The term was new to Australia and was incomplete, ill-considered and intolerable. Labour needed an objective everyone could understand.

He opposed socialisation if it meant not only nationalisation of industry but also the establishment of control by a Supreme Economic Council.”

Later on in the debate Mr. Blackburn, Victoria, moved—

“That this conference declares:

- (1) That the Australian Labour Party proposes collective ownership for the purpose of preventing exploitation.
- (2) Wherever private ownership is a means of exploitation it is opposed by the Party.
- (3) The Party does not seek to abolish private property, even of any instrument of production, where such instrument is utilised by its owner in a socially useful manner without exploitation.”

That motion was carried by 13 votes to 5 and if the hon. member for Toowong wants to know the document from which I was quoting let me tell him that the statement was published in the “News Weekly” of 15 September, 1948. For his benefit I will repeat it, because it is the story of Labour’s socialisation conference and that was why the proceedings were recorded.

What the devil is wrong with pledging your support to a party to stop the exploitation of young men and children? Why, Labour’s legislation is designed for the protection of workers in industry. How many people had their hair torn out by the roots in unprotected machinery? The Labour Movement aims at the protection of men, women and

children and the keeping of children out of factories when they should be at school learning to become decent citizens. They were exploited in factories, lads were exploited in coal-mines, and because of what Labour did the hon. member for Enoggera had the audacity to stand up and say that Labour was connected with the Communists.

The hon. member for Enoggera also spoke about Joek Garden. I have in my hand a pamphlet published by Mr. Lang and let me read from it to show what he says about J. S. Garden—

“Founder of the Communist Party in Australia. Member of the Executive of the R.I.L.U. in Moscow, and for twenty years the chief agent of the International Revolution in Australia. Expelled from the A.L.P. for trying to do the Communist Party’s work within the Labour movement.”

That is something totally different from what the hon. member suggested.

Mr. Wanstall: How did he get friendly with Eddie Ward?

Mr. JESSON: The same as the hon. member got friendly with his crowd.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: Let me go a little further and analyse the attempts to strew up hatred of the Labour Party—

Mr. Morris: Anybody has only to look at you to hate you.

Mr. JESSON: I am not finished with you yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I desire to appeal to the hon. member for Enoggera to refrain from interjecting during the speech of the hon. member for Kennedy. If my memory serves me right, the hon. member for Enoggera was heard mostly in silence when delivering his speech.

Mr. JESSON: I do not mind his interjections very much.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do mind. It is my responsibility to see that the proceedings of this House are conducted along orderly lines.

Mr. JESSON: If the hon. member does not refrain from getting into hots with me, I shall have to deal with him very severely—as he was dealt with in 1937-38 when he joined the Rechabites. Laugh that off!

I have reviewed the arguments the hon. member put up in his speech in this House, a speech which by the way got headlines in the Press, stirring up hatred against the Labour Party. As a matter of fact, that sort of thing is very old technique. I want to expose these people opposite in the eyes of the people for their tactics over the last two or three weeks.

Everyone knows that the Premier has gone to Great Britain and on his way there attempts were made by hon. members of the Queensland People’s Party to belittle and malign the

leading citizen of the State. They did this when he was on his way overseas to put a case for Queensland and Australia to the British Government and the British people. I never heard such a scurrilous attack. I absolve the Country Party of such an attack because they know that the Premier's visit will have a material effect on primary producers, because only in this morning's Press we read of where the Premier is negotiating a sugar agreement with the British authorities. He has been quickly on the job and he has not been over to devastated Germany, as one hon. member of this House did who on his return gave us a travelogue of what he had seen. The Premier has been doing a job for Queensland, despite the statements issued against him in this House.

The Premier went across to England to do a job for this country, a job that will affect primary producers very vitally. Is it any wonder that the Country Party was not responsible for moving a vote of no confidence in the Government, that it had to come from the Queensland People's Party? You can bet your last dollar that it was started by the hon. member for Windsor with his assistant, Mr. Porter, assisted by Alan McKinnon, the secretary of the Queensland People's Party. That is where it was engineered, that is where the plot was made. And why? What is behind the plot? I said some time ago in this House that there was a deep-laid plot made by the hon. member for Windsor to exclude any other industry from Queensland that competed with his. He tried to damage and stop any textile works that were coming to Queensland to compete with his own.

Mr. Pie: That is why the Government were sending everyone to inspect my plant.

Mr. JESSON: The members of the Queensland People's Party tried to malign the Premier, to do everything possible to stop him from carrying out his mission, but their plot has fallen flat. Even the Press has dropped them now and so they are alarmed and annoyed that there are no results from what they wished to bring about.

What did the people see when they went out to inspect the hon. member's plant? I have something here to read on that point. The hon. member is always prating about a fair days' work for a fair day's pay. He always pretends to advocate high standard conditions and the best amenities, but listen to this—

"Visitors who did not allow speakers' soft soap to deter them from making a critical inspection found that the much-lauded factory amenities were lockers, showers, sanitary conveniences, ablution facilities where eight persons can wash at once, and, for the girls, footbaths."

Take particular notice of that—footbaths for the girls.

The statement goes on—

"No couches are provided in the girls' dressing-rooms and the canteen, which is far removed from the factory, supplies only light lunches (mainly sandwiches and

cakes), which aren't worth getting wet for on the way during rainy weather.

"Workers in the spinning and dyeing department . . ."

I suppose a lot of them will die there eventually—

" . . . and also those employed on cutting, who stand on a concrete floor all day with breaks only at smoko and lunch-time certainly need the footbaths.

"Rubber mats as a preventive of foot weariness, fallen arches, and varicose veins would be valuable to workers who stand at their job all day. But no such mats were provided.

"It was apparent from the number of vacant machines that many workers did not feel that the double time offered for the two hours' work in front of the crowd on Saturday afternoon was sufficient inducement to get them back to work to put on a show for the bosses' benefit.

"Most of those who did work expressed relief when the ordeal of being peered at like caged animals was over at 3 o'clock. Their gallop to clock off was eloquent."

Let me go a little further. Here is a further report—

"Under the slave-driving conditions that exist at Bruce Pie Industries, girls are forbidden to sit idle for one minute during working hours throughout the whole day and are also forbidden to talk even to the worker next to them on the bench.

"If girls sitting next to one another talk, they are shifted to other machines away from their friends.

"Some of the girls say that even if you stop for a minute to think which article you will sew next or which cotton you will use, one of the foremen or a boss is sure to be at your side asking if you are short of work to do."

That is exactly what they were doing on the Rhine in Germany and in Moscow.

That report continues—

"Because of the heavy pressure of work in the making-up section and the terrific noise of the machines—many of which are old and constantly in need of repair—headache powders and tablets are a regular part of the girls' diet.

"There is the strain also which accompanies the constant fear of all the girls that they may make a mistake in sewing their garments.

"Great stress is laid by the management and some of the foremen on the 'crime' committed if a garment is spoilt by incorrect machining."

I have no reason to disbelieve that report.

Mr. Hilton: Did you have a look at the plant?

Mr. JESSON: I had no reason to go and look at it. I have this information about it and I have no reason to disbelieve it. I believe that every word there is true. That exposes the people who come here and make statements.

Mr. Aikens: If it is not true, the hon. member for Windsor can take action at law against those who made that statement.

Mr. JESSON: That is so.

This is my point: the hon. member for Windsor the other day quoted a statement published by the "Tribune," a Communist newspaper, and said, "This is true." My suggestion is that if what the "Tribune" published and if what the "Tribune" said about the secret conference between the Premier and Mr. Healy is true, then if the "Guardian" says he is slaving the employees of his factory, that statement also must be true. I wish to emphasise my point that if he believes what one Communist newspaper said is true about the subject he chose to attack the Premier on, then what this other Communist paper published about him as "a great model employer" must also be true.

Furthermore, we know that Mr. Harvey recently denied the statements about the secret meeting between the Premier and Mr. Healy, but we have not heard any acceptance of that denial from the hon. member for Windsor.

That brings me back to my first point, that there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the job the Queensland People's Party did in belittling the Premier while he was in England was a good one for vested interests and was for the particular benefit of those interests. I said in this House in 1945 or 1946, when the hon. member for Windsor went overseas for Bruce Pie Ltd. or Bruce Pie Industries Ltd. that he made the trip to gain knowledge, but he denied it. He was not back many months before this great model factory of his was erected.

Mr. Sparkes: Do you object to his building that factory?

Mr. JESSON: I have no objection to his building all the factories in the world if he desires. I have said in this House, not once but on many occasions, that I take my hat off to the hon. member for Windsor for his business acumen and enterprise, but I do condemn him for his dirty, filthy political methods to gain his own ends politically, and the ends of those associated with him politically. There is nothing to stop him from doing so politically, but let me remind him of what happened in the last election campaign. That will show that he is the greatest political larrikin that ever sat in this House. A letter I received stated—

"Herewith a cutting from the 'Townsville Bulletin' of today's issue. I know it will interest you, and it is just possible that you may miss it in the pressure of current affairs.

"The subject of the case was probably your worst traducer during the recent election campaign, and campaigned with your opponent in Ingham and hereabouts, meanwhile spreading the usual (or more than usually) vile slanders.

"He was, as you are aware, the Q.P.P. delegate to Brisbane and Rockhampton conventions, from Townsville, and in that capacity has earned public exposure as a

villain and convicted felon. This contumacious humbug has the temerity to attack decent men, the while posing as a champion of the people."

That is the man Cecil Smith, whom the hon. member for Mundingburra has referred to.

He was convicted and fined for the contemptible offence of stealing ration books and reselling them. That is the class of man the hon. member for Windsor was associated with at the last election. Yet he has the audacity to get up in this House and pose as a lily-white gentleman! Cecil Smith was treated leniently by the magistrate. He was let out on a bond.

A Government Member: Is he still a member of the Queensland People's Party?

Mr. WANSTALL: I rise to a point of order. The gentleman in question was expelled from the Queensland People's Party on my motion. (Government laughter.) The hon. member gave me a great opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order in an hon. member's reference to a man outside this House.

Mr. JESSON: I am very thankful for the hon. member for Toowong's admission. His admission amounts to a confession that his party does not mind whom it gets in its ranks; after he does its dirty work, its members expel him. They do not make any investigations about these people. They do not have to sign any pledge, they do not have to be decent citizens, but they are taken in to slander the Labour Party and the Country Party—do not forget that. They slandered the Country Party at the East Toowoomba election in order to get their man there.

Much has been said about the neglected North and the fact that no industries were developed in North Queensland; and that is a fact. There are no industries in North Queensland—Townsville, Cairns, and Bowen—mainly because of Tory action, because of the action of the big merchants. There is also the apathy of the northern people themselves. As a matter of fact, in 1943 I went down and interviewed the head of the C.S.J.R. in Sydney in reference to starting a canning factory in North Queensland, in Ingham, Abergowrie, or Townsville—Ingham was suggested at the time because of the water supply—but I could not get any help in the matter. I went on to Western Australia and I inspected a canning plant put up by the Commonwealth Government to can fish and had never been put into operation. It was idle and it could have been bought for a song. I went back to North Queensland and arranged committees and public meetings in regard to the matter, but as soon as my back was turned the thing was knocked on the head because it was to be a co-operative concern and the vultures and others could not get their hands on the thing and run it.

The following appeared in the Herbert River "Express" on 9 September, 1943:—

"The member for Kennedy, Mr. C. G. Jesson, M.L.A., who has interested himself very energetically in the proposed

establishment of a cannery works at Ingham, expressed surprise at the apathy of the people in the following letter he has addressed to the local Chamber of Commerce, the Shire Council and the Herbert River Cane-Growers' Association:—

'Several months ago I wrote you asking what the position was regarding the proposed cannery, pointing out that I wished the committee to meet and form themselves into a co-operative society with the object of making application to the War Organisation of Industry for permission to build, and to the Department of Supply and Shipping for permission to secure the necessary machinery. So far nothing has been done in this matter which is of vital importance to the district and I feel very grieved at the apathy of the people in a proposition I have given so much time and thought to. The preliminary meetings were most enthusiastic and I am at a loss to understand the apathy that now prevails. You are no doubt aware that big producing schemes are being inaugurated at Home Hill, Charters Towers and the Atherton Tableland,'''

Those things were only talked about and they also were knocked on the head by vested interests.

The statement continues—

“and when they are in full swing, there is no doubt canneries will be erected to treat these goods. This I pointed out when I addressed the meeting at Ingham, but until a Committee takes the action I have indicated on several occasions, it is impossible for me to get Agricultural Officers either State or Federal, to make an inspection of the district, consequently if something is not done in the near future the district will not be given its just rights, and the people will have none to blame but themselves.”

The same thing applies to the agitation that has been going on for many years for a cement works in Townsville. There is enough capital in North Queensland to have put a cement works in that area years ago. The trouble is that you have Burns Philp, Cummins & Campbell, Samuel Allens, and other big merchants who handle annually about 40,000 tons of cement, on which they receive 10s. a ton commission, which represents £20,000. Do they want to see a cement works in Townsville or anywhere else? Of course not. The same thing applies to iron. They control all the iron that goes through there and they make a huge profit in commission on the sale of that iron and barbed wire.

I am not speaking of the time when supplies are short, but of the time when there is a plentiful supply. It is a strange thing that the presidents or chairmen of all chambers of commerce are managers of large financial institutions, and as a result everything is being taken out of North Queens-

land, but damned little is being put into it; which retards the progress of that part of the State.

There is another important aspect of the matter, the apathy of local governing bodies to plan ahead in the years that are past. As a matter of fact, in Townsville at present, because of the shortage of water, one can use a water hose for only an hour a day, and the supply is cut off from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. the following day. But within 60 or 70 miles of Townsville 60,000,000 or 70,000,000 gallons of water run out to the sea daily. Where is the enterprise and where is the go displayed by governing bodies?

The same thing can be said of electricity. At the present time there is very little water running over the Barron Falls, and water restrictions are imposed in Cairns, but millions and millions of gallons of water run to waste annually there. None of the local authorities have made any suggestions or attempts to grapple with the problems of water supply and electricity. As a matter of fact, even with the present water scheme under construction at Mt. Spee, in 10 or 20 years' time Townsville, if it progresses, as it naturally must, will be in the same position as it is today.

These are some of the reasons why the progress of North Queensland has been retarded; it has not been because of the apathy of the Government. Nowadays everybody wants the Government to do this or that. There must be a local move by the people to have work done; they must not, as has been done from time immemorial, allow big financial interests to knock such moves on the head.

Another instance is the non-establishment of a steel works at Bowen. Today these would have been an accomplished fact had it not been for the Tories and the vested interests in Australia. Looking back over the years one sees how such people have retarded the progress of these parts of the North.

I am sorry that the member for Enoggera and his friends in the Queensland People's Party have left the Chamber to lick their wounds, as I now wish to tell the story of the Fascist Party, the New Guard that has been created. Some time ago a certain individual came from the South to Queensland and suggested to a very high Government official—in view of the number of assassinations overseas at present I am not prepared to mention any names—that permission be sought from the Government to put armoured cars in the streets of Brisbane, the suggestion being for three of such cars, to be hired out by banks, show societies, racing clubs and other such bodies that have to transport huge sums of money from place to place. In other words, the suggestion was that armoured cars manned by guards armed with revolvers and machine-guns should be allowed to traverse the streets of Brisbane, ostensibly to protect the property of such institutions as I have mentioned, and also Government money. What was the object behind all this? As a matter of fact, for

the big sums of money that have to be transported about Queensland, it would not pay to have even one armoured car, or even an armoured motor-bicycle. The idea of these three armoured cars in the city was that when the New Guard started to operate there would be available these three armoured cars to patrol the streets of the city of Brisbane. They would be placed at strategic points of the city and with them at hand the city could have been captured without any trouble. That move was turned down because of the danger, and rightly so.

There was also the suggestion that the New Guard that was to be formed would protect various public persons free of charge. These prominent people would be shadowed wherever they went, for their protection. But the real reason for the presence of this armed force was to shoot down the Commos or local Government personages or somebody else. It will thus be seen that it is idle for the hon. member for Enoggera to stand in this Chamber and indulge in ridiculous and extreme statements about there being three battalions of armed Commos ready to march in on Australia at any time. That is absolutely ridiculous. There may be a few who are inclined to be that way, and the sooner they are yarded up and deported or put in concentration camps or gaols, the better it will be for the well-being of the people of this country.

I have every reason to believe that the hon. member for Dalby, if he is not already a member, the hon. member for Aubigny, the hon. member for Enoggera, and the hon. member for Windsor have been approached to join this New Guard. I understand the hon. member for Windsor is going to be captain because he had some little experience when he was a captain in the militia before the war. He has received his initial training. My secret service is ferreting out the rest of them, and when I get a complete list of the members of the New Guard who are here to introduce Fascism into the country I shall get up in the House and expose them. I do know that the men whom I have mentioned have been approached. They can deny it if they wish but the fact remains that they have been approached, and if I were the organiser of this body I could not choose four better men in Queensland to form its nucleus. Only the other day we saw the hon. member for Enoggera throwing little pills into the waste-paper-basket. No doubt he was practising the throwing of tear gas bombs, or something of that kind. He gave every indication of what the little storm-trooper does. You, Mr. Speaker, know that what I have said about armoured cars and personal body guards is correct and there is no need for me to labour the point.

Another matter that has given me and about 25,000 people grave concern is the pollution of the Herbert River. I feel that it is my duty to demand that the Government take steps to stop it. The company causing the trouble is virtually controlled by the Queensland People's Party. The hon. member for Logan, Mr. Hiley, is the secretary.

The directors are Mr. E. M. Tooth, Mr. T. A. Hiley, Mr. F. B. Ferris, Mr. J. M. Owen, Mr. D. E. Evans—I do not know whether he is any relation to the hon. member for Mirani—and Mr. A. L. Nevitt.

Mr. EVANS: I rise to a point of order. I wish to point out that the Evans mentioned by the hon. member for Kennedy is not the hon. member for Mirani.

Mr. JESSON: Before the war this company was struggling along with depleted manpower and insufficient machinery. When the war was over it got into production and the dam it had holding back the polluted water could not stand the strain, and burst. Since then all this polluted water, together with the sludge, has been coming down the Herbert River and polluting that stream. Now things are in a bad way. The weather is so dry that the people of the district are forced to use river water, because their tanks are empty. It has been condemned by the health authorities and local medical men as being unfit for human consumption, yet this company is finding some way of evading doing the right thing. The only way to keep this pollution out of the river is to build a substantial dam and I should like the Government to take urgent steps in this direction.

These people are very prominent citizens. The leader of the Queensland People's Party is a shareholder and secretary of the company and during the last election campaign they said that if they were returned as the Government they would abate this nuisance immediately.

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

At the Queensland People's Party convention held in Rockhampton last year this matter was brought up and that party said that if it was returned as the Government the nuisance would be abated. I want to know why the Government do not carry out the wishes of the directors of this company. The Queensland People's Party have said that the water is unfit for human consumption. This company is making £25,000 a year profit. I say it is time something was done. I represent in the vicinity of 11,000 to 12,000 people in my electorate and during the war years it was termed the nerve centre of Queensland. I point this out also: Since I have been the representative in this Parliament of the Herbert electorate approximately £600 a year has been spent in the electorate in the provision of schools and public works and the like. As a matter of fact, the figures are: New work, £1,198; additions to public buildings, £5,670; other public buildings, £2,001, or a total over 13½ years of £9,869. That works out at approximately £600 a year. Those figures have been supplied by the Department of Public Works, and I take very strong objection on behalf of the people who sent me here on five occasions to represent them to the fact that such a paltry sum is spent on such an important area. If the war did interfere with plans, it is about time the Government concentrated on the job of doing something for the people in that part of Queensland.

As a matter of fact, there is no high school in Ingham. I heard mention in this House the other day of a hostel at Nambour for secondary schools; there is not even a secondary school for the children in the Ingham district. I voice my protest on behalf of those people and I say I do not think one hon. member will say that the average expenditure in his electorate has been only £600 a year over the last 13 years. I am forced by the people I represent—people have sent me letters and requests have come from the A.L.P. and other organising bodies—to make an emphatic protest at the raw deal these people have been getting. It is nearly time something was done to provide amenities for the people in this important part of the State.

I very much dislike doing this sort of thing, but I feel it is the only way to voice the opinion of the people who have supported me over the years. I have covered the matter of the statements made by the hon. member for Enoggera; I have proved that the Communist Party and the Queensland People's Party are very closely allied and I have touched generally on matters raised by hon. members opposite. I make this final plea: that the Government take notice of the people whom I have represented so long.

Mr. ROBERTS (Nundah) (11.50 a.m.): I desire to take this opportunity of saying that it is a very pleasing and a very characteristic feature of our British Parliamentary system that the speeches on the Address in Reply are of a high standard.

Both the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Port Curtis, and the seconder, the hon. member for Buranda, have well sustained the best traditions in this respect. It was a pleasure to hear the hon. member for Port Curtis place before us his case for the development of Gladstone, and I am sure that when the people of Gladstone read his speech they will realise that in him they have a real champion.

It was indeed a pleasure, too, to hear the hon. member for Buranda stand up in his place in this Chamber and despite opposition from hon. members opposite, say that he was a unificationist. We, as individuals do not always agree—and it would be a poor world indeed if we all agreed at all times—but it is a great thing to know that the hon. member for Buranda can rise in a place such as this and without fear or favour voice his sincere convictions.

Both those hon. members have proved themselves worthy hon. members of this Assembly, and they will, no doubt, give valuable help to the Government and the State in the solution of the many problems confronting Queensland, in common with the rest of the world, during the crucial period of reconstruction and re-establishment, when we sincerely believe that Queensland will progress, expand and develop as never before.

What is the composition of this House? The anti-Labour forces represent the privileged and property classes. As a matter of

fact, not one hon. member of the Queensland People's Party has been drawn from the ranks of the wage-earners, whereas the Labour Party on the other hand is neither narrow nor sectional in its representation. The members of the Labor Party are drawn from all sections of the community and included within its ranks are men of experience, of vision, and of enthusiasm. They bring to the task of government an enthusiasm and a drive that are impossible for men who are closely allied with private enterprise and bound up with that form of economy, people who are stultified by a blind adherence to the principle of bigger and more lucrative profits, men who adopt the "Devil take the hindmost" attitude towards their less fortunate brothers.

In a letter published in the "Courier-Mail" yesterday, I think over the name of the hon. member for Windsor, reference was made to the fact that the hon. member for Logan held some office in a church organisation.

How people professing to be of the Christian faith can subscribe to the principle of private enterprise, in other words of the doctrine "Dog eat dog" and the relegation of the weak to the scrapheap, is completely beyond my comprehension. I am firmly convinced that true Christianity is completely and irrevocably incompatible with the capitalistic principle of the maximum gain for the minimum of effort. I believe also that it is because the Labour Movement and its policy are based upon the fundamental Christian principle of "Love thy neighbour as thyself" that the future well-being not only of the people of this Continent but of the world is closely allied with that of the progress of the Labour Movement.

A few days ago the Deputy Leader of the Opposition took the Secretary for Public Lands and Mines to task for being an avowed Socialist. The fact that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has political convictions opposed to my own does not lessen my respect for him as a man and as a gentleman, because in his case I do believe him to be sincere. As long as a man is sincere I can understand him and I can tolerate him. As a matter of fact I have, I hope, many good personal friends who are diametrically opposed to me on political issues. By the same token these friends of mine bear with me in mine.

However, as to the ravings of the hon. member for Enoggera in this Chamber on Tuesday last when he became hopelessly entangled in a maze of Labour, Socialism and Communist bogies, I propose to say very little for it was obvious to the least discerning hon. member that he was speaking from the head and not from the heart. His words did not carry a personal conviction. Tolerance is one of our most cherished freedoms. I say nothing about the dirty political tirade of the hon. member for Enoggera, lest I make it a personal issue. To be quite frank, after listening to his speech on Tuesday I do not consider him to be worthy of that trouble.

For the enlightenment of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and also for the edification of any other hon. member sitting opposite who has not lost sight of the great and noble principles of Christianity and of the brotherhood of man, I propose to read a poem that came into my possession some years ago. Incidentally, I am not ashamed to say that this poem played some part in the formation of my own political convictions. Unfortunately I do not know the author's name. I have endeavoured to find out, but because of the similarity between it and other works, I should like to ascribe it to that great American poetess, Ella Wheeler Wilcox. It is as follows:—

“Who is the Socialist? It is the man who strives to aid or formulate a plan to better earth's conditions.

It is he

Who, having ears to hear, and eyes to see

Is neither deaf nor blind when might, rough-shod,

Treads down the rights and privileges which God

Means for all men. The privilege to toil,

To breathe pure air and till the fertile soil;

The right to live, to love, to woo and wed,

And earn for hungry mouths their meed of bread.

The Socialist is he who claims no more Than his own gift from generous

nature's store;

But that he asks, and asks, too, that no other

Shall claim the share of any weaker brother,

And brand him beggar in his own domain—

To glut a mad inordinant lust for gain. The Socialist is one who holds the best

Of all God's gifts is toil; the second rest,

He asks that all men earn the fruits of labor,

And that no idler fatten on his neighbour;

That all men be allowed their share of leisure,

Nor thousands slave that one may seek his pleasure,

Who on this golden rule shall dare exist, Behold in him the Socialist.”

Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed to subscribe to that belief. And we of the Labour Party are proud of the policy to which we have pledged ourselves.

For some inexplicable reason the hon. member for Enoggera endeavoured to create the impression that we would deny the first plank in the Labour platform; and that plank of course is the socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange. That is not true, and there is an unparliamentary term for such deliberate and conscious misstatements of fact. We of the Labour Party, with that policy in mind, will do what we can, first to avoid the haphazard development such as results when development is dictated

only by the hope of gain; secondly, to protect the public from profiteers, racketeers and economic industrial gangsterdom; thirdly, to afford every citizen the greatest possible freedom compatible with the same degree of freedom for others; fourthly, to maintain peace and the rule of law both internally and externally; fifthly, to give every man, woman and child an opportunity of leading secure and happy lives; and lastly, to wage war on hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance and intolerance, in order to raise the standards of life and the working conditions of the masses of the people.

During this debate much has been said about the menace of Communism, both to the freedom-loving peoples of the world generally, and in particular to our Australian way of life. Despite the pratings of hon. members opposite to the effect that there is some kind of alliance between the Labour Party and the Communist Party—a statement which they make deliberately, knowing it to be untrue—no man or woman capable of thinking for himself or herself believes it to be the fact. The spearhead, as a matter of fact, of the attack upon Communism in this country today is the Labour Party and the great industrial unions affiliated with it. It is because this is so that I feel obliged on this occasion to sound a note of warning, for I am really afraid that while the Labour movement is concentrating its forces upon crushing the Communist menace in our midst, another organisation, the Fascists, under various guises, aided and abetted by the Country Party, the Liberal Party and the Queensland People's Party, which is just as great a menace to our Australian way of life as the Communist Party, may be afforded the opportunity that it seeks of establishing a Right Wing totalitarian dictatorship in this country.

I say advisedly that it is Big Business in Australia—incidentally it was Big Business in Germany and Italy that financed and fostered the Nazis of Germany and the Fascists of Italy—that is financing the Communist Party in this country. And by the same token Big Business in this country would not hesitate for a minute today to finance the Labour Party in order that that party might continue its attack upon the Communist Party: not because Big Business has anything in sympathy with either the Communist Party or the Labour Party, but because it wants to keep alive the fight now raging between these two parties. Big Business knows that politically the Communist Party will never be a force in Australia although industrially it can cause a great deal of trouble. Its reason for financing the Communist Party and for its willingness to finance the Labour Party in its fight against Communism is that the Labour Party, which is the great bulwark against all extremes, might be so weakened that it could not withstand a deliberate, concerted, and vigorous attack by the anti-Labour political forces and so enable Big Business to establish a Fascist form of government in this country of Australia. It, therefore, behoves every member of the Labour Movement and every freedom-loving person

in the community not only to do his or her best to protect this land from the Communist menace but also to take care not to overlook the danger of Fascism. For Fascism is a creed fostered, financed and sponsored by those who stand behind the scenes directing the operations of the Liberal, Country and Queensland People's Party in this Commonwealth. It is a creed that is every whit as alien and contrary to our democratic way of life as Communism.

During the last session of this Parliament I was amazed to hear hon. members opposite one after the other eulogising the United States of America for having abolished price-control although at the very time they were giving utterance to these words, every report published in the United States, and available here and every report even in the anti-Labour Press of Australia about the position in the United States was to the effect that as the result of the abolition of price-control prices were soaring and the economic position of the United States of America was very parlous indeed. Hon. members opposite made those statements deliberately, knowing that was not the position. They were prepared to give voice to any untruth whatsoever for the purpose of defeating the Commonwealth Government's referendum proposals. My one hope is that those of us who realised the importance of the issues involved in that referendum will not have to pay too dearly for the credulity of the workers in particular who, during the referendum campaign, heeded the propaganda of hon. members opposite and of the anti-Labour Press and as a consequence rejected the proposals of the Federal Labour Government, a Government incidentally who in the Federal sphere have done more for the masses of the community than any other Federal Government since the inception of Federation.

The untruthful statements about the position in the United States of America for the purpose of defeating the referendum proposals were bad enough, but after listening to the condemnation of hon. members opposite of the Queensland Labour Government's proposals to co-operate with the British (Overseas) Food Corporation in the production of essential foodstuffs for Great Britain, I can only look upon their conduct as being of a very sinister character, designed to undermine Great Britain. In view of the statements they have made over the past 12 months, I should not be at all surprised to hear them openly urging at any time that Australia should withdraw from the British Commonwealth of Nations and ally herself with the United States of America, to hear them openly advocating that the Stars and Stripes should replace the Union Jack in that corner of the Australian flag which, fortunately for us, has so far been reserved for it.

I am not one of those who are blind to the faults and weaknesses of Great Britain. I well remember how the English financial octopus retarded the proper development of this country because English industrialists desired to utilise Australia for the production of raw materials and primary produce

in order to build up her own manufacturing and processing industries. I vividly recall that when, as a result of the machinations of international financiers and industrialists, Australians were on the breadline during the depression years, Sir Otto Niemeyer came out here and, instead of giving Australia the help we needed at that time—and which England could have given to us—told us coldly to put our own house in order first. I say advisedly that the depression was due to the machinations of the big financial institutions because the soil of Australia did not suddenly cease to produce, the machines in our factories did not suddenly cease to operate, the men and women in Australia did not suddenly cease to want to work. In this land of plenty at that time thousands were homeless and virtually starving.

So I say I am not unmindful of those things, but nevertheless I am in full accord with the policy adopted by this Government to lend every aid to Great Britain in her hour of need, and with the Federal Government in giving money to Great Britain for that purpose. Only a week or two ago we saw a report to the effect that the Federal Labour Government had, by way of gift, given to England a further sum of £10,000,000.

Now let us look at the United States and see the attitude adopted by that country. The United States of America has been glorified over the last 12 months or so by hon. members opposite. In the first place, the United States of America blackmailed England into ratifying the Bretton Woods agreement. I use the word "blackmailed" because it is common knowledge that America made it clear to England that if she did not ratify the agreement there would be no money going to England. England had become so impoverished fighting to protect the freedom-loving peoples of the world that she had to get that loan from America and consequently she was forced into ratifying the Bretton Woods agreement.

Mr. Wanstall: Did they force the Chifley Government into ratifying it, too?

Mr. ROBERTS: If the hon. member will keep quite for a while I shall tell him. In answer to his question, let me say that the one and only act of the Federal Government of which I am utterly and irrevocably ashamed is that they were responsible for Australia's ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement. I feel sure that when the time is ripe the international financiers—Wall Street particularly—who owe allegiance to no country whatever, will use the machinery provided by the Bretton Woods agreement to put the screws on Australia through that agreement and its two omnipotent instrumentalities, the International Monetary Fund and the Bank of International Settlements. We have sold our birthright to call ourselves a free and independent people; we are enslaved in the grip of a financial octopus, such as the world has never known. Already

those two ill-begotten twins have made available to the nations that ratified the Bretton Woods agreement some millions of dollars, but fortunately for Australia we have not as yet received any of that assistance, with the tags that attach to it. If the present position in France, a country that has been helped as a result of the agreement, is any criterion as to what will happen to this country when aided by the agreement, the sooner we withdraw from the agreement the better.

I mentioned that the United States of America had blackmailed England into ratifying the Bretton Woods agreement, otherwise she would not have received any loan money. When England was forced into the position and American loans to Great Britain became an accomplished fact, Big Business in the United States of America set up a cry and clamour for the abolition of price-controls in that country.

So insistent was their cry that Congress was forced to heed it and as we all know, to all intents and purposes price-control in the United States of America was abolished. One of the results was that the masses of the people there are now on the bread-line and how they are living no-one can visualise. The point I make is that by the abolition of price-control in the United States after America's loan to Great Britain, the effectiveness of the loan was approximately halved and I have no hesitation at all in saying that those who advocate the complete abolition of price-control in this country are actuated by a desire to make every possible penny of profit they can out of Great Britain's economic position today.

Incidentally, one of the arguments advanced in favour of the complete abolition of price-control in America, as in Australia—I read it in American newspapers at the time—was that the States could do the job more effectively than the Federal Government. And what a tragedy has resulted!

Notwithstanding what I said earlier about England's faults and shortcomings I sincerely believe that there is a great obligation upon us to do everything possible to help her and I deplore the attempt now being made through hon. members opposite to undermine Australia's aid to Great Britain. Apparently hon. members opposite are willing to discard any consideration of ties of blood and kinship, but look at it as you will you must realise that England today is still the greatest bulwark against the various 'isms that are rampant, and unfortunately in some part triumphant on the continent of Europe. If England collapses there is no other country that can stay the march of Communism or its equally distasteful opposition, Fascism. Therefore it behoves every democratic country and every freedom-loving individual to do his or her bit to help Great Britain in this her hour of need.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert) (12.23 p.m.): I listened very attentively to the Governor's Opening Speech and I should like to say that Queensland is very fortunate indeed in

having a Governor like Sir John Lavarack. He is a Queenslander, he has a splendid military record, and as Governor of this State he has in a short period demonstrated his keen interest in the welfare of this State. Both Sir John and Lady Lavarack have taken a keen interest in public matters, with benefit to the State, and I sincerely hope that they will continue to enjoy good health and that they will remain with us for many years.

I extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion on their efforts as new members, but I should like to tell them that we older members of this Assembly could plainly see that what they said in their speeches was but a repetition of what we had in years gone by. They were full of promises that have not been fulfilled. Many of the suggestions they made are hardy annuals that have not started yet to even bloom. Therefore, while I congratulate them on the manner in which they put their matter forward, it did not appear to me that their efforts will in any way solve the problems confronting this State.

This morning I was struck by some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Kennedy. He certainly dealt personally with many hon. members, which I do not intend to do, but I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that I think the case of the hon. member for Kennedy was weakened considerably by the fact that he rose in his place in this House the other day and disowned any connection whatsoever with the Communist Party and yet today, in order to drive home his case against some hon. members on this side of the House, he used the Communist paper in support of his personal attacks. He cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Power: He exempted the Country Party.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am not talking as a member of the Country Party only; I am talking as a member of this House. I just want to make this point, that any hon. member who declares that he is opposed to Communism yet uses its Press to support his case against someone else, has in my opinion a very rotten case.

Mr. Jesson: Does that apply to Bruce Pie?

Mr. PLUNKETT: Mr. Bruce Pie is able to look after himself. I am not concerned with him. I will say, however, that he is doing a job for Queensland of which we all should be proud.

Mr. Jesson: He is doing himself a good job too.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hilton): Order! Hon. members, when referring to another hon. member in this House should refer to him by the name of his electorate.

Mr. PLUNKETT: As I said before, the hon. member for Windsor can look after himself, but the fact remains that he is doing a good job for this State by creating employment for our own people. He is providing

amenities for the employees of his factories. I understand that those amenities are much superior to those provided by the Government.

I was interested also in the remarks of the hon. member for Kennedy about the pollution of the Herbert River. The Government of whom the hon. member is a supporter must of course accept the responsibility for it.

Mr. Sparkes interjected.

Mr. PLUNKETT: It is a matter that should have concerned those hon. members who represent the contiguous electorates.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Aubigny interjected that members of the Government were in the Tableland Tin Company. That is offensive to me and I ask that he withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Aubigny has not got the floor at present, and I did not hear his observation. There is no point of order there. The hon. member for Albert!

Mr. PLUNKETT: It was rather astounding to hear the hon. member for Nundah talk about private enterprise and observe his endeavour to attribute the lack of development in this State to private enterprise. Has not private enterprise made this State what it is today? But for private enterprise the State would not have been developed to its present stage. We all know that State enterprises have been a colossal blunder.

Mr. Brown: What about the State Insurance Office?

Mr. PLUNKETT: The State Insurance Office has a monopoly; it charges what it likes, when it likes, and how it likes. If private enterprise had the same opportunity as it has in the other States and the insurance companies were allowed to come in on workers' compensation we should get our insurance much more cheaply than we are getting it today. If the Government believe that State insurance is such a great benefit, why do they not allow private enterprise to come in on compensation? They have created a monopoly, and I will not agree that any benefit comes to the people from a monopoly. When you take the life out of business by monopoly, somebody has to pay.

If we want examples of the initiative displayed by private enterprise we have only to look round the world, and we find that private enterprise has developed every country. Take America, for example. You scoff and laugh at them now, but you did not do it when their soldiers came here when we were in difficulties. There you have Big Business and there you have the highest standard of living and better wages for the workers than in any other country in the world.

It is quite easy to say that people are blackmailed by this and that. The hon. member for Nundah went to great lengths to endeavour to show that America blackmailed

England into the position that she is in—virtually down and out. I suggest to the hon. member that he give some consideration to the question of blackmail in Queensland that lets people out of gaol and remits fines and does not take proceedings against those who have already been proved guilty. When we talk about blackmail in regard to the other fellow we should take a look at ourselves also.

I realise that it is not what we do in Parliament that is going to save Australia. I want to draw attention to the fact that at the opening of the Federal House the Governor-General in his Speech said—

“Every man and woman should make their individual and collective contributions towards greater production which is the key to a nation's wealth, harmony, and progress.”

That seems to me to be a very definite statement for everyone to absorb. The Prime Minister made a similar appeal when he came back from overseas, but he did not get any results; and later on I will tell you why these results were not achieved. He made a personal appeal to the coal-miners to increase production, and what was the result? Strikes started again the next day. The Prime Minister, who should have the greatest influence, personally told the miners the position that Australia was in and about the need for more coal, but they turned their backs on him and did not work next day.

Why do they not work? People in general feel that their activities are frustrated by the high taxation. It is no use asking workers to work overtime and then by taxation taking from them the money they have earned by working overtime. But that is what is happening. That is why they are strikes. That is why people do not want to work; they feel they are working under an injustice. This kills their initiative. They lose their incentive and their desire to work.

I would draw attention to the fact that every activity in this country is today slowed down. We have all become slower in our movements. We are all—I admit in many instances unconsciously—not producing to the same extent and not displaying the same capabilities and the same interest in our work as formerly, because we feel that we are deprived, and for some unknown reason, of the fruits of our labour. If we got away from that idea and instilled in the minds of the workers a pride in their work and an incentive to produce we might encourage people to keep on working. When all is said and done, man has to earn his living by the efforts of his hands and he should be rewarded for his skill and ability. But we do not do that. We force the skilful down to the level of the slowest worker. In this we are killing the spirit of the people to work, especially those in skilled trades.

Mr. Jesson: Do you not believe that the strong should help the weak?

Mr. PLUNKETT: Yes.

Mr. Jesson: That is Socialism.

Mr. PLUNKETT: That is Socialism, but I am trying to show that the heavy taxation with which we are now burdened is killing the initiative of the people and their desire to work. We must work: there is only one solution to our difficulties, and that is greater production and that cannot be brought about without work. The monopoly of taxation reposed in the Federal Government is hamstringing the welfare of Australia, and especially of Queensland, which I contend has the greatest possibilities. Queensland has greater mineral wealth and larger areas of good land as yet not put into production, as it should be, than any of the other States. But how can we develop this State if we have to go cap in hand to the Federal Government and ask for the money to do so? It cannot be done that way. The monopoly of taxation existing today is of great detriment to Queensland and I hope that something will be done to get back for Queensland and the Queensland people the right to do this through their own Parliament. This continually having to bend the knee to the Federal Treasurer and ask for something to develop this country is like begging a few crumbs from a wealthy man's table. To my way of thinking it is extraordinary to have to do this, especially when in the first place you have provided that wealthy man with his table and put the loaf of bread on it. But that is analogous to what has been done.

The Prime Minister said that we must be seriously concerned at the rate of increase in prices and costs during the last 12 months. I agree with him, but he is more responsible for that position than anybody else and he is not concerned at it because in 1948 he took £37,000,000 more out of the pockets of the people by way of taxation than he did in 1947. The war has been over for three years, and I should like to know what has occurred in Australia to make it necessary to take that additional amount from the people. What has been done to justify it? It must be realised that the more money Governments take by way of taxation the more we increase prices and costs. He has taken an extra £13,000,000 by way of customs and excise, £6,000,000 by way of sales tax, and £1,500,000 as payroll tax, all of which costs are paid in the final analysis by the consumer.

High taxation is due to bad management of the Chifley Government, a Government who have been influenced and inspired for many months by the Communists. It is expected that their expenditure for 1948-49 will be £510,000,000. As their revenue is expected to be £492,000,000, it means that borrowed money will have to be used to make up the difference.

When we realise that Australia, which is a producing country, escaped all the devastation suffered by other countries, we should appreciate the excellent opportunity we have for increasing production. With a world starving for our foodstuffs, there is a ready market for all our production, but we find that instead of increasing it is decreasing. In my opinion this decrease is caused by

high taxation, by controls over everything we do, and by harnessing the people's activities to such an extent that they do not know where they are. Again I ask: what have the Federal Government done to justify taking more money out of the pockets of the people? Until we can get the equipment that is essential to produce, we cannot increase production to the extent we should like, and it follows that the less we produce the more poverty-stricken we shall become.

Another important factor is the number of strikes that have taken place in this country. To me, they seem to be planned. It would seem that the greatest difficulty the unions experience today is to find a new excuse for going out on strike.

They have exhausted their schemes. During 1946-47 there were 943 industrial disputes occasioning the loss of 2,400,000 working days. I ask, Mr. Speaker: Can we afford to lose that time? Certainly we cannot. With all these strikes we shall ourselves create a depression in Australia. It is idle for us to make speeches and say what we are doing and what we will do in the future if the basis of our activities is not sound. In 1948 1.14 million tons of coal were mined, or 500,000 tons less than that mined in 1943. Why, we all know that in the development and expansion of industries within this country more coal is required but we have the spectacle of producing in 1948 less than was produced in 1943. Can we expand and develop under those circumstances?

Mr. Collins: Those figures do not refer to Queensland.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I indicated that they were Australian figures. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a strike in the Queensland coal-mines at the present time. Listen to these figures:—

Pig-iron production is down 400,000 tons on 1942 production.

Copper production was 2,800 tons in 1944 against 1,700 in 1947.

Silver production was 15,000,000 oz. in 1939 against 9,500,000 oz. in 1947.

Tin production was 3,400 tons in 1941 against 1,000 tons in 1947.

Lead production was 289,000 tons in 1941 against 196,000 tons in 1947.

Zinc production was 248,000 tons in 1941 against 182,000 tons in 1947.

One does not have to give much thought to the position to realise that these shortages are continuing and nothing is being done to prevent them. The activities of this country are being held up and I say we cannot afford these holds-up; we cannot afford to delay in populating this country. And there is no occasion for me to say that there are millions and millions of people—coloured people at that—not very far away from us. Do we ever give that fact a thought? Have we thought how we can keep them at bay? Those are all questions that should concern us. We have to protect Australia and that protection can be gained only by more production and still more production. The

world is in such a position today that anything might happen at any moment, and we should not complacently think that we are doing a wonderful job.

I say again that we are spending unnecessary money. It cost us £18,000,000 more last year for the maintenance of Government departments than it did the year before. The war has been over three years; if it were in war years that it was costing us that sum, one would not mind so much. Why has it cost us £18,000,000 more last year for Government departmental activities than for the year before? Are we becoming so incapable of work that we have to put two men on to do one man's job? Or are we making jobs for our friends? Such expenditure is taking the financial stability out of this country—taking it out of the pockets of the people.

No-one can spend money to better advantage than the man who actually owns it. The present taxation anomaly is frustrating us, and I think that the Chifley Government themselves have been frustrated by the communistic element.

Mr. Turner interjected.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Let me tell the hon. member for Nundah that Communism has frustrated the Queensland Government, too.

Mr. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker I rise to a point of order. I did not make the interjection, not that I would not have said such a thing; it was made by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove. I ask the hon. member for Albert to accept my assurance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Albert did make that error.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I tender my apology to the hon. member, but it gives me an opportunity of having a double shot. I feel very serious about this matter. I do not question the sincerity of hon. members opposite, but I want to tell them that it is nearly time they got away from this socialistic-communistic policy that they are adopting today. They cannot get rid of the Communists because the policy of the Government and that of the Communists is the same. Perhaps they did not know that, but it is true, because the Labour Party believes in the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. I could tell them the whole story if I had time, and unfortunately it is true. This idea that the people should work for the Government instead of the Government's working for the people is one that should have been thrown overboard long ago. I know that the war gave the Government many opportunities for coercive action and for ordering the people around, and now they think they shall have a perfect right to direct the people what to do.

Mr. Macdonald: Push them around.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Perhaps they do not do that for fear they might be pushed around too much themselves. The policy of the Government is one of Socialism, but Socialism has

always been a failure except in those countries where the people are prepared to allow themselves to be treated as cattle in a herd, not as human beings.

The best example of the outcome of Socialism is to be found in England itself. Do hon. members opposite know that during the coal crisis in England, when people were almost frozen, the Government went to the length of conscripting men and telling them to go to work in the coal-mines? The men went on strike and defied the Government. The Government hauled them before the court and they were fined, but they were so poverty-stricken that they could not pay the fines. The Government then allowed them to go back to work and took 10s. a week out of their pay to meet the fines. And this is what happened in a country that extends more justice to its workers than any country in the world, and under a policy to which hon. members opposite subscribe, a socialistic policy. If they do not support that policy they are not Socialists. Of course, I think that many people call themselves Socialists when they do not know exactly what the word means, when they do not for a moment think that its ultimate objective is Communism and dictatorship.

Mr. Brown: True Socialism is Christianity applied.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Let me give the opinion of a world-renowned economist on Socialism. A number of people say they are Socialists; they think they are Socialists, but they only think they are Socialists.

I will read an article headed, "Why I resigned from the Labour Party," written by H. Frazer-Urquhart, B.Sc., F.C.C.S., economist, who was the Socialist Parliamentary candidate for Macclesfield, England, in 1945, in the form of a letter to Mr. Morgan Phillips, secretary of the Labour Party, when he resigned his party membership. In it he says—

"Socialism in practice has failed. The socialist thesis of nationalisation and compulsion as a basis of organisation of British democratic society can no longer be accepted by me as an honest and sincere man. I take this step which means turning my back on friends, former principles and future prospects."

If the hon. member for Nundah defied the Socialist element he would have to turn his back on many friends and his future prospects for Nundah would not be very bright.

"Socialism in practice has failed."

You have to consider Socialism in practice. Had the hon. member for Nundah done that, he would not have talked as he did.

"And failed miserably for the reason that the welfare of our great country is in peril, and forces me to re-examine my thoughts in the light of practical experience."

I commend that considered thought to Government members and would urge them to re-examine their consciences too.

"In my address as a candidate in the 1945 elections I stated—'The Labour Party will strive for such economic and industrial arrangements as will enable you as the result of your labour to have food, houses, comfort, and the reasonable amenities of life. Freedom—only the Labour Party can guarantee the four great freedoms, speech and expression and freedom from want and fear.' I wish to publicly retract this belief in the Labour Party and in particular in the Labour Government. My advocacy of Socialism was made in all sincerity."

Just the same as hon. members over there do!

"I believed as I had for 12 years previously that the welfare of our great country would only be assured by the return of a majority Labour Government, and that the social and economic changes which would follow would make our country fully great, that more and more people would lead a broader and fuller life. Now in my judgment as an economist Socialism in practice has failed to live up to the grand ideals of the theorist. Instead of rational planning to overcome the immense difficulties arising out of the war we have had miscalculations, lack of leadership, eternal Cabinet dissention, the destruction of responsible and democratic local Government in matters of transport, electricity, and health."

That might apply here too. The Government should take a lesson from that experience and see whether they can improve on it.

"The Labour Government in the handling of national affairs on partisan and doctrinaire lines has brought our country to the verge of economic destruction."

There is no doubt about that.

"When the Labour Party took the step in peace time to introduce compulsion through direction of labour I could not and will not follow."

That is what I want to tell the hon. member for Nundah about.

"I am not prepared when there is an alternative to tread the path to a semi-slave state where we are no longer free British people in time of peace, but increasingly regimented directed and controlled on ever less and less rations on a declining standard of living."

That is very important. I agree with that.

"Labour will only give of its best, as will the employer, when there is an incentive. There should be bonuses, rewards, and inducement to stimulate increase in output per man-hour, income-tax free earnings for overtime, transference to undermanned industries by rewards not compulsion, and freeing of individual enterprise to rebuild our economy."

There is a man who has had that experience. He is chairman of the county council there.

It is not much use being critical of everything if one is not prepared to offer suggestions that will improve the position. I am quite satisfied that the attitude of the Chifley Government, if not dominated by

the Communistic element in our country, is inspired by it. No other Government would stand for the strikes to the extent they have. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the sooner the Chifley Government and their policy of the socialisation of industry go the better for this country.

The position needs immediate attention. I think it is imperative that taxation should be reduced, especially taxation that bears heavily on the working community and takes away their incentive to work longer. I think it has the effect of slowing down all forms of work. The worker feels that he is doing a good job but does not get any compensation for doing it. We have reached the stage when it is imperative to get things done. We are short of many things. We cannot house our own people, for example, so it is essential that we give an incentive for the production of materials that are used in home-building. I wish that during my period of political life I had seen many more people in their own homes, because nothing is of a greater asset to this country than home life. Home life means a better family life and a greater increase in the population. If ever there was a country calling out for more population it is Queensland. There is no doubt that we need more population and irrespective of the many good people who are coming to this country there is none better than the Australian-born, who is reared under our conditions. He has proved in war and sport that given a reasonable opportunity he can hold his own in any walk of life in any part of the world.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. PLUNKETT: We spend large sums encouraging people to come here, but we are not doing enough to create family life, which means a greater population. Any reasonable proposal to achieve that object would have my support.

Sooner or later we must reach the stage where every strike and every person who advocates strikes—

Mr. Jesson: What about the doctors' strike?

Mr. PLUNKETT: Strikes and hold-ups reduce the standard of living of the people and interfere with their welfare. I think the hon. member is just as anxious as I to improve the standard of living of our own people, but this cannot be done under a policy of socialisation.

(Time expired.)

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (The Tableland—Secretary for Public Instruction) (2.21 p.m.): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. I suppose there is no more difficult job for a new member of this Parliament than making his first speech in this Chamber and moving or seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. That is natural, for he has not had the experience of other members. It is indeed a very trying

time for him. I went through this ordeal, the same as a number of other hon. members. I congratulate the two hon. members who moved and seconded the Address on this occasion on the excellent speeches made.

An hon. member who spoke last week must have put in much time and work, probably receiving some assistance from his colleagues, to try and mix Communism with Socialism. Half the energy he put into this study should have disclosed to him that the Marxian doctrine on which Communism is based is dictatorship by the proletariat. Communism has nothing to do with Socialism, which means control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. These are two entirely different propositions. There is no connection between them.

Nobody is keener than am I to help the people in the outback areas of the State, but frequently hon. members, with the best intentions in the world, when speaking of helping these people, tend to create the impression that they are not happy or are discontented with their lot. On the contrary, I find that the people who enjoy greater amenities than these are the most discontented; not the people in the real outback, because today they are represented by hon. members on this side of the House, such as the hon. members for Barcoo, Gregory, Maranoa, Carpentaria, Cook, and myself. We are the members who represent the outback country. Districts represented by some Labour members and most members of the Country Party are virtually suburban areas compared with real outback districts.

I remember that on one occasion a member for a suburban electorate who was visiting the North was shocked at the lack of amenities at a certain place. He did not find there the things that he enjoyed in the city and other places he had visited, and suggested to the lady to whom he was speaking that she sell out and come to Brisbane. She replied, "Why should I do that? We have three good meals, a good bed, plenty of friends, and the best climate in Australia." That incident occurred at Croydon, a section of the real outback. Those people there were not unhappy or dissatisfied, even though they lacked the amenities that we should do our best to provide for them.

Another old friend of mine, who is in the 80's, lives well in the outback, helping in the kitchen and serving on the table without any trouble at all, and there is no possible chance of shifting her. I have another old friend who is 96 years of age. The only trouble he has had in recent years has been that a doctor sent him to have his eyes attended to. The oculist happened to be a lady and he came back and said the doctor was stone-mad for sending him to a woman to have his eyes attended to. These are the real people of the outback.

At Christmas time I had the pleasure of meeting a school teacher from Burketown. He was quite happy and contented. I gave

him a few extra things that might help him, but he is another of the real people from the outback.

Mr. Sparkes: The salt of the earth.

Mr. BRUCE: The salt of the earth.

Recently the slogan has been adopted to a very large extent by our political opponents, and to a lesser extent by the people who are suffering some hardship, that North Queensland has been neglected by the Government. I intend to prove that this is a slogan of the Opposition party. I intend to prove that any handicap North Queensland may be suffering from has been caused through the activities of private enterprise, not by any lack of support from the Government.

When I came to Queensland in 1910 all the coffee consumed in North Queensland was grown in North Queensland. It was the product of a prosperous industry that could have been extended. Of course, the grower had to trust agents to sell his goods. Those agents discovered that they could buy cheap coffee from South America and mix it with 50 per cent. chicory, with the result that not one grain of coffee is grown in North Queensland today. There an industry that could have been expanded was destroyed by private enterprise in the form of the agents who were distributing the goods.

Later on in Townsville there was a prosperous jam-making factory, producing some of the best jams and preserves in Queensland. Here again the producer had to trust to agents to distribute his products and the result was that the factory was put out of business in the interests of the southern jam manufacturers.

When I first went to North Queensland there were three breweries there, but a southern interest, Carlton Brewery, got control of the three of them and closed them down. Later, because the population was growing rapidly there was a heavy demand for draught beer and they were forced to reopen the Cairns brewery. Actually two industries were destroyed and a third suspended for a period and it was only the fact that Carlton Brewery could see big profits were to be had in the North that it reopened the Cairns brewery.

Let me talk about the establishment of woollen mills at Charters Towers, which would have been a godsend to the hon. member for Windsor. A company was established, and installed in Charters Towers all the machinery necessary for making wool-tops. It had an arrangement to buy from the sheep-growers of this State. And what a wonderful thing it would have been for the growers. Again, moneyed and vested interests destroyed this industry—wiped it out of existence, with the exception that the plant is now supplying electricity to Charters Towers.

Mr. Russell: How did they wipe it out?

Mr. BRUCE: The hon. member knows the methods better than I. Mr. Speaker, you might think I am leaving the track, but I

shall lead you back to where I was. Hon. members of the Opposition and every primary producer in my electorate have been crying out for barbed wire, galvanised iron, agricultural machinery, and motor-cars and trucks that we could have built ourselves. They cannot get these things.

Mr. Sparkes: Why?

Mr. BRUCE: Thank you! The answer is that when Ted Theodore suggested the building of a steel works at Bowen many years ago the Tory members of the day, probably supported by Broken Hill Proprietary Limited, sent Messrs. Philp, Cowley, and Walsh over to England and blocked the loan. That is why we have not got a steel works in the North today. That is an answer to the hon. member for Aubigny. Every time he wants barbed wire, let him realise that had his progenitors not been so silly Queensland would have had its own steel works and he would have had all the wire he wanted. Why did they not follow the lead set by one of the greatest men in Australia? Then we should have had a steel works in North Queensland. All his friends of the day did was to send those three gentlemen to England to block the loan with which a Labour Government intended to build the steel works.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, for another hour dealing with the activities of private enterprise that have held the North back. Now I intend to deal with some of the things that Labour Governments have done to build up the North, in contrast to private industry's attempt to subjugate the North. First of all, let me say that Labour linked up existing sections of railway and so created the Great Northern Railway. Did the Tories think of building this great line? No, their money was invested in shipping companies, and they did not want the links built. All they wanted Queensland to do was to produce the raw materials, so that the C.S.R. Company, the banking companies, and the shipping companies, could make huge profits. It remained for Labour to complete the North Coast Railway, and there is no need for me to say what the line has meant to the people of North Queensland.

We have heard speeches from hon. members opposite dealing with the great sugar industry of this State.

Mr. T. J. Ryan, a Queensland Labour Premier, and Mr. Andrew Fisher, a Federal Labour Prime Minister, signed the first agreement that stabilised the great sugar industry, the greatest organised agricultural industry in Australia.

State Labour Governments have built and are continuing to build dams and weirs in the far North to encourage tobacco production and when I refer to the far North I mean the part of the State including Cairns and extending to Cape York. Many people have the idea that the far North means the Burdekin district or the Townsville area, whereas the real far North takes in Cairns and extends to the Peninsula, an area capable

of producing tremendous wealth which at the moment cannot be produced because of the lack of markets.

And speaking of Townsville and the Burdekin area, I am reminded of the fact that at the moment the Government are actively engaged in building a very large and expensive concrete bridge over the Burdekin River. The development that has taken place in the North warrants the construction of the new high-level bridge. When the line was first built, a low-level structure served the needs of North Queensland but in the light of new development it has been a handicap in some respects and so the new high-level bridge is required.

The Labour Government built also the railway line from the Duchess to Mount Isa, thereby giving constant employment to well over 1,000 men and aiding materially in the production of silver-lead, copper, and zinc. Not only did the construction of the line mean permanent employment for over 1,000 men and the production of large quantities of minerals, but it also helped the war effort to a very large extent. It gave employment to shopkeepers and others in the district. It is true that the Government guaranteed the Mount Isa Company's credit to the extent of £500,000 and for this they were subjected to some criticism, but the line has been of tremendous benefit to the State.

Can anyone say that the few items I have referred to have not been a tremendous advantage to Queensland? Why, a member of the Federal Parliament gets more credit for having a telephone installed, for which the people have to pay, than State members get for having the big things done that Labour Governments have done in this State. The Burdekin scheme will help the people of the North considerably, not only in the way of irrigation but because they will also be supplied with electric current, which will help them in their work on the land. Cheap electric current will enable them to engage in many more activities than are carried on today. At the moment sugar is the main item of primary production in this area.

The Labour Government have harnessed the Barron Falls and are now harnessing the Tully Falls with the object of supplying electric current for domestic and commercial needs in the far North, thereby again helping industry to a considerable extent. Every hon. member realises the value of a plentiful supply of cheap electric current throughout the length and breadth of the State. Dairy farmers in my electorate are now able to avail themselves of the current from the hydro-electric plant at the Barron Falls. They are able to use milking machines and other equipment, which facilitates their work and increases their output.

The Labour Government have also investigated the establishment of an abattoir in the North. I am hoping that this abattoir will be established because a great proportion of our beef cattle are produced in the Peninsula. One friend of mine in that area

turns off 6,000 bullocks a year. An abattoir in the North would be of great benefit to our beef-cattle producers. It is required.

The Labour Government have also established a tourist trade that will be of immense value, not only to the State but to the people in the far North who cater for tourists. While I am dealing with this question I must stress the need for more accommodation, particularly at Cairns. As a matter of fact, accommodation at Cairns for any additional tourist traffic is practically non-existent. Today it is almost impossible to get accommodation at Cairns, although excellent accommodation is available on the Atherton Tableland at such places as Yungaburra, Kuranda, Babinda, Atherton, and Malanda. I would draw the attention of the Tourist Bureau to this fact and suggest that tourists be directed into those centres instead of into Cairns, which at present is overcrowded.

Since 1932, when this Government were re-elected to office again, they have made provision for a road system in the far North of Queensland that was undreamt of by the people who elected us to office.

Only the limited time at my disposal prevents me from setting out fully what the Labour Government have done for North Queensland. Whilst I was visiting North Queensland recently the subject of the formation of new States was being discussed. I found that generally speaking the northern people showed very little interest in the proposal for the creation of three States: it does not appeal to them at all. The section of the community who evinced any interest in the New States movement suggested that the creation of three States would add to the Brisbane drag south, the Rockhampton drag south, and the Townsville drag south. Their contention was that if practical effect was to be given to this proposal, two States should be created, and that one should have its capital at Cairns, which would counteract the drag south. That is the idea of the people in the North. The creation of three States with capitals at Townsville, Rockhampton, and Brisbane would only add another horse to the team dragging the people further south. They believe that the Cairns hinterland possesses better and greater natural resources than the area in which Brisbane is centred and that if the capital was fixed at Cairns it would lead to the building up of that part of the State and counter the southern drag.

I support the policy of my party, which, shortly, permits the people themselves to decide whether they want new States created or not.

Government Members: Hear hear!

Mr. BRUCE: That is a matter for them. I have outlined the consensus of opinion in the far North. The climate, with the great possibilities for embarking on primary production, and the establishment of secondary industries surrounding such a capital city in the far North, would more than counterbalance anything Brisbane has to offer.

In the brief time that I have at my disposal, I endeavoured to put a clear picture of what private enterprise has done for North Queensland and what the Government have done for North Queensland. Now I want to offer a few comments on the subject of education; naturally, it is expected of me, as Secretary for Public Instruction. Some of the papers from time to time show an immense interest in the question. As a matter of fact, I remember getting a lecture on education from the "Courier-Mail," but the boy friend who wrote the article made the mistake of taking Lincoln from Log Cabin to White House instead of Garfield. The other night there was a fancy dress ball at the Town Hall, in which 900 children appeared, and the Town Hall was packed to the doors. This entertainment reflected the work of the teachers, the activities of the department, and the enthusiasm of the youngsters, but not one of the daily papers had one word about that gathering; but they had a column of ballyhoo about Kramer's ties, the ties of the professional tennis player from America. That indicates how much interest they take in education. They ignore some of the really valuable activities of the Department of Public Instruction, showing the organisation of our teachers, showing what is done on behalf of the children and how the children respond. But if they think they can put me, as Secretary for Public Instruction, in a spot, they try to do it. They never publish anything really worth while. The other day they had part of a column showing a Chinese Communist being taken out to be executed, and singing on the way to the scaffold. How are we going to get on if we get that sort of hooey in the papers?

I wish to say something on the decentralisation of education facilities. We have divided the State into five divisions for this purpose. We are in rather a peculiar position because in one sense we have to have decentralisation before we have centralisation. These five divisions will later on be cut into smaller divisions, with the idea of giving educational facilities in the outback parts of the State, but when we get the groups formed the idea is to have a central school in each group and centralisation of all education into high-class schools with the object of giving every child in the State a better opportunity.

One of the centres is Roma and another Hughenden. People may say, "Why start there?" We are starting there because Roma is the centre of a huge area; although a small town, there is a large area from which people can be brought. The same applies to Hughenden in the North-West of Queensland, which is the centre of an equally big area and is situated at the junction of two railway lines.

Some people may say, "What about Townsville and Toowoomba?" I point out that you would not have decentralisation if you took those big towns. On the contrary, you would be accentuating the centralisation in those towns. There is a tremendous area within the western area containing only a very small population. I forget the population, but it is a small number.

Later the larger divisions will be subdivided into small divisions. The general idea is ultimately to bring it to something like 18 divisions, with a central school to each division. I am not quite sure of the policy in that direction but I do know they are to be cut up into smaller areas and that ultimately will go a long way towards stopping the drift from the country to the cities. It will give country children the opportunity of receiving an education without having to travel from one end of Queensland to the other.

In addition to these schools we shall have a teachers' training college in each division at which the young boy or girl who wants to take up the profession of teaching will be trained. He or she will not have to come to Brisbane to attend a teachers' training college but will be able to get the training near the locality in which he or she was born and reared. That will help very much indeed. One of the greatest handicaps in the past has been that the young people of the far northern and western parts of the State have to come to Brisbane to train at the Teachers' Training College and if we can localise this work much of the difficulty of transfers of teachers will be removed. The great majority of these young teachers would prefer to remain in the district in which they have been reared and trained and in which are their relations, friends, and associates. Of course, later in their careers, when they ascend the scale they will be eligible for the higher teaching positions in any part of the State.

While I do not do a great deal of talking, except on rare occasions, I think that the question of reconsideration of our education system is long overdue. Frankly, it has many handicaps. Every day some person or organisation wants to add something to the school curriculum; one has this idea and another another. A person who plays the violin thinks that every youngster should play the violin; another who plays the piano thinks every youngster should do likewise.

Then I come to the Oslo lunch. During the Brisbane Show Week country members opposite had a good time, inasmuch as the pigs from the country were fed on the Oslo lunches found in the waste bins of the State schools. The name "Oslo lunch" has a foreign ring and Australians are really averse to anything foreign. It consists of fruit and cheese and that sort of thing, but the Australian youngster gets any amount of these things; probably the Oslo lunch may do some good in European countries, in which we read that millions of children are starving and dying of starvation. The Press said that our youngsters were doing terrible things; eating meat pies and ice creams. A Pressman said, "What about the youngsters eating pies and ice creams?" I replied, "What about it? What is wrong with it? The pies are made under the Health Regulations and there is nothing wrong with them. All Australians like meat, and I am told that the ice creams are 100 per cent. nutritious. I think pies and ice creams are good."

I just mention these things to show that instead of being allowed to get on with our job we are hampered and held up by all sorts of cranks wanting all sorts of things included in our educational system.

Mr. Evans: You are the doctor.

Mr. BRUCE: They want us not only to be a doctor but to be a caterer and everything else. At one conference I held a man who was prominent in educational organisations wanted the compulsory school age to be reduced to two. That would mean we should be getting very near the maternity ward. (Laughter.) We should have charge of the child for a certain period of his life but the policy of some people is that we should have charge of the individual from the cradle to the grave.

While I am Minister in charge of this department we are not going to be responsible for people from the cradle to the grave. Whatever might be said about education, its primary object is to fit people for life after leaving school. Youngsters who may be musically inclined have ample opportunity for the development of their talent.

We all realise that the best education is obtained after leaving school. At school we learn all about history, geography, arithmetic and so on, and may pass certain examinations, perhaps qualifying for a profession, but when a child leaves school he is just a big boy who has learned certain things that are supposed to be the right things. He develops later, as he gains experience. If a person has the ability to read and write, if he has a studious mind, he can acquire all the information and knowledge any man could wish to have. I know men who have made good in life despite the fact that they have had no education. I know men who had to leave school when they were in third or fourth class, in order to earn a few shillings for the family, and who have made good in many of the professions and other walks of life.

Mr. Russell: Are you suggesting teaching them only to read and write and nothing else?

Mr. BRUCE: I am not, and I do not think the hon. member believes that that is what I am suggesting. I say that if a man can read and write then the world's knowledge is open to him. If he likes to apply himself to the literature that is available, he can study and qualify for anything, just as though he went through a university. I know men who are now holding the highest positions in the professional and business world of Australia, but who had to leave school when they were in fourth grade.

Mr. Aikens: The Government will not give anyone a job unless he has a junior certificate.

Mr. BRUCE: That interjection is pertinent. Today it has become almost mandatory to have at least a scholarship certificate. Although a lad may have had the same education as another boy who has passed the scholarship, he is looked upon as

being so much less able than the scholarship-winner merely because he just failed in arithmetic or English. We all know that the brilliant scholar who passes without any trouble has a photographic mind, but the point is that he can pass all his examinations without acquiring much knowledge. The boy or girl who has to work hard, plod and study acquires a great deal more knowledge than the brilliant youngster who can pick things up without any trouble.

Of course, it is essential that the best possible education be made available to our children, but many of the things that outside people would have us add to the curriculum would only tend to hamper the child in its ordinary school work, and in any case can be learned either later or even during school-age years if it is so desired. For instance, ample facilities are available outside for learning music, but these facilities are made available in our high schools and colleges. State-school education up to the scholarship stage is meant primarily to equip youngsters to go out into the world and follow any occupation they wish.

Mr. BARNES (Bundaberg) (3.0 p.m.): Before my eyes give out I shall quote a typical passage and refer later to what I have to say. This passage, by the way, is a statement made by the late John Swinton, editor of the New York "Times" and it was said on the occasion of a banquet on his retirement. When he was proposing the toast of "An Independent Press" he said—

"There is no such thing in America as an independent Press; you know it and I know it. There is not one of you who would dare write his honest opinions. I am paid 150 dollars a week to keep my honest opinions out of the paper I am connected with. The business of a journalist is to destroy the truth, and lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of Mammon and to sell himself, his country, and his race for his daily bread. We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are jumping jacks; they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities, and our lives are the property of these men. We are intellectual prostitutes."

My reason, Mr. Speaker, for quoting that is to prove to some of our nincompoops throughout Queensland how correct I have been in the past. In that regard I am not referring to the dills here. When I came into this House I came in on a wave of great publicity. In Bundaberg I had driven a horse and cart through the law; I have shown that summonses were not summonses but mere bits of paper and that there was no law to make a hotel close up, and so on and so on. By virtue of persecuting me in Bundaberg, the Government made court cases local comedy, without music. I had a colossal amount of publicity before I came into this House; the Press fell for my tactics. During a speech of, say, one hour in this House I would take up some 57 minutes on something solid, when somebody nearby would tell me that I had three minutes to go and then I

would talk about Ned Kelly or Al Capone or some such rot. The paper next day would come out with huge treble headlines about this stupidity, about my talk about Ned Kelly and Al Capone, and so on.

Some people who thought on unorthodox lines the same as myself ridiculed my idea of publicity. But knowing I could not get publicity about my policy I gave the members of the Labour Party of Queensland a rack on which to hang their hats. The Labour Party, when asked by their friends what sort of a chap this man Barnes was, referred to him as a madman.

Mr. Chalk: You said it yourself.

Mr. BARNES: I said it in my booklet, but I had a proviso—so were Marconi, Edison and Bell. Galileo, too, was supposed to be mad when he said the world was round.

I was distributing this book in Cairns in the Railway Hotel there and when I was talking to the proprietor, for the first time in my life, a chap came in and said, "Give me one of those books of Barnes's. My oath, he is mad." Next day I was told that he read the book and had decided that I was not mad. I came into this Parliament on a wave of publicity; it cost me at least £6,000 to get the ear of the people of Bundaberg and in turn of Queensland, but at least the people of Queensland knew that the hon. member for Bundaberg was mad, whereas they never knew whether the hon. member for Timbuctoo was mad or not. The result of what I did gave me record meetings—8,000 people at Rockhampton, 7,000 at Bundaberg, 6,000 at Mackay, and so on. I had to use the means of getting the ear of the people because knowing my economics I knew that the papers would not print anything about my policy. The only time they printed anything about it, since I have been in this House, was when they did it by way of innuendo, when Clem Lack wrote those humorous titbits about me and certain popular songs like "Coming Round the Mountain When She Comes," referring to the late Herbert Yeates, "Abie, Abie, &c.," and "Pennies from Heaven," referring to me. The people with the same economic thoughts as my own ridiculed my idea of publicity and I am making this speech to prove to them how wrong they were. While the Press thought they were ridiculing me, I was pitching for them as I knew that the day was coming when I should make complete asses of them as well as every member of this Parliament, which I did in the law courts.

Mr. Aikens: Oh no, not me.

Mr. BARNES: The hon. member was not here all the time. I did it on two occasions, and I will do it again.

I remember well one man asking the hon. member for Mount Morgan what sort of a man was Barnes and the hon. member for Mount Morgan said, "He is as mad as a hatter." Three years later the same guy asked the hon. member for Mount Morgan "What sort of a man is Barnes?" and the hon. member for Mount Morgan said, "He is a genius. He beats us every time down there."

We do not know what he is going to do next." My modesty overcomes me at times; I realise that.

My point now is that there is collusion between the Queensland Labour Party, the Country Party, the Queensland People's Party and the Press to suppress me completely. The arrangement is that I shall be given no publicity at all, except crook publicity by innuendo. That arrangement was carried out when I spoke on the anti-picketing law and the Press published what each hon. member said about it, or most of them. It said what the hon. member for Mundingburra had said, what the hon. member for Bowen had said, and then by innuendo it said that I supported the Communist Party, which was entirely untrue. That is the only publicity I have had in a Brisbane paper, or any paper for that matter, for some considerable time. But I had achieved so much by it that at the last elections I was not only returned to Parliament after making only two speeches in my electorate and spending the rest of the time helping my neighbours, but I could also tell the result of the elections before the figures were announced. I was able to do that at the previous elections, too.

I well remember the Leader of the Opposition saying to me, "Last time you told us the result of the elections beforehand. What will be the position this time?" to which I replied, "You will win a few seats but if I cannot win the necessary seats the Government will go back." He then said, "What will be the figure in your own seat at Bundaberg?" And to this I replied, "I shall get approximately 5,000, Labour 4,000 and the Kewpies 3,000." And those figures were approximately right. I got a little fewer than 5,000, the Labour Party representative got fewer than 4,000, and the Queensland People's Party got a little more than 3,000.

A Government Member: Ted Walsh will put you out this time.

Mr. BARNES: Ted Walsh will not have enough guts to fight me. I have already put him out of Parliament. After the Mackay election when I came back here, I accused Mr. Walsh of working with the Communist Party. He denied it absolutely, but when the hon. member for Bowen came into Parliament he showed that Walsh was with him in the Mackay election, and that he had thanked him for helping to get Graham into Parliament. In other words, Mr. Walsh had denied both Mr. Paterson and me; we were both wrong and he was telling the truth. I placed him in the position after that. I made him get up and denounce the Communist Party. But he did not have the brains to do so. I am one of the few people in this House who have the brains to do such a thing.

Mr. Aikens: Are you afraid of him?

Mr. BARNES: I am not afraid of any hon. member. The result is that Mr. Walsh got up in this House and denounced the Communist Party. At the time I said to a person sitting next to me in this House, "There is Walsh singing his swan song; he

will not be in Parliament after the next election. He worked in with Communism to defeat me in Mackay, but this speech today will put him out of Parliament." It did, and he will have as much chance of defeating me in Bundaberg at the next election as I have of jumping over the moon. I am perfectly satisfied that he will not fight me in Bundaberg.

This desire to suppress the hon. member for Bundaberg is so great that they have decided to suppress me at all costs, and they are using the Press to do so. Do not think for a moment that I am casting any reflection on any individual reporter engaged on the Press; the reporters have to do their work. After I came back from the Cairns by-election we were sitting a double-day and the "Courier-Mail" reporter said to me, "I have three good stories about you today." I said, "I will bet you they do not print one of them." He said, "Don't talk rot." Next morning the Press did not print one of the stories. He said, "What do you know?" They woke up to my methods of publicity, and decided that they would not give me any publicity, after that the only publicity I could get was by being thrown out of the Lodge, or Parliament, or going to the court. As it cost me £6,000 for publicity to get into Parliament, I have to use my own method of publicity while I am here as I have no bank behind me.

My opponents have evidently come to the conclusion that their attitude to me has been wrong; I have proved that by my method of publicity through the Press, and they have now set themselves to try to suppress me by other methods. There is a tacit agreement in this House to prevent me from using my former methods of getting publicity (Laughter.) Therefore, I altered my tactics. Last session on six different occasions in this House I point-blank defied the Chair, and I got away with it. (Laughter.) Complete freedom of the House, as one member on this side said, "I have complete control of the House." That brings me to the point of what was to happen to me. There is a gentleman's agreement in this House between the Government and Opposition, whereby speakers in debate can be pre-selected. Last session I was excluded from this gentleman's agreement, but a gentleman's agreement that does not include everybody in the House ceases to be such an agreement, therefore I am morally as well as legally entitled to take exception to such an agreement. I do not wish to squeal, even at this stage, but I was determined I was not going to be prevented from speaking. Today, when I found out by my tenacity—(Laughter)—that I was not included in the panel of speakers, I decided that "Murphy shall sing tonight" (Laughter) and Murphy did sing tonight (Laughter). It does not matter how I decided it but after deciding it, as I asked the Whip when I spoke, and he told me I was not on the list—I then said to him "you can tear that list up, it is out of date. I have altered it. Will you as Whip inquire when I speak?" He came back and told me I would speak after Mr. Bruce. That

will show to what extent I surprised him. The arrangements now are that I am not to be thrown out of the House even if I want to be thrown out, I have to be suppressed; they are going to see that I get no publicity outside.

If I want to be thrown out, you can believe me I will be thrown out. If I want publicity from the Press, I will have it. But at this stage of my political career I know that you can bore the people with too much publicity. When the horses turn the corner into the straight that is the time when I shall have publicity. When I say I will do a thing I always do it, and I will do it again.

Perhaps I am cheeky, the way I am speaking, by virtue of the fact that I nearly got one member of this Parliament in my party today, if the hon. member for Nundah would only have named who this Big Business was that he referred to in the early part of his speech. If he had done so I should most probably have given him an invitation to join the Frank Barnes Labour Party. (Laughter.) In other words, his line of speech was similar to my own. He blames high finance but he called it Big Business. I point my finger on the spot, which is international financial Jewism, which the world should wake up to by now—at least since the assassination of Count Bernadotte. You see what happened. Those who arranged for the assassination of Bernadotte do not care about the loss of a few lives. If a general sends in 10,000 men and only 3,000 come out but he gains his objective, that is good military strategy. The same applies to the international financiers. They do not mind if 20 people hang for the murder of Bernadotte because they have achieved their objective. It must help to make the world wake up to who this person or persons are who are controlling the destinies of the people of the world.

Take the speech of the hon. member for Albert. We heard his protestations about the loss of man-hours. I agree with him, except in one thing. As far as I am concerned it is abstract speaking, because you have to go further and say why these man-hours were lost. I quoted an authority in the early part of my speech, the late John Swinton, who put his finger on the spot and told you that as editor of the New York "Times" he was a jumping jack, an intellectual prostitute dancing to the tune of international finance. He said, "We are liars and perverts, and we vilify." There is a high authority and that is only one of many that I have quoted.

There has been a sham fight going on the last few days about Mr. Burns's statement—that he would fight on the side of Russia against us. That has been given colossal publicity. What about the statement made by J. B. Miles before 1942, which was quoted by me in this House in 1942? He was the then secretary of the Australian Communist Party and he made exactly the same statement when Australia was at war. What was done to J. B. Miles? The same thing will be done to Burns. Nothing that will not help Communism. As I said when making

my last speech here, when it comes to Communism there is not one man in this House who really understands it, outside myself. There are others who pretend to understand and one of those is the hon. member for Nundah.

Mr. Russell: What about Paterson?

Mr. BARNES: Mr. Paterson, unfortunately, is misguided.

The position today is that the international Jewish Press has chosen, through its agents, the local Press, to make a song about Burns's statement. Most probably that was arranged before it was made. All these things are prearranged, just as it was prearranged with the Cabinet or Minister to fire the loyal railwaymen during the strike. These things just do not happen willy-nilly. I remember that in 1942, after I won the Cairns by-election for this Parliament in November of that year, I received a letter from Berne in Switzerland. The letter was in the form of a pamphlet, and printed on that pamphlet was the body of Frank Barnes, with a rooster's head, and alongside his body was also Hitler's body surmounted by a fish's head. The size of the pamphlet was slightly larger than the business sheet of the House. The idea of that pamphlet was a warning by the Jewish financial system that if I did not lay off the Jewish financial system I should be bumped in the neck. The rooster's head was a warning that I was crowing too much, and that Hitler had done his crowing, the fish's head representing that he had got his last warning, that he had to be bumped off.

Mr. Decker: Any flathead.

Mr. BARNES: No, but there is one sitting behind me now.

The older members of this House will remember the occasion in this Chamber when I received this ultimatum by way of a letter from Berne, Switzerland, and how I answered it in this House—"Here lie the remains of John Francis Barnes, shot in the back by an agent of the international Jewish system." The only reason why I have not been shot is that I have not been successful enough, but if I was shot in the back by the international Jewish financial system at least I should die a martyr for the cause and that would not worry me one iota.

Mr. Smith: What sort of a pamphlet did you get after you lost the election in 1947?

Mr. BARNES: I did not lose any election in 1947 but if the hon. member will tell me what he means, I will answer him.

Mr. Smith: Losing Cairns.

Mr. BARNES: My brother is not here because members on the Government benches kidded to him and he fell for it. Unfortunately, I had to take the bump with him. That is unfortunate, but these things happen.

Coming to the two things that are most important today from the point of view of the world's Zionists' needs, I shall quote the Protocols. The newer members do not understand the Protocols and therefore I will

enlighten them. The Protocols were first published in England in 1920 by Victor Marsden. He was interned in the fortress at Petrograd in 1917 and escaped in 1920. After his escape he studied Pro. Nilus's copy of the Protocols, which were in the London Museum, and translated the Protocols into English. The London Press, such as the "Morning Post," the "London Times," and others, said these were fiction, and that some person had written the Protocols after the events had happened, because everything that happened prior to 1920 was in the Protocols. Victor Marsden, when he tried to reply, said he got a copy from the London Museum and the documents were there in 1906. Marsden was not allowed to reply.

But I am now speaking of from 1920 to 1948. Everything of major importance that has happened in the world in that period is prophesied in Protocols. What do they say about the events of today?

They say—

"There shall be talk of peace but we will not give them peace until they recognise the international super-Government."

What is the international super-Government? That is where every man in this House falls down. You cannot separate international financial Jewry from Communism. They are inseparable. If you follow the history of Communism throughout the ages you will see that it protects the Jew 100 per cent. because the Jew is its big boss. Money means nothing because the international Jewish financial system finds the money for the Communist Party. Communism has been taught in no fewer than 1,000 languages throughout the world. I ask hon. members to sit down for five minutes and try to work out how much it would cost to finance the teaching of Communism in 1,000 different languages throughout the world. They would then realise that it is not financed by the worker, that this international group finds the money. There are three types of Communists, the international financial Jewish group which is obscure; then, further down, there is the group with the Chifeys, Evatts, and others; and then the Englarts, Healys, and so on. Each has an entirely different job to do, but not one job is done by the last or the middle party except at the direction of the Learned Elders.

Why are they so anxious to control the world through Communism. It is a very simple story. You have only to take the speech just delivered by the Secretary for Public Instruction about school children. If any hon. member cares to peruse the sixth-class syllabus in State schools he will find that the definition of banking says that banks borrow money from John Smith for 3 per cent., lend it at 5 per cent. to a second person, and in that way make a profit out of which they pay dividends. That is an outright lie because the Encyclopaedia Britannica, in the 14th Edition, says that banks create money out of nothing, and this is

corroborated by the Government's own financial adviser, Mr. Colin Clark. There are thousands upon thousands of authorities to prove that banks create money out of nothing.

I will try to explain it this way: In England in 1832 the amount spent on education was £150,000, whereas in 1942 it was £55,000,000. This means that in 1832 the average education in England was equivalent to the third grade in the infants' school, whilst today it is about equal to fifth-grade in the primary school. Because of this improved education people throughout the world began to wake up a little to the international financial system, so the international Jewish financiers decided to counteract the improved knowledge that people had gained and they introduced Karl Marx's doctrine of Socialism.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. BARNES: Let me digress from my speech here and say that at least in Bundaberg there is a smaller proportion of Communists, having regard to its population, than in any other part of Australia. In other words, the people who are awake to the present Labour Party do not turn Communists but hang their hats on the Frank Barnes platform. Had Frank Barnes not been there they would have hung their hats on the Communist rack. They say to me, "You are the first man in Australia to be outspoken about Communism, the only consistent denouncer of Communism, and if there is a revolution in this country we have the best town in Australia."

I was speaking to a man in Bundaberg the other day, and he said, "Why are you building a house in Bundaberg if there is to be a revolution?" I said, "You are telling me I am silly, because when the time comes the Communists will knock it down?" He said, "Yes, that is right." I said to him, "You have to take the risk." I repeat that we have fewer Communists in Bundaberg than in any other town in Australia, and, what is more, I know who are the Communists. I can predict when this fateful hour will come, and I shall be the first in because, as I have told all hon. members, I have a thousand rounds of cartridges and bullets—which cartridges and bullets you cannot buy today—for the purpose of shooting when the revolution comes to this country as well as shooting tucker for myself. To quote J. Laver's "Nostradamus," page 22, which during the war was badly misrepresented and misused—

"Those in the islands long besieged will take vigorous measures against their enemies; it is those outside who will die of hunger, so great a hunger as there has never been before."

In the Protocols it is said, "By starvation we will make them submit to our international super-government." They say that if wages go up 10s. a week the price of goods will go up 20s. a week. To help bring about this shortage they during the depression dumped thousands of loads of wheat, etc., into the

sea. I quoted the figures the other day. They will bring about this state of shortages and as you all know a hungry belly will do anything. A hungry belly has no conscience. I warned hon. members about these strikes and how they will grow and grow, and eventually will be the cause of hungry bellies.

Let us take the Englart, Julius, and Healy gaol business and see what part that will play towards hungry bellies. It was said that the Communists would not strike. Don't be silly! Do you mean to say that the Seamen's Union or the Waterside Workers' Union would not have gone out on strike if called? Of course they would have, but the directions were that this Government had to submit to the international group and there was no need for them to go out on strike. Any man who thinks that the seamen and the waterside workers would not go out on strike is nothing more nor less than a pure, unadulterated fool. It was impossible to think otherwise. The plans, from the middle group or perhaps the higher group, were to force the Government to submit to the international Jewish financier. The Government submitted, and I might add that if the Leader of the Opposition and his party had been the Government he would have done exactly the same. I curry favour with nobody; I care only for what is right and just. If John Curtin or Bob Menzies had been in power it would have made no difference. Whoever was in control would have bent to the direction of the Elders. As the Protocols say, "You cannot gain high place unless you have a panama on your soul"; in other words, unless you stole a pig when you were 14 years of age or did something 10,000 times worse, and therefore you will submit to the Elders. They will tell the public what happened when you were 14, that you stole a pig, if you don't.

Mr. Aikens: I am getting close up; I cannot hear you from over there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member should not walk between the hon. member who is speaking and the Chair.

Mr Aikens: I apologise; I am dreadfully sorry.

Mr. BARNES: I know the hon. member would not do it purposely; it was accidental.

That brings me back to another statement in the Protocols, which says that the aristocracy, which is the goyim, as a political force is spent. You're telling me it's true!

They say the goyim, as landowners, can be of considerable interest to them. Now, what has happened? Here the Government have been for years trying to give themselves away and again the Opposition have been stopping them. For years they have been trying to get out of power and for years the Opposition have stopped them. As the Protocols say, "The aristocracy of the goyim are dead, but as landowners they can be of considerable interest to us." But when they say, "I, John Francis Barnes, do hand over to the Soviet State of Australia my property situate in Bourbong street, Bundaberg—"

An Honourable Member: Tripe!

Mr. BARNES: It is not tripe. Look at the recent Tasmanian elections. After they had taken Cosgrove to court, the Tasmanian Government still came through with flying colours. The Opposition expected a colossal victory there. By the same token, I was pleased to see Cosgrove come through, because both he and Dwyer Gray supported the same monetary policy I was speaking about today at Loan Council meetings and Forgan Smith was very shocked to know that I had a verbatim report of the proceedings at those meetings. Read "Hansard" for October 1941. Cosgrove was the only Premier in Australia to support the financial policy that I put forward today, and he was vindicated. I was pleased he was vindicated because so far as I am concerned, he is the only official Labour man in Parliament today. Jack Lang is an unofficial Labour man, a fair dinkum Labour man.

Getting down to tin-tacks, there will be no such thing as Labour parties or Tory parties in the future, and when I say Tory parties I include the Queensland People's Party and the Labour Party. There is no difference. That was proved the other day when the hon. member for Bowen moved an amendment to the motion to introduce the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act Amendment Bill to remove the penalty of £500 imposed on the farmers' representative if he divulged information concerning the millers. The Country Party is supposed to represent the farmers, but its members got together with the Queensland People's Party, the Big Business party, to oppose the amendment. They drew a red herring across the track by trying to make out it was Communism, whereas the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bowen had no semblance of Communism in it. The hon. member moved the amendment in the interests of the sugar farmers. Is a millers' representative fined £500 if he divulges any of the farmers' information? No. He is privileged to divulge the information of the farmer, but if a growers' representative on the board divulges the information to a farmer he is fined £500. The Country Party, which is supposed to represent the farmers, combined with the members of the Queensland People's Party, which represents Big Business, and then tried to draw a red herring across the track by saying it was a Communist move, but there was nothing of Communism in it.

In future there will be no such thing as Labour or Toryism. There will be either the correct use of the credit of the country or Communism. There can be no middle path. Some time ago I pointed out that in 1914 the National Debt stood at £230,000,000, and in 1941 it had grown to £1,400,000,000, and that in 70 years it would grow to £78,000,000,000, or, in other words, each family would be required to pay £13,500 a year as interest on the National Debt.

Hon. members call that sound finance, but I call it high treason of the worst kind. Our finance, as I have often stated, is controlled by international Jewry. In the early Ages they saw to it that the socialistic plank was

included in the platform of the Labour Party in order that that party would be controlled, as the international financiers control the Tory Party by stopping them from interfering with their banking policy. That party is the protector of their banking policy, therefore they must accept equal responsibility with the Labour Party for the chaotic economic conditions that exist today.

(Time expired.)

Mr. INGRAM (Keppel) (3.41 p.m.): In adding my contribution to the debate I want first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion to the Address in Reply. Their speeches show that they will be acquisitions not only to this Parliament but to the State as a whole.

I regret very much the absence of the Attorney-General through illness. I am sincere in my expression of regret. I am not like some members of the Queensland People's Party. I observed that some of those members expressed regret at the illness of the Attorney-General, but during the sessions in this Parliament at which I have been present I have heard some very sarcastic remarks made by members of that party against the hon. member for Ipswich. They have described him as the grey-headed old man and as being asleep on the front bench. I want to tell those members that if when they reach his age they are as energetic and law-abiding as the Attorney-General they will be worthy representatives of the people of this State. I am afraid, however, that they will never attain his age.

I regret that the hon. member for West Moreton is not in his place in the House. I listened to that hon. member some little time ago making a very severe attack on the Premier and Secretary for Public Lands. I came to only one conclusion after his speech and that was he was trying to sabotage the scheme for growing food for Great Britain. Great Britain requires all the food she can get. There is nothing to prevent any individual farmer from producing all he can, because he is assured of a very profitable market for his products. The large-scale farming that the Government have started is purely an extra effort to provide food for Britain. Because the Government are doing this the hon. member for West Moreton described the venture as communistic. It ill becomes the hon. member for West Moreton to do so. No doubt his attack was the result of a very deep-laid plot. In fact, I came to the conclusion that it could only emanate from a melancholy mite like the hon. member who if he ever had a thought in his head it would die of solitary confinement. The hon. member is just a brake on the wheel of progress. I would describe him as a suspended member, something that would be better out than in, that is to say, he would be better out of Parliament than in it. I am convinced that we have been too gentle with the Opposition and the time has come for us to put the gloves on. I am putting them on from now onwards.

The hon. member for West Moreton made a bitter charge and accused us of being fellow-travellers with the Communists. I am not

going to charge the hon. member for West Moreton with being a fellow-traveller of Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo, but he stands for the same things as they stood for.

An Opposition Member: If he were here you would not say that.

Mr. INGRAM: I am not afraid of any of the hon. members opposite. They uphold a system of capitalism with all its evils. The hon. member for West Moreton is one of them. They opposed decent wages and shorter hours. So does the hon. member. They opposed large-scale farming. So does the hon. member and members of the Opposition. Let us have no illusions on these matters. Hon. members opposite represent Big Business, the monopolies and the banks. They represent the capitalistic class that has exploited the workers throughout the ages. They represent the class that has opposed every reform that has ever been brought before them. They opposed workers' compensation, old-age pensions and arbitration. They opposed everything that was in the best interests of the people. They have represented the sweater, the market-rigger and the profiteer. When they were the Government they treated the workers as some people treat their dogs; and no-one knows better than I do, because I worked under them. The worker was kicked from pillar to post during their term of office; his children were never properly fed or clothed; he had no leisure; in fact, he was not treated as a human being at all.

Hon. members opposite may be nice gentlemen personally, but as a class I have no illusions about them. They showed their teeth during their campaign against the nationalisation of banks. Some of them hinted at bribes and forming a New Guard movement. You touch their profits and you will make them squeal. The Opposition are the biggest allies of the Communists. They aid their growth. When they oppose progress, as they do, and denounce every move made to make this country great, they play into the Communists' hands. This State must move forward, and if progress is blocked, as hon. members opposite would like it to be, it is only a matter of time when the Communists will take control. People have really one choice. They can progress the Labour Party's way but not the Communists' way. I do not think people want the Communists' policy.

We have heard much about the Liberal Party of Australia. The Queensland People's Party is the agent of the Liberal Party, and Mr. Menzies, better known as Pig-iron Bob, is their great boss, who virtually forced the waterside workers to load iron to make war material to shoot down the Australian soldiers. Then they class him as their leader. This is what Menzies said in July, 1939:—

"I do believe that if one were to take the history of Germany as a nation, one would be bound to say that Hitler has done some very great things for his country.

“Why should we not be fairminded enough to say so? Why should he be so blackened with prejudice as to deny that he came to the aid of his country when it was in a state of despair and he has, by some means, restored it to a position of power, solvency and, in many ways, relative prosperity.

“Those are great achievements.

“It is against reason to believe that men who have made real achievements willingly throw them away. That factor tells in the direction of peace.

“And the mere fact that some fatuous person attacks remarks of that kind and says that I am an open admirer of Hitler and Fascism will not deter me in my belief.

“If Herr Hitler were to be considered fairly and dispassionately, it must be admitted that he had done remarkable things for his country.”

Interjector (woman's voice): Concentration camps, my God!

Menzies continued:

“Hitler was able to say that he had found his country bankrupt and he had brought it back to a comparative state of solvency.

“Mussolini had been the ruler of Italy for many years and it was a sober and historic fact that he took charge when its government was corrupt and inefficient and there was widespread poverty and unemployment throughout the country.

“Would anyone believe that a man with the achievements of Mussolini behind him was going to risk the destruction of his country by provoking a European war?”

See how the Liberals admired Hitler and Mussolini and how these dictators put the people of their countries in a strait-jacket! That is what they would do if they ever regained power in this country. I will remember the hon. member for Windsor, after returning from a trip abroad, speaking in this Chamber and the floor being wet with the tears he shed over the way Germany was smashed and the shocking shame it was, but he did not say one word about war-damaged England. All the hon. member could see was Hitler and Germany. That is all these people think about—foreign countries; they don't care a tinker's cuss about Australia.

At no time have the Opposition offered any constructive criticism in this House. All they have done is to criticise the Labour Government and that is done for one purpose only, for political reasons. They know in their own hearts that the Labour Government are governing for the masses and not for the great beef barons, the great financial institutions, or the great shipping combines, as the Opposition have always done. We as a Labour Party have catered for and will always cater for the masses of people and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

We had a taste of Tory regime prior to Labour's getting control of government and a further taste in 1929-32 when the workers of Queensland were virtually starved to death

by the Tory Moore Government. Representatives of that party sit on the Opposition benches today. No person knows better than I what we had to suffer under that Tory Moore Government. Not one member on the Opposition bench went through the trials that I had to go through at that time. My wife and six children suffered with me. The hon. member for Windsor is always praising up his family but the members of my family have as good a character as his.

The Moore Government forced the nursing staff in nursing hospitals to accept a reduction of 10 per cent. in their wages. Not only that, but they starved the patients in these institutions. They forced hospital committees to stop the purchase of any more eggs. Prior to that the supply was 30 dozen weekly. They would not let us provide Bovril for patients and they instructed that patients were not to be supplied with rump steak, that beef steak was good enough for them. These are particular things we had to endure in 1929-32 and if ever that party gets into power again we shall have to live under conditions as bad if not worse than those of that regime.

In the last few days hon. members have said that the North of Queensland was sadly neglected and that the Premier of the State never knew there was such a locality as North Queensland until 1948. That is a ridiculous statement. It is absolutely stupid. Recently, because of the kindness of the Secretary for Public Instruction in giving me an invitation, I toured the northern part of the State and there I found nothing but a land of plenty; in fact, I was surprised to see the way in which that part of the State had been developed. The Government have been accused by the leader of the Opposition of not giving anything to country centres, stating that all the Government thought of was the city of Brisbane. Everywhere I travelled in the North I was struck by the number of new hospitals, new schools, bitumen roads, so it is with first-hand knowledge that I can say definitely that the statement made by the leader of the Opposition is absolutely false. This Government have done everything for the development of North Queensland.

While in the North I visited the Tableland and was agreeably surprised to find that all the small towns there were connected by first-class bitumen roads. These roads even extended to all the scenic spots. New hospitals were in the course of erection. Others were being added to, and there were new schools and additions to schools. Almost every town had water supply, sewerage, and drainage. The Government are doing everything possible for the benefit of the farmers and others in the North. As an instance, look at what they have done for the Mareeba tobacco industry. They gave financial aid to the Mareeba Tobacco Association for the installation of irrigation and at present are building a weir across the river for irrigation purposes. Despite all this, we hear the rabble of the Opposition saying that the Government are doing nothing to help the people in the North. If they think that the people in the North are going to take any notice of them for a moment they have another think coming.

During my travels in the North the people had nothing but the highest esteem for the Government and the Labour Party. They appreciate what the Government did for them during the difficult war years and what has been done for them since. It is all very well for the hon. member for Mundingburra to say that Labour members in the North are doomed. He knows that is not so. He is the one who will have to watch his seat and in my opinion that is why he calls meetings and holds deputations in various electorates, his idea being to endeavour to obtain a safer seat than Mundingburra.

One thing that impressed me forcibly on and around the Tableland was the distribution of the various brands of Australian tobacco. It is not possible for one to buy any of the recognised brands such as Havelock, Log Cabin, or Capstan in Brisbane, Rockhampton, Mackay, or any similar town but on the Tableland it is possible to buy not one tin or packet but several, and the same applies to cigarettes. When I noticed this I came to the conclusion that these brands were being distributed in the North for the sole purpose of smashing the Mareeba Tobacco Association. We all know that these other brands are controlled by that big tobacco combine of W. D. & H. O. Wills and they do not want this Queensland industry to prosper.

When I endeavoured to get a tobacco quota for a returned soldier who is starting a business at Yeppoon I was told by this tobacco-distributing combine that it would be impossible to give him a quota. They are not consistent. They are distributing huge quantities in the North to smash a Queensland industry, yet they will not give a quota to a returned soldier who is starting in business at Yeppoon.

I visited Mount Garnet also and inspected the dredging operations there. I was disgusted at the way in which the dredge is polluting and silting up the Herbert River. Something should be done about it and I am almost certain that in the very near future the Government will take action to prevent it. I noticed, too, that where the dredge had finished operations it left heaps of dirt and rocks as well as big holes, whereas if the company had levelled off that ground it would have been useful for farming. During the last election campaign the hon. member for Windsor criticised the Government on numerous occasions for the pollution of the river and said that if his party was returned he would see that this matter was attended to. When he is addressing meetings of this kind during an election campaign, I should like the hon. member for Windsor to tell the truth.

He knew very well that he would not take any action because one of the members of his party, the leader, is a director of the company. He knew that the hon. member for Logan, Mr. Hiley, would lose and lose badly if the company was forced to do that. That director is instrumental in having this nuisance continued.

I also made a tour of the North-West and Central-West in company with the Minister for Transport. We went to virtually every

town from Townsville to Mount Isa and from Mount Isa to Longreach, and thence back to Rockhampton, and everywhere we went we were met with smiles on the faces of the workers and the pastoralists, too. I admit the country was in a deplorable condition, because of drought, and not through any fault of the Labour Government, as the hon. members opposite try to make out. The people agreed that a Labour Government have done everything possible within their power to help the people on the land. We did not hear squeals in the far West like the squealing that comes from the Opposition benches, the very Opposition who are trying to belittle this Government. According to information received in those centres, no matter what the Opposition say about this Government, their remarks fall on deaf ears. And all the squealing in the world will not have any effect upon the Government.

I should like to draw attention to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition that the main roads were not being built in country areas, but everything was being done in and around Brisbane. For the purpose of my case let me quote what has happened in the Keppel electorate. Prior to my entry into this Parliament there were no bitumen roads in the Keppel electorate, except that from Rockhampton to Yeppoon. During my term of office roads have been constructed and even at the present moment are being constructed throughout the electorate. New schools have been erected and additions and improvements made to various school buildings.

It has been said by the same hon. gentleman that everything comes to Brisbane. In the last financial year, of the ten new schools built seven were situated in country areas, and of the 33 schools to which additions were made 16 were in country areas. In face of that hon. members opposite have the audacity to say we are not doing anything for the country.

I congratulate the Department of Public Works on the magnificent way it is carrying out its various jobs in and around Rockhampton. Only recently I saw one of the best septic systems in a State school a few miles out of Rockhampton. I am only pointing these things out to show that the Government are doing everything for the benefit of those in country areas. Furthermore, look at the additions and improvements made to the Westwood Sanitarium and the Yeppoon Hospital. Look at the money to be spent on the Rockhampton General Hospital. I repeat that the Leader of the Opposition says nothing is done for the country. We have also to look at the number of government houses built in and around Rockhampton, and, for the benefit of the hon. member for East Toowoomba, who is always criticising the Queensland Housing Commission and travelling from one part of the State to another to find fault with the commission's work, let me say that the Government have built a great number of houses in Rockhampton; they are still building them

there. Rockhampton is only a small place compared with Queensland. Here are the figures:—

Number of rental houses—	
Completed	106
Under construction	12
Tenders accepted	14
Plans prepared	8
Number of home purchases—	
Completed	15
Under construction	1
Not started	2
Approved	19
Number of sites held	199

That should let the hon. member for East Toowoomba know what the Government are doing to help the people of the State.

A great deal of main-roads work has been done in my electorate but a great deal more can still be done. I should like to see a bitumen road built between Wowan and Mount Morgan for the benefit of the primary producers. The present road is in a deplorable state, and only by bitumening it can it be made an effective thoroughfare. However, I appreciate all that the Main Roads Commission has done in the Central District, but I am sure that it will do more there in the near future. If we only had the same mileage of bitumen roads in Central Queensland as there are in North Queensland we should be on clover. I do not know why on earth hon. members opposite should want to trounce the Government for having failed to carry out improvements in the northern part of the State.

Let me now deal with the accusation by the Country Party and the Queensland People's Party that the Labour Party is hand in glove with the Communists. I want to give that accusation an emphatic denial and to say that no-one has tackled the Communists from the platform more than I have and no-one has tackled them more from the platform than the Australian Labour Party. The Queensland People's Party is hand in hand with the Communist Party and there was adequate proof of that the other night at the debate where Mr. Burns was supposed to have made his statement. In my opinion the whole thing was prearranged. Representatives of the Queensland People's Party attended this Communist meeting with the deliberate object of asking questions in the interests of political propaganda against the Labour Party. We have absolutely no truck with the Communist Party. Before any person can be a member of our organisation he has to be proposed and seconded, and even then he is not admitted as a member straight away. We have a credentials committee, and it makes inquiries about him for one month to see whether he is a fit and proper person to become a member of our organisation. If anything is known against him he is not admitted. That cannot be said of the Queensland People's Party or the Country Party; they take anyone. They talk about Communists being in the Labour organisation, but I can tell them that there are plenty of Communists in the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation.

I shall not detain the House any longer. Nothing that the Queensland People's Party or the Country Party say about the Government and nothing that they can do can affect the political prospects of the Labour Government. They will go on and on and will continue to introduce legislation for the benefit of the people and the State generally.

Mr. PIE (Windsor) (4.9 p.m.): I appreciate your courtesy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have been jumping up all day and this is the first time that I have had the opportunity to speak.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Mann): Order! I should like to tell the hon. member that the Standing Orders provide that if an hon. member wishes to speak he must rise in his place and address the Chair. The hon. member who first rises and catches the eye of Mr. Speaker is given the call. The hon. member being the first hon. member to rise, he caught my eye, and I gave him the call.

Mr. PIE: Yes, I know. I will not say any more.

First of all, I should like to discuss a proposal for the improvement, if possible, of the relationship between employer and employee, not only in Queensland but also throughout Australia.

I believe that something must be done. Australia is a country abounding in rich natural resources but we are not getting the best out of it because there is something growing within our midst that is pulling further and further apart, as far as possible, the relations existing between employee and employer. We have to face up to the position because Australia cannot continue to travel for ever the road she is now taking. Unless these relations improve within the next few years, we shall quickly go on the down-grade.

There are one or two other matters that I want to talk about. One is the 40-hour week. We supported that legislation in this House and I want to make quite clear the reasons why our party did so. I was the leader at the time. I want to make it quite clear to the people in the country, and everyone else, that the only reason we supported the 40-hour week was that we believe in arbitration and conciliation. The Federal Court of Conciliation and Arbitration had made its decision. Who then were we to decide, after that decision was made? Therefore, we supported the 40-hour week, knowing that once a Federal decision was made through the Federal court and believing in arbitration, the decision of that court must be upheld. What would be the position in a State like Queensland if we had a 44-hour week operating in industry here and a 40-hour week operating in an industry covered by the Federal award? We should have had people working 40 hours under the Federal award, and others in the same factory working 44 hours under the State award, for we have in this State Federal and State awards operating in the one industry. The thing was absurd. We have on our statute book

a principle that is entirely wrong, that is, that Parliament, not the court, should decide whether a 40-hour week or 30-hour week should be worked. In the Federal arena the principle must be decided by the court.

What happened at the last election? The question became a political football. It did not matter what happened, the Government pledged themselves at the election, whether the Federal court decided the principle or not, to bring in the 40-hour week, even if it meant disaster to Queensland. It has meant disaster to Australia. I have the figures. It has meant a $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase in costs to the buying public and 10 per cent. less in production. It was said, in support of the 40-hour week, that the introduction of more machinery would pick up the decreased production brought about by the shorter working hours. It is obvious that machinery will not turn out more goods in 40 hours than in 44 hours. What is the cause of the spiral of rising costs today? The lack of production brought about by the lesser working hours.

As I have pointed out that was the only reason why our party supported or voted for the 40-hour week. We definitely spoke against the principle. It was I who supported the Leader of the Opposition when he moved an amendment to apply the 40-hour week to all phases of industry, both primary and secondary. Why did I support him on that? Because I believed it was wrong that the man on the land should work up to 60 hours a week and not get some compensation for the work he was doing. I knew it was impracticable for the man working on the land to think that he could get away with a 40-hour week. I have some knowledge of what happens on the land. I know from my own little experience that the men are working 50 and 60 hours. What for? To keep prices down to support the man working a 40-hour week who puts his price up, which they have to pay for by hard work.

This State will have to assess very soon the amount a man works in primary industry in relation to his price so that he shall be compensated in proportion to the work he does. Why should a man working a 40-hour week get the benefit from the man on the land, who at times has to work up to 60 hours a week? He has to milk the cows during the week and Saturday and Sunday; it is a full-time job. Something will have to be done in that regard.

I have a very important matter to bring before this House. It is important because I believe the future of this country is at stake. I believe that something has to be done. I say very definitely—and I shall prove this as I go along—that the Australian Labour Party today is bound hand and foot to the Communist influence within Australia. I believe that we on this side have the greatest opportunity ever in the history of Queensland and Australia to prove conclusively that we are the people who can guide Australia from the depths to which she has sunk to the heights of prosperity that our natural resources warrant. I say

very definitely that the bed-fellows today are the Socialists, Communists and Australian Labour Party.

I believe that we shall never get anywhere as an Opposition while we are divided. I have always believed there must be one party opposed to Socialism, that there must be one party opposed to its bed-fellow, Communism. I am glad to see today that there are some people in Australia who realise that fact. I want to make it quite clear that from my own viewpoint I realise that we can never be the Government in this State unless we are united in Opposition. I make that appeal today—and I do not care whether I stay in or go out of politics—to all those opposed to Labour, to Communism and Socialism, because they are one, to fight as one united body. I know that I speak for myself but I do feel that our party would be prepared at any time to join completely with the Country Party in a common fusion. Then we should have one united front against this menace that is threatening this country today.

So let us face the thing clearly. I am talking to the public today and I wish it to be understood that we want unity in Australia today in opposition to the opinions of Labour. I am ready at all times to say, "As far as I am concerned, you can have the presidency of the combined party. Let us call it a Liberal-Country Party or call it a Country-Liberal Party, or let us call it a People's-Country Party if you like; but let us be united to fight this menace to which the Australian Labour Party is bound hand and foot." I am glad to see that at least some people in Australia are waking up to where this Australian Labour Party is heading.

I am not one who believes that religion should come into politics, but I say that all religions today must combine to fight this menace that is threatening Christianity and all the things we have been taught since our youth.

I am glad to find that at least one church has awakened to the duplicity of the Australian Labour Party. An article in this paper, headed, "Roman Catholics differ on Labour Party's Policy" and proceeds to outline the very thing that I tabled in this House for everyone to see, "Australian Labour Party Red; Hanlon taken unawares by Communists adopts the socialisation objective and plan for government by Supreme Economic Council." That was tabled in this House. There is a ten-point plan and within it we find that the Premier of Queensland moved for the complete socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. Then again we find, "Roman Catholics differ on Labour Party's Policy" and "Roman Catholic Church on Socialisation criticised by Labour Government." I point out that I do not care in what religion a man is born. He is born to his religion and I respect and admire his religion. I admire the religion that has come into the open at last to disclose what the Australian Labour Party is doing.

If any hon. member cares to read the ten-point plan he will see to where the Australian Labour Party's platform is heading this country, to a complete totalitarian state. Clearly the time has come when all those who are not prepared to bow to the dictates of the Communists in this State must get together and help this great Australia into something that is worth while. I do not care who it is, and although we do not want to bring religion into our discussions at any time I would point out that at least one big faction in Australia today has awakened to the duplicity of the crowd that call themselves the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. PIE: The hon. gentleman is bound hand and foot to the complete socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, and although I know he does not like being bound to it, he did sign the pledge for complete socialisation. Every person in Toowoomba and in Australia must be made to realise where the Australian Labour Party is headed. It is all contained in this document for a ten-point plan and it is complete totalitarianism.

Now to revert to something that occurred last week: we in this House remember Mr. E. J. Walsh. I remember him quite well. He suggested that the decent worker should refuse to work with the Communist. He is reported in the Press—"Workers should consider whether the time has not arrived to refuse to work beside an avowed Communist said Labour Party organiser yesterday." And on the same day, speaking in my factory, I told the workers in no uncertain terms that no Reds were needed in the factory. The next day two resigned. We are now getting somewhere. If we can get the unions to come in and not allow Communists into their unions and the employers to agree not to employ Communists, we shall be getting somewhere and we shall the more quickly destroy the menace in our midst that is white-anting the community. We must do something about this destruction and there is the answer—on the one hand unionists not to work with Communists, and on the other hand employers not to employ them. That is the solution. I got rid of them next day. I told them in no uncertain terms I did not want them in my place.

The hon. member for Kennedy made a personal attack on me in connection with the amenities provided in my industry.

Mr. Jones: He quoted from a paper.

Mr. PIE: I do not care what he quoted. Only a fortnight ago the Premier of this State opened that factory and said he had never seen better amenities anywhere in the world, and he was supported by the Deputy Premier. Then I received a letter from an official of the Australian Workers' Union, and it was not asked for by me. It reads—

"Dear Sir,

"I am in receipt of your invitation to the official opening of your Company's Textile Mill at Kedron on Saturday, 4th September, 1948.

"I thank you sincerely for this invitation and just as sincerely regret to advise you that I cannot be there on the specified date. It is unfortunate for me that matters have arisen, which prevent me from attending.

"However, I wish to take this opportunity of complimenting you and your company on providing amenities of a standard which could not be surpassed anywhere.

"I feel sure that members of the Australian Workers' Union in your employ will appreciate the value of the amenities provided in this new up-to-date factory.

"Again sincerely regretting I cannot be present,

"Yours faithfully,

"(Sgd.) J. Bukowski,

"District Secretary."

That clearly proves that the Australian Workers' Union will have nothing to do with the hon. member for Kennedy. He says that we had no beds there, but carefully overlooked mentioning that in that structure is being built one of the best sickbays in any factory, employing a matron to look after the girls and in which medicines and so on are provided. Then these liars—I call the Communists scurrilous liars—say that we should have rubber mats on cement. Has anyone ever heard anything so stupid? What we are doing is providing duck boards on cement and they are almost completed; but these Communists want to say, "We forced them to do this."

The hon. member for Kennedy went to a great deal of trouble to try to expose us, but I have quoted what the Premier and Deputy Premier have said about my place, and anyone is welcome to inspect it. The hon. member for Gregory has been out there. Any Labour man can come out and see the conditions there. The representatives of Courtaulds were there yesterday. Harris, of Toowoomba, has been out there and the Government have sent several people out to see what a decent factory with proper conditions is like.

This little chap from Kennedy is very brave, but I always tell a funny story about him. He stood for election to the committee of an important club here. Someone came along to me one day and said, "I hope you are going to vote for one of these chaps who is a friend of mine." I said, "Who is he?" He said, "He has a big business here and he is doing very well." I said, "But what is his name?" He said, "He is a chap named Jesson. You must know him." I said, "I do not know him," not thinking for a moment that a respectable club would have the hon. member—

I quoted the story from the platform at Ingham and I got a great kick out of it.

Mr. JESSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. All I want to say is that there is supposed to be a certain amount of ethics and decency in debate and when an

hon. member tries to belittle a person who belongs to a certain club—and I might say that the club he refers to is Tattersall's Club—it is not decent. I stood on three occasions and I will stand every time there is an election.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Kennedy has a perfect right to stand when he likes. I have been away at a meeting of the Buildings Committee and was not present during the whole of the hon. member for Windsor's speech but I would ask the hon. member to be careful of personalities.

Mr. PIE: Continuing with the story, I said, "Who is this chap?" And he said, "Oh, here is his card," and he handed me a card with the words, "C. G. Jesson & Co." on it. I said, "What is his job?, is he a commission agent or what?" and the man said, "Oh, I think he will come at anything." That is the story I always repeat; it is a true story.

Mr. JESSON: Mr. Speaker, I again rise to a point of order. I still maintain what I have said, that the hon. member for Windsor is a political larrikin.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to conduct this debate on the plane on which it should be conducted.

Mr. JESSON: If I had a few minutes to spare I would tell all about your trip to Toowoomba and the South Coast. You talk about morals! You are as low as a snake.

Mr. PIE: I will fix you.

Mr. JESSON: You dirty low thief.

Mr. PIE: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Kennedy called me a dirty low thief. I take strong exception to that expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The term is certainly unparliamentary and the hon. member for Kennedy will have to withdraw it.

Mr. JESSON: I will withdraw what I said but it is still what I have in my mind.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Windsor!

Mr. PIE: Are you willing to accept that withdrawal?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: I do not know what you, Mr. Speaker, think about it but I think the use of the word "larrikin" is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has withdrawn the expression. If the hon. member for Windsor does not continue with his speech, I shall have to ask him to resume his seat. The hon. member for Kennedy has withdrawn the expression.

Mr. PIE: He has not withdrawn the expression "larrikin," which is objectionable to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will agree that it is unparliamentary and he will assist the Chair by withdrawing it.

Mr. JESSON: Mr. Speaker, I feel I have some right not to be vilified by this individual.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The point about it all is that I ask hon. members to cease using unparliamentary expressions. It is very difficult to arbitrate and keep the debate on the plane on which it should be conducted. I ask for the co-operation of all hon. members on this point.

Mr. JESSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. PIE: I should now like to talk about a subject of vital interest to this country and it refers to the Coal Board to be brought into being in this State. I say that if the coal-miners of Australia can hold in their hands an industry of such magnitude and tie up Australia, something should be done about it. Stoppages, as you know, Mr. Speaker, have become a succession of strikes and the whole of the lifeblood of industry is being tied up because of the continued disruption in the coal-mining industry.

Although we believe that coal is the lifeblood of industry, very little is being done to make certain that we in Queensland shall recognise the value of our great open-cut mines.

Industries throughout Australia are looking to Queensland for the development of these great open-cut mines at Blair Athol and the Callide Valley, and I trust that the Government will be strong enough to see that the unions that work these great open-cuts are not handed over to the Communist-dominated Miners' Federation. I invite the Acting Premier to come out into the open now, because industry wants to know what this Government will do about our great open-cuts. Are they going to hand them over to the Communist-dominated unions or are they going to hand them over to the Australian Workers' Union to control, as that union controls Mount Isa?

Open-cut mining is not mining in the true sense of the word. It is quarrying with earth-moving equipment. I want to know, and the whole of Queensland wants to know, whether these open-cuts are to be handed over by the Government to the Miners' Federation to further disturb industry throughout Queensland and Australia. Are we going to put up with a continuation of the threat to the great Mount Isa mines, where a certain section want to get away from the Australian Workers' Union and go to the Communist-dominated Miners' Federation? Mount Isa has been a veritable wealth-producer that Queensland can ill afford to lose. Are we going to take Mount Isa away from the Australian Workers' Union and hand it over to the Miners' Federation?

Mr. Power: You know.

Mr. PIE: Tell us what the Government are going to do with their open-cuts.

A Government Member: It is a matter for the court.

Mr. PIE: It is not only a matter for the court, it is also a matter for the whole of Australia, because if the Government hand these mines over to the Miners' Federation industry cannot be developed in Queensland, because the Miners' Federation, not the Government, will decide what quantity of coal shall be produced. It is the duty of the Acting Premier to come out into the open now and tell us.

Mr. Bruce interjected.

Mr. PIE: Perhaps the Secretary for Public Instruction can tell us.

Mr. Bruce: The Australian Workers' Union has controlled all metalliferous mining since the beginning of metalliferous mining in Queensland.

Mr. PIE: Therefore, I can tell interested people, from the hon. gentleman, that the Australian Workers' Union will control the open-cut mines at Blair Athol and Callide Valley? The hon. gentleman does not answer. He immediately runs for cover. I shall quote what the hon. gentleman said, exactly without any distortion, to people who may want to come to Queensland. I shall be able to give them that decision as coming from the hon. gentleman as to how they will be controlled.

Mr. Bruce: The Australian Workers' Union has controlled all metalliferous mining up to date.

Mr. PIE: That is all right, so long as the hon. gentleman gives us his assurance that the Australian Workers' Union will continue that policy.

Mr. Bruce: Coal is not a metal.

Mr. PIE: Now the hon. gentleman is hedging. Now we are getting nowhere, because we do not know where we stand, and that is typical of this Government. They never know where they stand. There are things that they must face up to, but they will not face up to them.

Mr. Devries: Metalliferous mining is not coal-mining.

Mr. PIE: I am pleased to have that interjection from the hon. member for Gregory, and he will probably tell us more than the Minister can about what is going to be done, because the people of Queensland and Australia want to know. Every industry coming here wants to know what the position will be.

Mr. Mann: It will come under the Miners' Union.

Mr. PIE: I can take that as gospel from you?

Mr. Mann: Yes.

Mr. PIE: The hon. member is one of the most important members of the Government today from an influence point of view. I have got that from inside—that he is one of the strongest men inside the Government. (Government laughter). I believe he has a following that dominates most things in Caucus. I believe that what he says goes.

Now we have got from the leader—which section do you lead, the militant or the Right?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. PIE: We have it from the leader of the militant section within the Caucus of the Labour Party that the Miners' Federation will control the open-cut mines. I am sure the people of Queensland will want to know that. Coming from such a man, we must take notice of it, but maybe he has not the power he thinks he possesses.

I have covered the whole position, except this business of the New Guard. Here it is in the headlines of "The Telegraph"—

"New Guard Allegation.

"Stormy Scene in Parliament.

"Morris and Jesson In Clash."

This (alluding to the hon. member for Dalby) is Corporal Russell and this is Lieutenant Sparkes. I never heard of it. We have never heard of the New Guard. My friend the hon. member for Enoggera is going to be the bomber. All this comes out of a mind that must have dreamt something last night, but there it is. It says also that I am "a political larrikin." That is lovely, coming from the mouth of a man like him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. I cannot allow the loud-mouthed individual from Windsor to insult me. I read in the newspaper that he objected to a reverend gentleman and used the arguments about his great morals and the morals of his family. I object to his remarks, as I have a family nearly as large as his.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I can assure the hon. member that I will not allow this debate to get out of hand. I ask the hon. member for Windsor to refrain from personalities, likewise the hon. member for Kennedy.

Mr. Jesson: I should like him to withdraw that statement. I am not "this individual." I am a gentleman. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Windsor!

Mr. PIE: The only and last thing I have to say about the hon. member for Kennedy is this: Both he and I have been up North quite often. We understand that he will not receive the endorsement at the next election and that Mr. Kelly will be the man who will be representing his electorate. I have met Mr. Kelly. I do think he could make many valuable contributions to the deliberations in this House.

Mr. H. B. Taylor: If he was elected.

Mr. PIE: Yes, if he was elected. It would be like changing horses when crossing a stream—you would not know which one would pull the better.

There are other important matters I could touch on that can be discussed on the Budget, but in my final appeal—and I want to make it quite clear—I say that so far as I am personally concerned I believe that we on this side of the House have to get right down to taws and decide very quickly that we will be one in fighting this menace that is facing Australia more than anything else.

That is the menace of the combination of Communism and the Australian Labour Party, which has been proved by what I tabled in this House some time ago for all to read, and again by what has been said in the "Sydney Morning Herald," and on the occasions when this Labour Party has sold out to the Communists and adopted a policy that means in the future complete totalitarianism and the destruction of Christianity and all religion.

Mr. PATERSON (Bowen) (4.46 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, after listening to this debate on the Address in Reply, it appears to me that the Communist Party is supported by all parties, is affiliated with all parties, and apparently dominates all parties. As a matter of fact, so many stories have been told about the Communist Party that the effect of one tends to counteract the effect of the other.

The hon. member for Enoggera in his speech outlined a number of allegations against our party, and he quoted from the "Sydney Morning Herald." When he quoted from the "Sydney Morning Herald" he said that the allegations had not been refuted. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Communist Party issued a challenge to the "Sydney Morning Herald" and offered to pay £50 to any charitable institution it cared to name if it could prove the allegations set out in that paper.

Further, if the allegations made are true then the very party to which the hon. member for Enoggera belongs stands condemned for not having taken action against the Communist Party in the States where it is in power today. According to one of his statements the Communist Party decided at a congress to do this—

"By all energy and intermittent inside work to deteriorate the armed forces of the country and all institutions upholding law and order by incorporating secret agents in their midst."

He said that was decided on by the congress of the Communist Party in 1928. In that year the Bruce-Page Government were in power. They had complete power to take action against the Communist Party or against the Communists who are alleged to have decided upon that at their congress, but the Bruce-Page Government took no action. As the Honourable the Prime Minister well pointed out recently when replying to a speech made by Mr. Menzies, Leader of the Federal Opposition, he had heard nothing new in the charges made by Menzies against the Communist Party, but he drew the House's attention to the fact that at no time had the Bruce-Page Government or any other

Tory Government ever attempted to take action against the Communist Party for its alleged offences.

If the Communist Party is guilty of those charges obviously some individual member of the Communist Party must be guilty also, because the party can act only through its individuals. If the individual members are committing offences or crimes, we have the law of the land to deal with them. We have a Tory party in power in Victoria and in South Australia and Western Australia, but no attempt has been made in those States to bring before the courts any member of the party for doing any of the things alleged against the Party.

I think the position was well stated by the Hon. the Federal Attorney-General, Dr. Evatt, in a speech he made in the Federal Parliament on 7 April this year, when he was replying to the suggestion that the Communist Party should be banned because of various allegations made against them. He said this, on page 622—

"The principle is that unless a positive breach of the law is alleged or proved against people, one should not ban people because of their general political views. The Communist Party comes within that classification. The Communists must be dealt with as individuals, not as a party. Should any instances of breaches that could be proved come to the attention of the Government, they would be so dealt with. No such case has ever been brought to my notice."

These allegations are being made either by people who know they are deliberately false or by people who fail in their duty to report them to the responsible authority in order to have action taken against the people alleged to be committing the offences. They cannot have it both ways. If individual Communists are committing these offences, it is a most remarkable thing, as the Federal Attorney-General has said as late as 7 April this year, that no such case has ever been brought to his notice.

Therefore we must ask ourselves, why is it that they resort to these false allegations in order to discredit our party? I suggest that we have not to go very far to find the real reason. Let us examine the history of the Tory Parties, whether called Liberal Party, Country Party, National Party, or by any other name they have given themselves. We find a book has been published in this country under the title, "The New Road." The book was written by Eric Campbell, who was the leader of the New Guard mentioned in this Chamber today. The book sets out in detail a scheme for the establishment of the Fascist system in Australia. On page 49 Mr. Campbell states—

"The spiritual and moral inspiration of Fascism is the hope of civilisation."

Later, on the same page he writes—

"I am a Fascist because I am a democrat."

And on the next page we find—

“My belief in Fascism is grounded on two foundations; first, in the days of the New Guard I became a Fascist without knowing what Fascism was, and secondly, my conviction is the result of a close study of the affairs of both Italy and Germany with information gained at first hand and a background of historical and political reading.”

Eric Campbell was appointed a commissioned officer and put in charge of a transport section of the A.I.F. in this country by the Menzies Government, after he had written this book in which he openly admitted he was a Fascist. How then can the Liberal Party, to which the Queensland People's Party has given support and allegiance, say that they are the loyal element of the community and attack the militant sections as being disloyal?

I am not making this statement rashly. I first quoted the book written by Eric Campbell and I know that my statement about his appointment in the A.I.F. can be checked, and if checked will be proved to be correct. But it is not surprising that this appointment was made when one reads some of the statements made by the Leader of the Liberal Party to which, as I have said, the Queensland People's Party gives allegiance and support. Some of these have already been quoted by the hon. member for Keppel today. I intend to quote, not from Communist newspapers, but from newspapers that give full and wholehearted support to those two parties.

On 9 August, 1938, at a time when the international situation was tense and Hitler was spreading his power throughout Europe, Mr. Menzies' views were published in an article on page 11 of the “Sydney Morning Herald.” In that article we find this statement—

“European War Unlikely.”

“Mr. Menzies' Views.”

“The Empire's Task.”

“I do not believe that war is possible in Western Europe,” said the Australian Attorney-General, Mr. Menzies, in a special interview with the Australian Associated Press on the eve of his departure for Melbourne.”

Remember, Mr. Menzies had just visited Germany. He had been to Germany. He had the opportunity of seeing for himself what Hitlerite rule was like, and if he was this great Australian that the Queensland People's Party and Liberal Party would have us believe, and if the Liberal Party and the Queensland People's Party are as Australian as they would have us believe, then obviously it was his first duty to come back and not praise Germany but warn us of the great dangers of the Hitlerite menace.

First of all, he tried to lull Australia into a false sense of security by saying, “I do not believe that war is possible in Western Europe,” only 13 months before war broke out.

He then says, under the heading, “Anglo-German Entente”—

“I hope the understanding between Great Britain and Germany will grow.”

That is, between Great Britain and Germany under Hitler because Germany was then under Hitler. Mr. Menzies continued—

“No German wants war. There is a great deal of spiritual quality in the willingness of the young Germans who are devoted to service to the State.”

Just imagine the great deal of spiritual quality that Mr. Menzies was trying to tell us was to be found in the youth of Germany under Hitler. And he had been there! There might have been some excuse for him had he not been to Germany or if he had not even read widely about Germany, but he had been there and he came back and told us that there was a great deal of spiritual quality in the youth of Germany in their service to the State.

When he came back to Australia he addressed a meeting at the Old Melbournians' luncheon at the Hotel Federal, in Melbourne, and the report of that address appears in the Melbourne “Argus” of 15 November, 1938, again a paper that supports the politics of the Liberal Party and the Queensland People's Party. He said—

“I am constantly astounded to realise how difficult it is for most people to realise that there are two sides to every question,” Mr. Menzies continued. From talks with leaders in Great Britain and Germany he had concluded that Germany had some real grievances against Czechoslovakia. This was also the view of the British Government . . .”

That was the Chamberlain Government—

“but because he expressed this view he was accused of being a pro-German.”

I think hon. members will agree that he was rightly accused of being pro-German.

Then he went on and said—

“It was no good sitting back and thanking God that we were better than the Germans or the Italians,” Mr. Menzies said, “Democracy might be the form of government which suited Australia but that did not mean that it suited everyone else. Before dictatorship had been introduced in Italy democracy had sunk to the lowest level of corruption and incompetence. Italy was fundamentally more prosperous and better governed now than it was 10 or 15 years ago.”

Note that Mr. Menzies first said that democracy might be the form of government—not that it is the form of government or should be the form of government, but that it might be the form of government—that suited Australia, but that did not mean that it suited everyone else.

Then we find, as a third example, again in the Sydney “Morning Herald” of Monday, 12 December, 1938, on page 11, column 8, under the heading, “Viewpoint of Germany,” the following:—

“Mr. Menzies' Plea for Understanding.”

He was speaking at a service for men at St. Stephen's Church. He said—

“We must get out of the cheap, easy-going habit of mind which causes

people to say, whatever Germany may do, that it is wrong. I have already in some quarters been called a Fascist, and it is a risky plea that I have just made because I am certain to be misrepresented by someone. I think there was a great deal to be said for Germany re-arming. A nation of 70,000,000 of the most virile peoples in Europe, it was unarmed in a ring of nations, most of whom had armed or were arming to the teeth."

"Would we have tolerated being told that we must completely demilitarise the districts of Sydney and Newcastle, for example?"

He was referring to the fact that under the Versailles Peace Treaty, Germany had to demilitarise part of her Western frontier. He was not speaking of Germany in general or Germany at any time, but the Germany under Hitler, for it was Hitler Germany which rearmed, and that is the important point to remember when reading this passage.

He went on to say—

"I think there was a great deal to be said for Germany re-arming."

Those were Mr. Menzies's words, and they were published in a Tory newspaper; it is hardly likely that Mr. Menzies had been misrepresented in the report of his speech.

I mention those things to show that there was nothing unexpected when Eric Campbell, the leader of the New Guard, was appointed with commissioned rank to the A.I.F., yet these people who support Mr. Menzies and his political philosophy were the first to attack the Communist Party and talk about our disloyalty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Queensland People's Party and the Liberal Party and Mr. Menzies adopting the attitude they did. Mind you, I disagree with it, but I can understand their attitude because they represent the great exploiting classes, they represent the banks, the big monopolies, the trusts, and the combines and the wealthy shareholders who receive thousands and thousands of pounds each year in dividends without doing any work. And yet it is they who are the first to suggest that the worker is not pulling his weight. Only in this morning's Press—and it was given great prominence—I read a statement that the waterside workers worked more or less like old-age pensioners—

Mr. Russell: They do.

Mr. Aikens: What do you know about work?

Mr. PATERSON: Anybody who thinks that should go on to a wharf to see what it is like, even if he is not prepared actually to take part in the work. He should look at the men and see the conditions under which they work. On my last visit to my electorate I was on the Bowen wharf when men were loading sugar, and, candidly, I marvelled, not that they were slow but that they were able to do so much work, carrying heavy bags of sugar—which

work they were doing on this occasion—in narrow holds that were badly ventilated. And yet those people to whom I referred have the cheek to suggest that those men do not work!

Mr. Speaker, if a waterside worker was suddenly taken ill and only able to limp in his work, he would do more work in one day than the idle rich do in one year. If there are loafers or idlers in this country who should be pilloried and attacked, they are not to be found amongst the ranks of the workers who load ships, or amongst the workers who build houses or work on the roads or run our trains or do any other necessary work, but among the many coupon-clippers, the wealthy shareholders who draw dividends, and in some cases dividends from several companies. In addition to drawing dividends, they draw thousands of pounds a year in directors' fees, and are able, by some magic method, to be directors of numerous companies, have plenty of holidays, and still get their thousands as directors and their thousands from dividends. They do no work, and yet it is they and their agents who have the cheek to suggest that the workers are lazy!

I did on one occasion work on the wharf at Bowen. I worked because under the rules of the union one had to work to become a member. The branch of the union there wanted me to become the honorary editor of a waterside workers' paper.

It was a paper run by the militant waterside workers throughout Queensland. And so I went down to work for this day and all I can say is that if it had not been for the help of other men I certainly could not have lasted the day. But I did not have the cheek, nor was I nasty enough, to say that they were loafers. On the contrary, I realised that these men worked hard carrying heavy bags of sugar, doing their loading work and seeing that the ships were got away. I was lucky enough to be able to get some help which enabled me to carry through.

I repeat that I can understand why the members of the Queensland People's Party and the Liberal Party take the stand they do but I want to emphasise this point as strongly as I can and as strongly as the hon. member for Windsor emphasised some of his points: that Australia has got to be on guard. Let us be under no illusion. She has got to be on guard against the real loafers, the rich loafers, and not against the working class in this country.

Of course, I realise that it is very easy to stir the public up with all sorts of lies in the newspapers against the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. In the latest issue of the "Telegraph" today, even the Attorney-General of the United States has had to warn the people of his country that the spy-scare stories that are now being told in the United States are preposterous. The people there have allowed their imagination to run away with them to such an extent that even the Attorney-General in the United States has had to sound this warning.

But there is nothing new in these lies, nothing new at all. Ever since the working class began to struggle, one of the methods used in defeating them was that of telling lies about them and misrepresenting them. The Prime Minister of Australia, when replying to Mr. Menzies's motion, was able to point to the time when he himself had suffered victimisation at the hands of a Tory Government in New South Wales in 1917 because of the part he had played in the New South Wales railway strike. I can remember that strike, although I was only a young fellow at the time, still at the university. I can remember that the "Press" was trying to tell us that the workers were disloyal, that the workers were anti-Australian, that the workers were pro-German, and that the workers were everything that was bad. At that time I did not know that there was such a man as Ben Chifley among those workers but on reading his speech the other night I saw that he had reminded the Federal House that he had suffered during this period from victimisation. He had had experience of these lies and he was able to answer his critics.

Let me now deal with a series of lies that were told in the early stages of the recent world war. It was at a time when Russia was at war with Finland and I can remember the big headlines that used to come out in the newspapers. There were big scare headlines attacking the Soviet Union and attacking the Communist Party. The Brisbane Telegraph came out with an article headed, "Seditious elements." In this article it urged the Federal Government to ban the Communist Party because a leaflet had been issued by the Communist Party attacking the attitude of the Finnish Government and supporting the stand taken by the Soviet Union. Strange to say, over 4½ years later the "Telegraph" wrote a leading article and completely contradicted the article that it had originally written under the heading of "Seditious Elements."

When it had written the article under the heading of "Seditious Elements" urging that the Communist Party should be banned it based its article on the stories then being published in the newspapers about Russia and the Communist Party. But on 5 September, 1944, it wrote a leading article headed—

"Finland Sees the Light."

I propose to quote a part of this article in order to show just how the newspapers convict themselves out of their own columns in respect to the lies they have been telling. By this time Finland was ready to pull out of the war she had been fighting on the side of Nazi Germany.

Here is what the leading article says—

"Finland's acceptance of Russia's preliminary armistice terms virtually completes the collapse of yet another of Germany's carefully laid and widely supported plans for the annihilation of Russia and the discredit of yet another of the reactionary groups in small nations who hope to consolidate their power by climbing on to the Nazi bandwagon.

1948—s

"There has been a great deal of misplaced sympathy since the Russo-Finnish war, mainly because she was a small power which had been attacked by a big power."

I pause here to remind the House that this misplaced sympathy that the "Telegraph" in September, 1944, lamented had been caused mainly by the lies told by the "Telegraph" and other newspapers. The article then proceeds—

"Although Finland was small, her strategic position made her of immense importance to Germany's plans, and consequently to Russia, because her territory was the key to Leningrad, which was the key to Moscow.

"Russia, acutely aware of the Nazis' eastward encroachment sought to secure this territory, so vital to her own defence and agreed to compensate the Finns, but the Finns were playing the Nazis' game and refused, thus precipitating the Russo-Finnish war, the settlement of which was anything but harsh against the Finns."

Note, Mr. Speaker, that this leading article in the "Telegraph" admitted that the Finns had been playing the Nazis' game, yet when I went to address a public meeting in Townsville at the time on the Finnish war, to put forward this view, the Fascist section of Townsville—the New Guard section of Townsville—organised a gang to try to break up our meeting. Fortunately for us, they failed and they finished up by running away—not I or those who were at the meeting, but those who had come to break the meeting up. I can remember, as a matter of fact, some of them were singing "Boys of the Bulldog Breed" and a wag called out, "But on this occasion the bulldogs have been crossed with dingoes." Yes, they were prepared to attack us and try to prevent us from stating what we believed to be true.

The "Telegraph" in 1944 admits that the stand we took, and the stand Russia took, was correct. We should not mind if the "Telegraph," or other papers like it, made that mistake and then profited by their mistake in the future, but instead of doing that they merely continue the same old game of lying.

Let me quote further from the leading article—

"The course of war has demonstrated beyond all question how important was that Finnish territory, not only to Russia, but as events turned out, to the whole United Nations' cause.

"Had the Russians not secured these defences there is little doubt that the Germans would have dominated, with the support of the Finnish ruling class, the whole of Finland and launched an assault on Leningrad that might well have crippled the Russian defences from the outset.

"For that reason the 'gallant little Finland' attitude that swept a world then painfully unaware, in the main, of the real menace of Naziism, and nearly brought Britain and Russia into conflict under the direction of Mr. Chamberlain, was extremely dangerous."

It is equally dangerous today when we consider that there are people like the hon. member for Enoggera, like the hon. member for Windsor, and like all the hon. members of any Tory Party, who try to mislead the public about the truth of the international situation.

The hon. member for Nundah this morning spoke the truth when he referred to the fact that the British Government had been blackmailed by Wall Street into signing the Bretton Woods Agreement and Wall Street represents the great American bankers who are linked up internationally with the great banks throughout the world and the great industrial monopolies. The menace to the world today is not the Soviet Union; it is not the working class; the menace today is the people who control the economic system through their control of the banks and the great monopolies and such people are to be found in Wall Street in New York today.

What do we find them doing? We find them pursuing policies against which even many of the Americans protest. They are actually setting out to build up Japan again; not simply to build up the food-producing factories or industries in Japan to give the Japanese people a higher standard of living, but to rebuild the war potential of Japan, and rebuild the war potential of Germany.

Mr. Aikens: Rebuild Japan as a military power.

Mr. PATERSON: Yes, and rebuild Germany as a military power.

Side by side with this, we find the tendency to find prominent Nazis not guilty in war trials and to release them in Germany. No protest from the ranks of the Opposition, from the ranks of the Queensland People's Party, or the ranks of the Liberal Party! There is no protest against that, but when the Government released waterside-worker strikers quite recently, there was a howl of protest that the law must be allowed to take its course. The Tories howled then, but they did not howl when the Nazi gangsters and leaders were being released. No, because the Nazi gangsters and leaders represent the great financial and industrial groups in Germany and other parts of the world, which are represented here in the Australian sphere by the Liberal Party and the Queensland People's Party.

But the menace is nevertheless great. Just as the Communist Party and many other progressive thinkers in this country and other parts of the world prior to 1939 warned the world of the menace and were vilified because of it, so today we are vilified because we warn them of the menace of the American millionaires and Wall Street domination, linked up with the millionaires of Great Britain and every capitalist country throughout the globe.

Now, I make no bones about where I stand in this situation. I definitely stand for the working class against the millionaires, against the exploiting class, no matter where they come from. My course is perfectly clear. I

am not ashamed to admit candidly that the goal of myself and of my party is Socialism. I am not concerned whether it costs me 100 votes or whether I gain 100 votes because of that; it is because I believe it is the duty of every man to state fearlessly what he honestly believes to be right. If we state fearlessly what we honestly believe to be right, then at least the world knows where we stand.

And, of course, if I break the law, or if in the course of carrying out my work to realise my ideal I break the law, then I expect the law to deal with me. But, Mr. Speaker, I make it perfectly clear where I stand on this because I believe the capitalistic system is the root cause of the economic evils of society today. And seeing that I believe that, obviously I must stand for a state of society in which the capitalistic system will no longer exist. Therefore, I stand for socialism.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not stand for the type of Socialism that has been falsely depicted by the newspapers that are opposed to the great working-class movement. They would have one believe that Socialism necessarily means a totalitarian State. Strange to say, prior to the war these people never objected to the totalitarian State under Nazi-ism in Germany or Fascism in Italy or the militaristic clique in Japan. The Socialism for which I stand is socialisation of the banks and the great industrial concerns and the abolition of the right to anybody to live by profit or by exploitation. That is what I stand for. I do not stand for the abolition of all forms of private property, because there are two forms of property; there is the private property that exists for the use of the individual or of groups and there is the private property that exists primarily for the purpose of exploiting human labour. The private property that exists for the use and enjoyment of mankind is what the Communist Party stands for and I, as a member of that party, also stand for. The private property that exists, not for the use and enjoyment of the people but for the purpose of exploiting the working people, I am opposed to; and naturally I and my party aim at the abolition of the system in which such forms of private property can exist.

Mr. Macdonald: You are fishing for a few votes.

Mr. PATERSON: Let not the hon. member judge me by himself! If he wants to speak, he has ample opportunity to do so in this House without expending his lung-power simply on interjections.

My allotted time is virtually finished and I do not propose to start on anything further. I shall draw to a conclusion by saying that today it is more necessary than ever that every person should try to ascertain the truth and the facts. If, for instance, I believed the facts to be as some hon. members in the Country Party apparently believe them to be, obviously I should take the stand

they take. But I do not accept or believe the facts as they accept them. I have come to the conclusion, as the result of much reading and study over the years, that the future lies in the hands of the useful people of the community, the industrial workers in the cities and towns, the rural workers, and the working farmers in the countryside. They are the people who form the backbone of the community—not one section alone but both sections. As far as I am concerned, my life, I trust, will be devoted to seeing that we shall have established a system of society in which the wealth these useful people produce will exist for their benefit and for that alone, apart from one group of exceptions, namely, those who are too old to work, too young to work or who, through sickness, weakness or accident are unable to work.

Motion—That the Address in Reply be adopted (Mr. Burrows)—agreed to.

SUPPLY.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Acting 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. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Acting 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 5.26 p.m.
