

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER 1949**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER, 1949.

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY RESUMPTIONS, BANYO, NORTHGATE AND VIRGINIA.

Mr. ROBERTS (Nundah) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. With reference to the proposal by the Railway Department to resume certain lands at Banyo, Northgate, and Virginia for railway purposes, has he read the report published in the ‘Brisbane Telegraph’ of the 11th instant to the effect that, at a meeting of the Brisbane City Council held that day, Alderman Kerr (C.M.O., Sandgate) said: ‘Hundreds of homes in the Northgate and Virginia areas would have to be demolished if the Government went ahead with its plan for the construction of new workshops and marshalling yards?’

“2. How many houses (a) constructed and (b) partly constructed will have to be either demolished or removed at (i.) Banyo, (ii.) Northgate, and (iii.) Virginia, if the Government does proceed with the present proposal?”

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

“I should like to preface my reply to the hon. member by stating that I appreciate the very close attention which he has given to the question of minimising any inconvenience to residents which might be occasioned by the Railway Department’s decision to resume land in the Banyo, Northgate, and Virginia areas.

“1. Yes. If Alderman Kerr made the statements attributed to him, they are grossly exaggerated and in marked contrast to the reasonable and more temperate views expressed at the same meeting by his leader, Alderman Chandler.

“2. Banyo—Constructed, 12, plus three temporary dwellings; partly constructed, 4. Northgate—Constructed, 7, plus one temporary dwelling; partly constructed, 2. Virginia—Constructed, 7; partly constructed, nil.”

REPOSSESSED WORKERS’ HOMES AND DWELLINGS.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Public Works, Housing and Local Government—

“Adverting to his answer to my question on September 13 relative to sale of repossessed homes, what are the following details of the three highest sales in 1948-49, viz:—(a) Situation of the home, (b) age (c) area of floor, (d) price, and (e) amount of Local Authority rates owing, respectively?”

**Hon. W. POWER** (Baroona) replied—

“(a) Enoggera, Innisfail, Chermide; (b) 21 years, 19 years, 21 years; (c) and (d) both these questions relate to the prices paid by the purchasers, and without their permission the information cannot be disclosed; (e) approximately £102, £71, £80.”

**STOCK DISEASES COMPENSATION FUND.**

**Mr. McINTYRE** (Cunningham) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“In reference to the Stock Diseases Compensation Fund, what was the total amount of (a) levies and (b) compensation payments (if any) for the Darling Downs in 1948-49?”

**Hon. H. H. COLLINS** (Cook) replied—

“(a) Levies received, £2,092 11s. 10d.; (b) nil. Testing under the present scheme for the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle did not commence in this area until the present financial year.”

**LOAN LIABILITY OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES.**

**Mr. MULLER** (Fassifern): I desire to ask the Treasurer whether he has an answer to the following question which I addressed to him on 20 September—

“What was the loan liability, showing Treasury loans and loans guaranteed by

the Treasurer separately, of (a) the Brisbane City Council, (b) other City Councils (total) (c) Town and Shire Councils (total), at 30 June, 1949?”

**Hon. J. LARCOMBE** (Rockhampton) replied—

“Yes, the information is available. It is lengthy and I lay it on the table of the House.”

Whereupon the hon. gentleman laid the following paper on the table—

	Treasury Loans.	Loans Guaranteed by The Treasurer.
	£	£
Brisbane City Council ..	2,955,095	20,070,045
Other City Councils ..	1,618,608	3,674,556
Town and Shire Councils ..	3,171,180	3,065,443
<b>Total .. ..</b>	<b>7,744,883</b>	<b>*26,819,044</b>

\* Amount of indebtedness of Local Authorities in respect of debenture loan borrowings, not the amount of the original borrowings.

No reasonable applications for loans or subsidies are refused to Country Local Authorities or other Local Bodies. Treasury loans and subsidies approved and debenture loans guaranteed for Local Authorities and Local Bodies during the seventeen year period 1 July, 1932, to 30 June, 1949:—

	Treasury Loans Approved.	Debenture Loans Guaranteed.	Total Loans Approved or Guaranteed.	Treasury Subsidies Approved.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£
Brisbane (a) .. .. .	1,524,484	13,594,404	15,118,888	3,827,327	18,946,215
Other Cities (b) .. .. .	1,940,901	11,439,957	13,380,858	3,484,964	16,865,822
Towns (b) .. .. .	573,231	1,528,921	2,102,152	648,889	2,751,041
Shires (b) .. .. .	3,084,755	4,647,117	7,681,872	1,974,593	9,656,465
<b>Total .. .. .</b>	<b>£ 7,073,371</b>	<b>31,210,399</b>	<b>38,283,770</b>	<b>9,935,773</b>	<b>48,219,543</b>
Percentage of Brisbane to Total ..	21.55%	43.56%	39.49%	33.52%	39.29%

(a) Includes Brisbane and South Coast Hospitals Board, Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board, Brisbane Harbour, &c.

(b) Includes Hospitals Boards, Fire Brigade Boards, &c.

Loans and subsidies approved for Local Authorities and also certain expenditure incurred by the Government but not charged to Local Authorities for the year 1948-49:—

	Treasury Loans Approved.	Treasury Subsidies Approved Including Subsidies (i.e., Proportion of Expenditure borne by the Government, and thus not charged to Local Authorities) in respect of the construction and maintenance of Highways and Main Roads.	Total.
	£	£	£
Brisbane (a) .. .. .	116,080	631,063	747,143
Other Cities (b) .. .. .	121,651	267,011	388,662
Towns (b) .. .. .	68,078	164,640	232,718
Shires (b) .. .. .	503,046	2,455,150	2,958,196
<b>Total .. .. .</b>	<b>808,855</b>	<b>3,517,864</b>	<b>4,326,719</b>
Percentage of Brisbane to Total ..	14.35%	17.94%	17.27%

(a) Includes Brisbane and South Coast Hospital Boards, Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board, Brisbane Harbour, &c.

(b) Includes Hospitals Boards, Fire Brigade Boards, &c.

NOTE.—Debenture loans guaranteed by the Government are not included in the above figures.

ADMISSIONS AND RESIGNATIONS, PUBLIC SERVICE.

**Mr. MORRIS (Enoggera):** I desire to ask the Premier whether he has an answer to the following question, which I addressed to him on 13 October—

"1. How many young men and women leaving school with (a) Senior Public Examination certificates and (b) Junior

Public Examination certificates, joined the State Public Service each year from 1936?

"2. How many persons left the State Public Service each year from 1936 to 1948?"

**Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Premier)** replied—

"Yes, I have the information and I lay it on the table of the House.

Financial Year.	Number who joined the State Public Service.			Number of Resignations, Retirements and Dismissals of Officers who enter the State Public Service by the Public Service Examination or with Qualification equal to or higher than the Senior Certificate of the University of Queensland.
	From the Public Service Examination.	With Qualifications equal to or higher than the Senior Certificate of the University of Queensland.	Total.	
1936-1937	166	31	197	100
1937-1938	177	15	192	101
1938-1939	142	28	170	86
1939-1940	156	15	171	87
1940-1941	423	24	447	98
1941-1942	580	32	612	118
1942-1943	460	4	464	133
1943-1944	276	6	282	120
1944-1945	223	20	243	155
1945-1946	27	30	57	327
1946-1947	231	47	278	325
1947-1948	359	37	446	378
1948-1949	327	142	469	395

(NOTE.—These figures exclude officers of the Department of Labour and Industry and the State Income Tax Office who transferred to the Commonwealth Public Service during 1945-46 and 1946-47 as a result of the establishment of the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service and the undertaking by the Commonwealth of the collection of Income Tax under the Uniform Taxation Scheme.)

PAPERS.

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

Report of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, Queensland, for the year 1948-49, and Estimates for the year 1949-50.

Report upon the operations of the Sub-Departments of Native Affairs, "Eventide" (Sandgate), Eventide Home (Charters Towers), Institution for Inebriates (Marburg), Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind, and Queensland Government Tourist Bureau.

Report of the Department of Agriculture and Stock for the year 1948-49.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council (2) under the Abattoirs Acts, 1930 to 1949 (6 October).

Ordinance under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1949 (13 October).

INCOMPLETE ISSUES OF "HANSARD."

**Mr. SPEAKER:** During last week's sitting, the hon. member for Bundaberg raised a matter concerning the omission of certain remarks of his from "Hansard." I called

for a report from the Chief Reporter, Mr. C. T. Wood, which report I now make available to hon. members. It is as follows—

"12 October, 1949.

"Memo:

"The Honourable the Speaker.

"I have made inquiries from the Government Printer, Mr. Tucker, about the omission from some copies of "Hansard" No. 7 of pages 497 to 528, which included about six pages reporting Mr. Barnes's speech on the Address in Reply.

"Mr. Tucker informs me that all the copies still in the Government Printing Office are complete, and I have examined all those accessible to me at Parliament House and find that they also are complete, and I have had no other complaints.

"Apparently, these 32 pages, representing one flat sheet of make-up, were inadvertently not included in a few of the 2,400 copies that were bound in the Printing Office and four people who received them communicated with Mr. Barnes because they were interested in his speech in particular.

"Mr. Tucker, of course, repudiates the suggestion that the absence of these pages from a few copies was sabotage, and I agree. I think it was due to an error in assembling, which in the publication of

pamphlet "Hansard" is a rush job, and might occur in any printing office. Mr. Tucker suggests that Mr. Barnes supply the names of the persons who received the imperfect copies and that complete copies be issued to them."

## SUPPLY.

### COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

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

Debate resumed from 14 October (see p. 890) on Mr. Larcombe's motion—

"That there be granted to His Majesty for the service of the year 1949-50 a sum not exceeding £557 to defray the salary of the Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. MARSDEN (Ipswich) (11.1 a.m.) who was received with "Hear, hears" said: I wish to join with other hon. members of the Committee in congratulating the Treasurer on his presentation of a clear, concise, and excellent Financial Statement. As a new member, it is indeed gratifying to me to read a document that is so illuminating and sets out so clearly the prosperous condition of this State brought about by the efforts of successive Labour Governments.

My one regret is that my predecessor, the late Hon. D. A. Gledson, was not present in this Chamber to hear the Financial Statement so ably presented by the Treasurer. Dave Gledson gave a lifetime of service to the Labour movement and was well known for his administrative ability, as a debater, and above all for his loyalty—loyalty to his State and to his party.

In spite of the criticism of the Opposition, the Budget has been well received by the people of the State, irrespective of their political thought. Even the "Queensland Times," a newspaper published in Ipswich with a large circulation in the country centres of Stanley, West Moreton, and Fassifern, had a good word to say of it. In its editorial of 8 October last that paper said—

"The State's Finances.

"Whilst in these days particularly, figures do not tell the whole story of the economic condition of the State, the Budget which Mr. Larcombe presented to Parliament yesterday reveals a generally satisfactory condition. There will be some criticism, of course, of the effect of Labour policy, not only within the State but throughout Australia, upon prosperity and progress, but critics must admit that the State's potential remains great and that the figures reveal signs in some directions of substantial progress for the future.

"Mr. Larcombe's anticipation of a surplus of £35,365 is in accord with the policy that has been followed in recent years of keeping the figures to as near a balance as possible. The surplus expected seems reasonable in view of the fact that for the

year ended last June the favourable balance was nearly £35,000 more than the estimate."

This newspaper, to say the least, is anti-Labour but it has a sense of fair play and gives credit where credit is due.

Whilst listening to the speech of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition he stated that the basic wage had more purchasing power in 1932 than at the present time. This is what the hon. gentleman said—

"Then let us examine the basic wage. At 30 June, 1932, the last quarter of the Moore Government, the basic wage was £3 14s. a week, and the C Series index figure was 772. I have heard hon. members opposite, led by their choir master, the Secretary for Public Works, refer to that wage by using epithets such as 'starvation,' 'iniquitous,' 'baby-starving,' and so on. Let us examine this position coolly, calmly, and analytically, and find out what is the real value of the present basic wage compared with that payable in 1932. The present basic wage is £6 6s., and the C Series index figure is 1,335, so that the present equivalent in purchasing power of the £3 14s. at 30 June, 1932, is £6 8s. 3d. The present real basic wage has, therefore, 2s. 3d. a week less purchasing power than that of 1932. Let hon. members opposite work that out."

"The present real basic wage has 2s. 3d. a week less purchasing power than that of 1932," perhaps it has, I am not going to dispute those figures; perhaps they are right, perhaps they are wrong. I am no mathematician. But compare the position today with 1932. How many workers were able to enjoy a basic wage of £3 14s.? Unemployment and misery were rife throughout the State. In Ipswich alone over 1,500 were receiving relief. Coal-miners were working short time, whilst at the railway workshops at North Ipswich hundreds of employees had been sacked, married men were working six days a fortnight and single men seven days a month. How could they enjoy the basic wage? They were not receiving it.

Even if, as the Leader of the Opposition says, the present basic wage has 2s. 3d. a week less purchasing power than in 1932, at least the worker today has full employment, he enjoys the benefit and comforts provided by a Labour Government. He has no fear of unemployment. He has not to queue up at police stations to receive his weekly dole. He has not to travel from place to place in search of employment. The spectre of want is a thing of the past.

What are the figures today? I read from Bulletin No. 37 of 1949 issued by the Government Statistician. This is what it says—

"Persons receiving unemployment benefit—  
June 1949.

"June 1949 figures of persons in receipt of unemployment benefit were 587 males and 61 females, the total of 648 being 525 or 45 per cent. below the corresponding figure for the previous June. Of this

number of 648—207 were receiving unemployment benefit because of seasonal work and weather conditions.”

These are the figures for the whole of the State. Compare them with those of early 1932. In Ipswich alone, I repeat, 1,500 were receiving relief.

One has only to read the financial columns of the daily newspapers and study the balance sheets of various public companies to find the true prosperity of the country. In Ipswich, a highly industrialised town, the well known firm of Cribb and Foote Ltd. is celebrating its centenary. This firm is the oldest established business in Queensland, if not in Australia, and is well patronised by the workers of Ipswich. It sells anything from a needle to a tractor. The continued success of this company can be taken as an indication of the general prosperity of the State. This year, after spending thousands of pounds on its centenary celebrations—I admit the money was distributed amongst the sporting and cultural societies of the town—and after taking into consideration the effects of the disastrous coal strike, which hit Ipswich more than any other town in the State, this company paid a dividend of over 8 per cent. plus a bonus. How are these profits made? Only by the spending power of the worker. Surely some credit must be given to the Government who make this possible.

Now to turn another page of this excellent record we come to the housing programme and what do we find? The value of general building operations, including dwellings completed in Queensland in 1948-49, was estimated at £15,615,000, compared with £9,888,000 in 1946-47. The number of dwellings completed in Queensland during 1947-48 was 9,297 compared with 7,845 in 1946-47. The Housing Commission completed 1,015 houses. Seventy per cent. of all houses in Queensland are occupied by their owners or are in process of being purchased by the occupants. Expenditure by the State Housing Commission totalled £1,553,418. What an enviable achievement! Yet we find criticism levelled at the activities of this department.

During the recent by-election at Ipswich the Liberal Party and its little brother, the Communist Party, endeavoured to make capital out of the non-completion of houses at the One-Mile Estate, Ipswich. Expensive advertisements and photos were inserted in the Press, showing the homes in an uncompleted state and a lot of “Blah, Blah” was said on the stump accusing the Government of all sorts of things in this connection. Now, Mr. Mann, what was the true position. It is over two years ago that tenders were called for the erection of these dwellings. The tender of a firm of building contractors was accepted and work was begun. Foundations of some 12 dwellings were laid. Water, gas and electricity were laid onto the Estate and everything in the garden looked lovely. However, after a few months’ work began to slacken and only spasmodic efforts were made by the contractors. After two years about two dwellings were completed and the contractor finally fell down on the job. Of course, as usual the Government was blamed, but it was

private enterprise that was at fault. The houses in question are now being completed by the Housing Commission.

As a result of this untruthful publicity many insinuations were cast about the town that the Government were not giving Ipswich fair treatment in regard to housing. The Ipswich Chamber of Commerce, which is composed of the business section of the town, wrote to the Secretary for Public Works, asking why Ipswich was so neglected. The Minister replied to the Chamber and the matter was discussed at its last meeting. The result was that the following article appeared in the local paper under big headlines—

“Chamber of Commerce to get information.

“‘Contractors are building houses in other centres, but they will not build here under the same conditions,’ alleged Mr. G. H. Treagle at a meeting of the Ipswich Chamber of Commerce and Industry last night. He said it was a great pity for the city’s progress that homes were not built.

“The meeting was discussing a letter from the Minister for Housing (Mr. Power) which stated that the Housing Commission was continually calling tenders for the erection of houses in Ipswich, and was prepared to negotiate with contractors, who were prepared to tender.

“The Minister also stated that if the Chamber of Commerce had any knowledge of any contractor who was prepared to undertake the building of homes in Ipswich, it should advise the Housing Commission accordingly.

“‘What is the trouble with contractors that they do not tender?’ asked Mr. Treagle. ‘I think there is a fault in Ipswich we did not know before, and I believe the Minister meant what he said. We will get the houses if the contractors will build them.’

“‘There are some other faults besides the Government. Contractors are building houses in other centres, but they will not build here under the same conditions. There seems to be something about Ipswich that is not right,’ he continued.

“Mr. Treagle said there was a challenge from the Government to the contractors. ‘I will find out more about it, because the conditions are no more severe here,’ he added.”

The Treasurer in his Financial Statement points out that ample funds have been provided for a continuance of the Government’s housing scheme and it is no fault of the Government if the contractors refuse to tender.

I now wish to deal with loans and subsidies to local authorities, a subject of great interest to local authorities, ratepayers, and the public generally. The Treasurer has set out in detail Treasury loans and subsidies approved and debenture loans guaranteed for local authorities and local bodies during the 17-year period, 1 July, 1932, to 30 June, 1949. The loans approved or guaranteed

totalled £38,283,770 and the Treasury subsidies approved were £9,935,773. Yet we hear a continued wail that the Government are not helping local authorities.

The Treasurer points out that local authorities continue to show an increasing interest in the provision of water supply and sewerage schemes and much of this interest may be attributed to the generous subsidy scheme provided by the Government.

From my experience as an alderman of the Ipswich City Council for over six years, I have a personal knowledge of the assistance given by the Government by way of subsidy to local authorities. I refer especially to the Ipswich City Council, which for years has taken advantage of the generosity of the Government. Today one large section of the city of Ipswich is completely sewered and work on another is in progress. The completed section cost over £700,000, 50 per cent. of which was paid by the Government. The section in course of construction is estimated to cost £528,000 and there is a Government subsidy of 50 per cent. on this amount also. In addition, augmentation of the Ipswich water supply and construction is estimated to cost £238,000 and a water supply from Goodna to Bundamba is estimated to cost £100,000. On these two projects a Government subsidy of 33½ per cent. will be paid.

The same terms and conditions are available to other local authorities and it is beyond my comprehension why false statements are being continually made as to the lack of assistance given by the Government to local authorities. They have also been relieved of the payment of hospital precepts.

Abundant coal supplies are vital for the successful carrying on of industry and in the Ipswich district there are vast reserves of this useful and necessary product, as is shown by the report of Powell Duffryn Technical Services Ltd. The wages and working conditions of the miners have improved considerably in the last 30 years. In those days the conditions were heart-breaking and back-breaking—no 40-hour week, low wages, and no amenities. Today, because of the efforts of the Miners' Union and sympathetic Labour Governments, there has been a noticeable and distinct improvement in their conditions.

It is pleasing to note that the coal-owners will co-operate in putting into effect the recommendations of the Powell Duffryn report. The majority of coal-owners in the Ipswich district are co-operative and make an effort to improve conditions and provide decent amenities. There are, however, one or two whose greed for gold is causing uneasiness and concern to residents of two suburbs of Ipswich. Some years ago serious subsidences occurred at Blackstone, which has been a mining centre for the past 80 years. These were caused by the failure of coal-owners at the time to take the necessary precautions and as a result huge craters appeared on the roadways and private properties. It was no uncommon sight for a householder to rise from his bed in the morning and find a crater at his front door with fumes and smoke belching from it. Several houses were

removed elsewhere. At a great cost to the Moreton Shire Council these subsidences and cavities were eventually filled in and residents again enjoyed a normal and placid life. "How green was my valley!"

Now, these gold-diggers, whose only aim in life is profits, propose to again disturb the peace and quietude of this suburb by beginning mining operations in what is known as the Borehole Estate. Unfortunately, there is no law to prevent these operations, as the lands in this area, as are most of Ipswich, are owned by the property-owners to a depth of only 50 feet or so. The mining rights were acquired many years ago. Today residents of this suburb are faced with a repetition of what occurred some years ago. The same applies to North Ipswich. Here the mining rights right in the centre of an excellent residential area have been acquired by a small company. On a piece of land about half an acre in area a shaft has been sunk and blasting operations continue night and day. In the vicinity are probably about 20 residences owned and occupied by workers. Are they to suffer annoyance and discomfort and resultant depreciation of their homes?

The Ipswich City Council, which is composed of men of understanding and ability, is fully cognisant of the situation, but until its town-planning scheme is put into operation its hands are tied. I realise the need for extra coal to be produced, but surely, with thousands of acres available in and around the district, some other location could be found for the sinking of shafts or tunnels? I believe that the newly-formed Coal Board has the power and authority to prevent such things as this, and it is to be hoped that it will take speedy action to do so.

Before I conclude I quote these words of the Hon. the Treasurer—

"Queensland has a record of excellent achievements. In addition many important projects are being carried out. Further plans for future industrial development on a scale of magnitude are ready for implementation and the funds are available to finance them."

Knowing the fair-mindedness of hon. members opposite and their penchant for the truth, I feel assured that when this session is concluded and they go back to report to their electors, the first words they will utter are these: "There is no doubt the Labour Government are doing a mighty job."

**Honourable Members: Hear, hear!**

**Mr. HILEY (Logan) (11.26 a.m.):** The Address presented by the Treasurer is remarkable in many ways—for the great sums that it contains, the length of its contents and, above all else, for the ability with which the Treasurer has kept only one eye open for advantages in favour of the Government in view of the coming elections. It is perfectly obvious when one examines the contents of such a document that it was compiled by someone who had only one eye open, an eye open to detect anything that was good and to the advantage of the Government and an eye resolutely closed to anything that

operated against the Government. In other words, as a highly partisan document it must stand as a classic for all time.

**Mr. Brown:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. HILEY:** Even the hon. member for Buranda says, "Hear, hear."

These are times when the trend in published accounts enables us to detect a certain tendency that has developed over the last generation and is today in the highest flood of all our experience. We find, partly as a result of statutory direction and partly as the result of some particular approach to some accounting question, that there are two distinct tendencies, one is that accounts must be rendered more fully and the other that there is an ever closer direction to the subject of truth. The result is that the old practice of secret reserves is being thrown aside. Indeed, in England today this has been carried to the point of statutory prohibition. I quite expect that before long Australia will do exactly the same thing as England has already done—that is, to ban secrecy in the statement of accounts and the whole endeavour will be to present the accounts in a manner as simple as possible, and as true as possible. It should be the practice for the Treasurer to present to the people a Financial Statement that mirrors not only the balances at the Treasury but also the truth about the flow of the tide in the economic affairs of this great State. What do we find in the Statement submitted to us.

The first basic accountancy approach is a survival of the reign of Queen Victoria. We still have no regard to anything outside cash transactions. For instance, if the Railway Department carries a certain quantity of goods in a financial year on credit and no money is actually received within the financial year, the Treasurer takes no notice of the transaction. He shows no income in respect of it until he actually collects the money. On the other hand, if the department incurs real liabilities, as for long-service leave and accrued recreation leave—liabilities in the truest sense of the word—no record is made of these as liabilities because they have not been met in cash.

The result is that the Treasurer can either build up inventories of his stocks or reduce them; he can build up commitments or he can reduce them. Those things pass over his accounting head completely. The only thing he has regard for is what money passes in or out of the fund in the Treasury.

**Mr. Hilton** interjected.

**Mr. HILEY:** If the hon. member for Carnarvon were abreast of accounting practices he would know that a tide of budgetary reform is sweeping over the world, but he is still an advocate of the old Victorian approach in a generation that is fast realising its imperfections.

**Mr. Hilton:** You do not know the first rules of debate.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. HILEY:** There is still no attempt by the Treasurer to distinguish expenditure for capital purposes from expenditure in terms of revenue. He has no regard for the growth or diminution of inventories and he has no regard whatever for depreciation in capital assets bought in earlier years that are wearing out in this year and will continue to wear out in subsequent years of use. Moreover, in many directions, some of which I propose to illustrate, the Treasurer's Financial Statement does not reflect losses incurred in some of the Government's trading sections, which are financed and hidden so far as the Consolidated Revenue Fund is concerned in the Trust and Special Funds. His accounting approach is deficient inasmuch as his Financial Statement does not disclose the real value of these transactions.

Take the Financial Statement as it stands. The Treasurer boasts of a surplus of £49,723. That is the best surplus that he can produce after admitting that he has had recourse to reserves to the extent of £1,586,030, withdrawn this year from the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Fund. Even after that gigantic withdrawal the best surplus he can show is one of £49,723. Then he admits that in this financial year he did face up to losses not incurred in this year, but in years gone by, to the extent of £100,000. He met losses to the extent of £10,000 on the Irvinebank State Treatment Works; £30,000 on the State coal-mines; £30,000 was absorbed in the State coke works, while £40,000 was part of a deficiency for outgoings from the Stock Diseases Fund. Whilst he did absorb £100,000 in this financial year, he still reports unrecouped deficiencies in this fund amounting to no less a sum than £324,218. His own figures show that the deficiency carried forward in connection with Irvinebank State Treatment Works still amounts to £25,965, that the State coal-mines carry forward a deficiency of £151,820, that the State coke works carry forward a deficiency of £40,000 odd, and that the Stock Diseases Fund is still overdrawn, after absorbing £40,000, to the tune of £106,642. Who can say that there was a surplus in the accounts for the past year when you have regard for these vast unrecouped losses and when you reflect on the fact that it was necessary to have recourse to reserves of £1,586,000?

**Mr. Aikens:** He only told us what he actually had in the till.

**Mr. HILEY:** That is so. If any company director released accounts of that aboriginal standard he would be either laughed to scorn or dealt with under the Criminal Code. The law of the State makes it abundantly clear that directors who produce a surplus by drawing on reserves are engaged in a policy of deception and that their action is reprehensible. It was that practice that sent Lord Kylsant, managing director of the Royal Mail Packet Steamship Co., to gaol for two years in the second division. His policy was to live on reserves, concealing their withdrawal, when in fact the accounts of the company were experiencing a loss.

**Mr. Aikens:** Balfour and Bottomley.

**Mr. HILEY:** The Treasurer is in notable company. (Opposition laughter.) I say that this surplus, viewed in that light, loses all significance. It is merely the extent to which money happens to remain in one of the Government's bank accounts. Other funds can be stripped bare by withdrawals from reserves, but the Treasurer still parades that very doubtful surplus.

The Treasurer boasts of loan expenditure. He tells us he is going to spend from the Loan Fund this year on public works an amount totalling £9,500,000. The Loan Fund will supply the bulk of it, amounting to over £5,000,000. He told us also that the gross Public Debt will increase by £5,441,000. Let me say that I have not the slightest general aversion to borrowing; on the contrary, overdrafts and loans are often the sign of a vigorous developing business. I can say, regarding Queensland's economy as a whole that a loan programme must be present in a young developing State like this. Neither do I seek to criticise the Treasurer's general management. I have expressed perfect agreement with the policy he has followed—a policy that demanded a progressive reduction of interest rates, a progressive repatriation of loans from overseas—from London and New York, to Australia.

Whilst I agree with the general tendencies of the Treasurer's management of the loan funds, I noticed that last year we raised £5,492,123 in London to convert a loan that was falling due. Let us have a look at the background and consider why this State saw fit to borrow money in London to convert a loan falling due there. Never in its history has the Australian nation—and this State is part of it—had more funds in London lying idle, more funds eating their heads off in idleness in London. If ever there was a time when you could safely afford to retire London loans, last year was the year more than any year.

Why did this State see fit to borrow in London approximately £5,500,000, in order to renew a London loan?

**Mr. Burrows:** You know quite well that you are only advocating that because it would embarrass the British Government. Go to the library and read the Industrial and Financial Review of Australia.

**Mr. HILEY:** Whilst I do not doubt the poverty to which the present Administration has reduced the British nation, I have yet to be convinced that so much hangs on the repayment of £5,500,000 by the State of Queensland. Does the hon. member mean to tell me that it would embarrass the British Government if the Australian Government refunded to Britain £5,500,000? We are not taking it from them; we are giving it to them.

**Mr. Burrows:** You know the implication involved.

**Mr. HILEY:** The implication is that if we repaid it we should no longer have round our neck an obligation for interest externally;

we should pay that interest locally to Australian bondholders. If the hon. member wants to stand up as an advocate for overseas loans, let me tell him that I want to repatriate every penny of them.

**Mr. Burrows:** You would put another brick around the poor old Britisher's neck.

**Mr. HILEY:** I clearly question the wisdom of the Treasurer's action this year, which was the reverse of what has been his general policy. His general policy—and it is one he should take now—is to repatriate every London loan as it fell due for conversion. Why he chooses this particular year, when our funds in London are more embarrassing to us and more embarrassing to Britain than ever in history, to renew a £5,500,000 loan in London is something I frankly cannot understand.

The Treasurer has another obligation in using the Loan Fund, that is, to have regard to a need that was not realised 20 years ago but is realised among financial circles today—to avoid anything that contributes to stepping up inflation in the community he serves. To go back to the early days: neither in the Federal sphere under Mr. Scullin or in the State sphere under Mr. Moore, or among the Governments generally for that matter, was there any real appreciation of the part Governments can play either towards countering a depression on the one hand or controlling inflation on the other. If one lesson has been learned from bitter experience over the last generation it has been that Treasurers, whether in the Federal or State spheres, have a very important part to play in protecting the people against the threat of depression or arresting the tide of inflation. In very many directions Treasurers, both in the Federal and State spheres, have introduced positive measures with that very object in view.

In the principal directions that are open to Governments in Australia to arrest the tide of inflation at this moment it seems to me Governments are doing much less than should be possible. Governments can arrest the tide of inflation by their taxation policy. They can do it by their control of banking policy, by the extent to which they throw extra loan money into circulation on a market already over-supplied with money and under-supplied with goods. At the moment there is every appearance that, just as in the depression Governments did everything possible to add to the degree of depression most Governments in Australia are doing everything possible to try to extend inflation.

To support this charge let us take an illustration: in the first place, I stated that taxation policy can contribute to the effects of inflation. In the old days, the members of the Australian Labour Party, for different reasons, were strong champions of direct taxation, and strong opponents of indirect taxation, contending that a direct tax was at least selective—it did not tax the wealthiest in the community and the poorest in the community at the same rate, which is the cardinal criticism levelled at indirect taxation.

Although it was not present in their arguments, there is an inflationary effect of indirect taxation. Direct taxation does not push up price levels in the community, whereas every indirect tax does. For instance, customs duty is not paid by the importer, it is paid by the man who buys the goods. Sales tax is not paid by the manufacturer or the distributor but by the customer. And so it goes on. Pay-roll tax happens to be paid in the first instance by the employer but it goes into his cost of production and is paid by the man who buys the products of his factory. So, Mr. Mann, it is my contention that Governments throughout Australia, by their concentration on indirect taxation today, have made a material contribution to the effects of inflation at work.

**Mr. Aikens:** Would not the same thing apply to direct income tax?

**Mr. HILEY:** No, direct income tax does not go on to the cost of the product; it withdraws something from the spending power of the man who has made the money and reduces spending power in the community; it does not push up the price of goods. Indirect taxation inevitably pushes up the prices of goods. A way in which Governments of late have added to the effects of inflation has been by the pushing forward of loan programmes in acceleration of the extent to which the community can supply the goods and man-power to enable those programmes to be put into operation.

Take several of the matters mentioned by the Treasurer for his works programme. These items mean more competitors for too little steel, more competitors for too little timber, more competitors for too little cement, and more competitors for too little man-power. If the Government boast, as the Treasurer appears to do in his speech, that it is a fine and wonderful thing for Queensland that we should choose, in this year, to push our loan expenditure up to record levels, the Treasurer should have regard for the fact that at the same time he is making too definite a contribution to the extra inflationary pressure that has already taken so sad a toll of our Australian community.

There are other directions in which the Government fail to arrest some of the factors leading to inflation in this country. Nearly two years ago I drew the attention of the people to the problem that arises from the unrestricted pouring of speculating funds into Australia, adding to the already excessive pressure of too much money for too few goods. I told them at the time of the South African experience and of the experience of the Irish Free State into which speculating capital or refugee capital was pouring from sterling areas and swamping their economy. Those were unrequited money transfers. They were mere transfers of money. No goods moved into the country.

What happened? In the Irish Free State that flood was so strong that the Government had to put up legislation to stop it.

In South Africa, where the flood reached such a pace that in one quarter 100,000,000 sterling moved rapidly from sterling quarters to South Africa, the Government had to put restrictions up, and I warned that the same thing would happen here. The Government did nothing, and the result is that the very latest report published by the Commonwealth Bank draws attention to the fact that our excessive London funds at the moment are swollen by at least £110,000,000 that it can recognise, as either speculating or refugee capital. This is not genuine investments by people who want to bring capital assets to this country, to conduct genuine businesses—we cannot have too many of that sort of transfer—but the manoeuvring of people who simply play the money markets of the world and send their money to where they think they might pick up capital appreciation because of devaluation or a correction in the exchange rate between Australia and England, or something like that; under no circumstances are these people of any use to this country, and the Governments should put up some barrier to prevent that vast sum from coming here.

**Mr. Macdonald:** They are vultures.

**Mr. HILEY:** They are. They should be prevented from coming here to the extent of £110,000,000, which the Commonwealth Bank parades as a fact, simply to add to the already too great pressure of too much money chasing too few goods, which, in a few words, is the real story of inflation in Australia.

So the story of what Governments have failed to do in Australia to arrest this tide of inflation does not make pleasant reading today. It is clear from what the Treasurer tells us that this State is embarking on a vast programme of loan expenditure.

Normally, the State, just like an individual, borrows money for either of two reasons. It borrows either because it is having a bad time or because it is confidently going ahead with a big programme, the financing of which exceeds its current resources. It is clear that this State is not borrowing money at the present time because it is hard up. On the contrary, it is borrowing money because it wants to go ahead with some very big programmes, with which I am not quarrelling but which it says are beyond its current resources. What should cause this State to borrow more money this year than in any year in the past decade? Never were the exports of this State or Australia better. Never, in world terms, was Australia better off. In 1939 Australia's exports totalled £135,000,000 in value. In 1948 they totalled £404,000,000 in value; and in 1949, with wool prices still continuing to soar, it seems to me whatever the figures that the value will be higher again. Not that I am carried away by mere figures of money value. In 1939 Australia exported 63,000,000 bushels of wheat, which produced £8,750,000. In 1948 Australia exported 60,000,000 bushels of wheat and received six times 1939's value, namely, £52,750,000. In regard to wool, although the quantitative export is better, last

year we exported 18,000,000 cwt. compared with 9,500,000 cwt. in 1939. Last year we received £148,000,000 compared with £42,500,000 in 1939.

My point is this: If we seriously accept the need for borrowing when programmes are beyond current resources, then on any examination of the Australian economy this should be a year in which we should need to borrow less than last year. Never was the Australian economy more richly endowed with tremendous prices for our exportable surpluses. Instead of building more debts, we should be finding it possible to add to our reserves. I say on the question of inflation that when our economy is out of balance with too much money circulating in the community in relation to the goods available, the Government's heavy loan expenditure adds weight to the overloaded side. It makes inflation worse. I say that inflation, the real thief of our generation, is destroying under our very eyes the value of savings, killing the hopes of young people saving up to be married, and callously repudiating the real value of Government bonds and war gratuities in a manner that is within the law but offends every sense of moral values.

There is one cry prevalent in every section of the Australian community today and that is: For goodness sake give us stability of money values; don't let us live in a world where values are moving with such rapidity that we cannot plan and budget.

**Mr. Aikens:** You do not know how much the pound will buy tomorrow.

**Mr. HILEY:** Exactly. Too many Governments are doing too much to accentuate a state that is already bad enough.

If there was ever a cause for criticism I should say that the opening peroration of the Treasurer is deserving of censure, because in the last few pages of his Financial Statement he presents a completely one-sided picture of the prospects, showing us only the beautiful, without regard for the serious difficulties. In his adulatory peroration he presents a picture of a Treasurer blown up with pride and achievement, blind to the needs that confront him and as a result he produces two pages that strike me as a failure to look at the other side of the picture. He starts off by claiming presentation of a balanced Budget. Having regard to the extent to which he has eaten into reserves and has failed to face up to the losses incurred on some enterprises, that myth of a balanced Budget is pretty well exploded.

His next point of approach is that of full employment and on that score let me say this: During the last few years the arrangement of full employment in the Australian community has been thanks to no Government. It is no credit to any Government that full employment has been possible in the Australian community. On the contrary, we have for years failed to keep pace with the normal requirements in the housing and building

needs of the people and in that respect alone the lag is sufficient to provide for full employment in Australia for many years. We have record prices for our exportable surpluses, after years in which no Treasurer should have to face up to any real difficulties in the employment situation. If the Treasurer had provided full employment while the price of wool was below par, I should have said, "Well done!" but it has been full employment in a period in which there was no occasion for a Government to do anything; and so Governments have done nothing to make full employment possible. The statement by the Treasurer becomes a specious parade of something that happened in spite of anything the Treasurer did.

On this question it can fairly be said that much of the full employment of the last two years has been relatively wasteful and has not been of maximum use. Full employment that is not at the same time useful employment, does not impress me as being good employment. Waste is bad for any nation at any time. In the last two years we have had on far too many occasions the spectacle of waste of valuable man-power through the absence of raw material to keep industries going to capacity; because of the shortage of material there has been a decline in productivity amounting to waste. The test of employment is the extent to which it is really useful and helpful in supplying the needs of the community and by that test some of the full employment of the last two years must be looked at with rather a jaundiced eye.

Then the Treasurer refers to increased wealth production, and so far as money value goes there is not the slightest doubt about the truth of that. Never in our history have we commanded such money wealth. But there is another side to the picture, which gives serious concern, and that is the extent to which the quantities of some of our products have not improved and have indeed gone back. That is so in a great industry like the dairying industry and of the cotton industry, with its great potentialities. The Treasurer has told the people and this Chamber that the money value of some of our exports are magnificently up but there is the fact, which gives real concern, that some of our industries are not expanding but are in fact shrinking.

Then the Treasurer speaks of "Full assistance for co-operative enterprise and for other industrial enterprise." I do not know exactly what the Treasurer means by that. It sounds nice on paper. If he means that it has been physically possible for factories and other enterprises in Queensland to build what they wanted and when they wanted it, he knows very well that that is not true. At the present time the opportunities of expanding Queensland industries are restricted by the shortage of factory and warehouse space, and other forms of commercial space. We are growing far out of balance in the proportion of commercial space to domestic housing. I do not find any quarrel with his statement that there has been some increase in production, but I do quarrel with the attitude presented in the

report, which seeks to show that there has been an ever-growing tendency to increase physical production in the State.

The Treasurer then refers to the provision of greater funds for electricity supply and rural electrification. This is one of the best directions of Government purpose, but even there the Treasurer will have to explain why he has disappointed us and countless thousands of people in this respect. For years we have looked forward to the development of the Tully Falls scheme and at the moment it appears to be no closer to its fulfilment than it was some years ago when it was first mentioned and was in the blue-print stage. I want to see the Tully Falls scheme operating. I want to see these things pushed ahead. The Treasurer has no concern about the slowness with which some of these concerns are moving to a conclusion, but many people have.

Then the Treasurer speaks of the regard of his Government for water conservation and irrigation. That is quite true. Let us all be quite clear about it, that in this State there is a belated approach to the opportunities of water conservation and irrigation, in marked contrast to what took place in some of the other States. Whilst today there is a changed outlook on the part of the Government on these matters, we should be miles ahead in water conservation and irrigation than we find ourselves at the moment. Whilst it is true that extra funds have been earmarked for this purpose, it is abundantly clear that the State would have the greatest difficulty in pushing its plans ahead, because of the shortage of material and man-power. The shortage of man-power is a difficulty partially created by the Government in the payment of niggardly salaries. Because of this fact the Government are finding it harder and harder in the technical sections of the Public Service not only to hold but attract good men. Their approach to water conservation and irrigation will be severely limited by the absence of skilled men to carry out that important work.

Now we come to the part of the Budget that boasts of increased expenditure on the utilisation of our coal resources. That is quite true, but it is a tragic confession to make. It is a confession of failure on the part of the Government to grasp those opportunities, which have existed in the past, and we have continued it over the years by the expenditure of a niggardly sum amounting to a few thousand pounds a year on exploiting our coal reserves. Yet we are now prepared to spend £143,000 for that purpose, which is more money than the Department of Mines has spent in ten previous years. The Government have now spent £143,000 in one year in an attempt to repair the deficiencies of the past. They have obtained technical advisers from England, where the industry has been nationalised, but if there is one industry in England that has shown up badly by world standards, it is the coal industry. England has not been able to produce in the coal industry more than a ton per man per day. Here we have the spectacle of a great producing nation like England, which has not been able to produce better than

1 ton per man-day, and yet we are paying experts from that country to come and tell this State, which last year boasted of an output of 3½ tons per man per day, how to develop the industry. We want to go to those parts of the world for expert advice where coal production in the past has been carried on successfully. We should have gone to the Ruhr or to the United States of America, where the methods of developing coal resources are infinitely better than those obtaining in England. We are choosing to spend a vast sum this year in an attempt to overcome our deficiencies in the past, but it is a crying shame that we have not been able by our own efforts to build up something that would have been of perpetual value to the people.

We are told, too, that we are to have co-operation from the Commonwealth in expanding the cattle industry. If the Treasurer there is speaking of things to come he might be right, but if he is speaking of things that have happened I tell him plainly that it is not so. There has not been effective co-operation in the past between the Commonwealth and State in extending the cattle industry. In fact, the output from it has fallen. Whilst the Government are showing an interest in the channel country and other schemes that may do something in the future for the cattle industry, let us clear up the position now and say that not one acorn has fallen from the tree. The tree has still to grow before reaching a state of fruition.

The Treasurer also had something to say on the housing policy of the Government and promises more generous terms to home-builders. On that point I say that it is quite true the Housing Commission has a record of improved performance, but do not let us shut our eyes, as the Treasurer does, to the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of people who are either homeless or living under sub-standard conditions. You saw the picture in the Press the other day of accommodation in Victoria Park, where families were living in huts partitioned with calico. Are you satisfied with that? Are you satisfied with the knowledge that thousands of people in this State are living under crude conditions? By all means honour the Housing Commission for the good it has done, but sensible people should show a sense of humility in realising the tremendous task that lies ahead of us. I am nauseated by this vanity and refusal to acknowledge the greatest task that lies ahead.

As to the question of easing the conditions for home builders, on any measurement of the Government's recent proposal I say it savours of giving a man with pneumonia an aspirin; that is about the relative value of what is proposed. It is true that the rising cost of home construction is becoming a nightmare to the young people but interest help or some free insurance is playing with the problem. There is serious need for the Government to acknowledge the greater trouble that still lies uncorrected.

I acknowledge that the Government's work in regard to main roads for a generation has

been continuous and good. I have no criticism to offer concerning their performance in regard to roads.

The next point refers to continued work in land settlement and substantial sums for ex-service men and other borrowers from the Agricultural Bank. Every member heard the contribution to the debate of the hon. member for Hamilton who as a result of his own personal observations set out some of the real difficulties facing soldier settlers in this State. It is true that the Government have done something for soldier settlers; it is equally true that they should do a great deal more. They have not, as they are obligated to do, prepared one farm a settler could go on and find it ready for occupation. On many places, in company with the hon. member for Hamilton, I saw men on properties that were under heavy timber and they faced the task of clearing it before they could get the first crop planted. Those men have lost enough valuable years of their lives—irreplaceable years—fighting the enemies of this country; and it is absurd to see this Government smirking over the fact that they have done so much when they merely have said to the settler, "Here is a timbered block; get onto it and make a property out of it." The Government know that their contractual obligations with the Commonwealth Government were to provide farms ready for immediate occupation. They are not honouring that obligation when they put a settler onto a heavily-timbered block.

The chorus of praise from hon. members opposite of the amount of subsidies for local authorities and local bodies continues. Quite true. The Financial Statement says that the public-works policy is based on the needs of the State and upon the technical staff and general labour and materials available. With the first half of that statement I could agree but as to the second half, not in one year since he took the mantle of office has the Treasurer ever succeeded in spending his loan appropriation. Every year we have had the same thing—the material could not be procured and the manpower was not available. By what miracle of arrangement can this year become an exception when the bidding has been pushed over to £9,500,000? By what miracle will the State find it possible to command technical staff, materials and general labour to carry out the vast programme it proposes?

The Treasurer goes on to refer to the further implementation of the Government's policy of decentralisation. As a piece of plain rot, that is a classic, because this Government have done more by their fundamental policy to bring about centralisation than any other Government, because the Treasurer who presents this Budget imposes a higher tax on transport than any of his predecessors. It is a record tax on transport. How in the name of fortune can the tax on transport encourage decentralisation? Every tax on transport is a positive penalty on decentralisation. This same man who produces a Budget containing a record revenue from tax on transport parades it as a munificent contribution to decentralisation.

He then gets back to the Moore regime and refers to "the fullest opportunity for young Queenslanders." On that point we can only say what happens. Frankly, I must confess I do not know what it means in essence, but if he is referring to the young Queenslanders of school age, and if the "fullest opportunities for young Queenslanders" means the fullest opportunities to be taught in classes larger than any educationists recognise as fair or as far as accommodation warrants—the fullest opportunities to be squeezed in seven into forms constructed for five, the fullest opportunities to be taught lessons under a tree in the school-yard or on a school veranda (never was accommodation in schools in this State more inadequate for the growing needs)—that is not the sort of opportunity I want to see.

Then we come to "further action to continue the equitable distribution of wealth." What does the Treasurer mean by that? If, of course, he means the Golden Casket, that would be a consideration. In one direction, that is, inherited wealth, where the Treasurer has it within his province to effect a fundamentally equitable distribution of wealth, neither this Government nor any of their predecessors have lifted one finger to do so by putting weight of taxation there, but they have done a great deal to keep the poor man struggling, to keep him poorer by taxation of the wealth he has earned. Not a finger has been lifted to increase the tax on inherited wealth. The heaviest weight of taxation is on earned income.

"More generous workers' compensation legislation," he says. Let me observe that the amount no more than reflects the inflation to which the Government have made such material contribution. There is no real increase in the spending capacity of workers' compensation benefits or in the true worth of the amount payable on death: it merely reflects the reduced value of currency. We still find that a Government, on the face of things pledged to support what they call the workers, still preserve the absolute privilege of the Crown in relation to the workers. If an injured worker chooses to appeal against the decision of the Commissioner he is still in the position that if he wins the appeal he can collect one guinea in costs from the Commissioner; but if he loses the appeal the department set up by these friends of the worker mulct him for every penny of costs it can lay its hands on. One rule for the department and a different rule entirely for the worker, the subject of this case.

The Treasurer proceeded to say, "Close attention to the cost of living." All I can say is that the cost of living has had attention and that attention has resulted in the terrific rise we have in the cost of everything. If the Government pretend that they are able to keep the cost of living in check, they have lost touch with the people and the average housewife in the community.

His Statement proceeds to say, "Continued careful attention to public health." On the side of public health this Government can fairly claim some of their most important

contributions to the well-being of the people of this State, but the Treasurer should add that some of the steps taken have been taken at the urgent insistence of the Opposition. For instance, take the matter recently before the House concerning the testing of dairy herds in this State for T.B. In 1944 such a campaign was vehemently urged from this side of the Chamber. It was resisted from the Government side, unanimously. It was one of our main election points, and I can remember the observations made by the present Premier and some of his colleagues about the monstrous suggestion of the Opposition in trying to frighten the people concerning the testing of dairy herds in this State for T.B. Within two years we find that the Government see the light of day and admit the truth of what we said. I repeat that the Government have done something for the health of the community, but at least the Treasurer should open his other eye and pay a bit of credit to this side, where it is due.

Then finally—one thrown in apparently for good measure—is “abundant funds for social services in general, including the needs of women and children in particular.” So far as this State is concerned, that is utter rot. This State does nothing of any material value in connection with social services. As the Treasurer well knows, the great bulk of the social services programme falls within the responsibility of the Federal Government.

So I say that looking at the Budget, apart from the points of positive rejection I have raised, one of which was the manner in which it is presented, I am led on this occasion to criticise the Treasurer for departing from what I feel was a customary standard of approach, that of dealing objectively with the real problems in our economy. By all means let us give credit where it is due, but also by all means, as responsible legislators, with an air of humility when we consider the great tasks lying ahead of us, let us be prepared to portray fairly to the people of this State some of the problems that confront this Government and will exercise the minds of succeeding Governments.

**Mr. DONALD (Bremer) (12.17 p.m.):** I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on the way he has handled the finances of this State during the past 12 months. To have finished the year's work with a credit balance of £49,723 is a great achievement, particularly when we take into consideration the many major difficulties encountered during the period under review. Is it any wonder the people of Queensland give loyal support to the Labour Government?

This revenue surplus of almost £50,000 is not an accident but the result of careful planning, capable administration and wise legislation. Nor is the surplus a fluke or an unusual happening in Labour-governed Queensland. It is the tenth surplus in a period of 11 years, the only deficit recorded during this period having resulted from the railway strike of 1948. It is without doubt a very creditable performance, a performance that brings distinction to the Premier, his Cabinet Ministers, and other members of the

Government Party generally, and supplies the reason why the electors of Queensland have shown unwavering confidence in the Labour Government for over three decades.

I admit that it is also wonderful political propaganda, very effective propaganda, but even our political opponents are forced to agree that it is a true record of the work and success of the Government and a true reflection of the worth of the Labour Party to the workers and people of Queensland in general.

As we are of the people, a distinction that cannot truthfully be claimed by any other political party, it is only natural that we should sponsor legislation that brings prosperity and security to our people. This has resulted in the Government of Queensland's enjoying a degree of trust and confidence from the people that is not found in any other part of the world. For this reason we have remained the Government of Queensland for such a long period; for this reason we have not to spend fortunes on political propaganda, as do the Opposition parties; and for this reason also the extensive and expensive propaganda indulged in by the opponents of Labour generally fails to defeat or discredit the Government.

When Government members draw a comparison between the splendid record of the present and past Queensland Labour Governments with the inefficient and disastrous administration of the last anti-Labour Government to sit on the Treasury benches of this State, whose deficits run into millions of pounds, Opposition members contend that the comparison is unfair, stating that the Moore Government were in office during the last world-wide depression. Therefore, Mr. Mann, we will forget their mismanagement and inefficiency, and compare the doings of three anti-Labour Governments now in office in Australia with those of our own Government.

The Honourable the Treasurer announced when presenting the Financial Statement to the Committee, that there remained a surplus of almost £50,000 on last year's transactions. Now let us examine the position in Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, the three States handicapped by anti-Labour Governments; I use the word “handicapped” advisedly. In Victoria, in spite of all the publicity given to the Government of that State, they finished their year's work with a deficit of £1,374,933, and so little confidence have they in themselves and so little regard have they for their ability to manage the State of Victoria effectively that they have estimated a deficit of almost £2,000,000 for the coming year, the exact figure being £1,925,280. In South Australia the deficit was £344,882, and in Western Australia it reached £886,000. Therefore, the best of the anti-Labour Governments was £394,605 behind the Queensland Government in managing the affairs of their State.

We cannot overlook the important factor, in making these comparisons, that each of

these States has had generous financial assistance from the Commonwealth Labour Government, South Australia receiving a special grant of £2,850,000, and Western Australia received a special grant of £3,600,000. Victoria received £17,054,961 in direct payment from the Federal Government; South Australia, £9,682,917; and Western Australia £10,620,109. For the assistance of primary producers Victoria received from a Commonwealth Labour Government, who are supposed not to take an interest in primary producers, £2,609,658, and South Australia £1,028,543, whilst the Western Australian Government benefited to the extent of £1,302,254. The subsidy paid to the dairying industry in Victoria by a Commonwealth Labour Government was £1,338,411, South Australia £384,938 and Western Australia £275,283. The total payments by the Commonwealth Labour Government to Victoria were £19,730,845, South Australia £10,743,852 and Western Australia £11,945,477. Yet in spite of this very generous assistance they could not balance their Budgets. These comparisons reveal the necessity of maintaining a Labour Government in Queensland and returning the present Federal Labour Government to office following the next election.

If further proof is needed that the contention of the Opposition that the primary producer is neglected by Labour Governments is wrong, it is obtained by comparing the Commonwealth Budget of 1938-39 when the anti-Labour Government were in office with the Budget of 1948-49, with Labour at the helm.

If hon. members opposite and the people generally would take the trouble to examine the Commonwealth Budget they would find that the Commonwealth Labour Government had given this magnificent help to the primary industries for the year 1948-49—

Assistance for Relief of Primary Producers—1948-49.

Dairy Industry Subsidy ..	£4,802,951
Efficiency Grant .. .. .	141,356
Assistance to Wheat Industry—	
Special Payment .. .. .	7,875
Herd Testing Contribution ..	20,000
Pedigree Stock—Assistance to	
Importers .. .. .	1,854
Stock Feeders—Assistance ..	20,991
Bounties—	
Tractor .. .. .	37,146
Wine Export .. .. .	1,918
Cattle Tick Control .. .. .	53,325
Superphosphate Subsidy ..	3,373,105
Nitrogenous Fertilizers ..	163,813
Drought Relief .. .. .	43
Tobacco Industry—Assistance	5,821
Flood Relief .. .. .	8,400
	<hr/>
	£8,638,598

I propose now to compare the foregoing table with the Budget of the political party that claims to be the friend of the primary

producer. This is what it did for the primary producer in 1938-39, the last year it was in office—

Assistance to Wheat Industry	£1,756,732
Special payment during operation of Flour Tax .. .. .	51,961
Bounties—	
Cotton .. .. .	115,012
Iron and Steel Products ..	23,049
Sulphur .. .. .	87,575
Wine Export .. .. .	167,872
Apple and Pear .. .. .	529
Citrus Fruits .. .. .	9,904
Prune .. .. .	29
Apple and Pear Research	10,000
Tobacco Investigation .. ..	10,000
Cattle Tick Control .. .. .	69,450
Pearl Shell Industry—Assistance .. .. .	5,300
Artificial Fertilizer Subsidy	206,020
Training of Dairy Farmer Operatives .. .. .	550
Farmers' Debt Adjustment (from Loan Fund) .. .. .	2,000,000
	<hr/>
	£4,513,983

It will be seen from those figures that the anti-Labour Government gave the primary producers £5,124,615 less than the amount given to them by the Commonwealth Labour Government. Even allowing for the fact that the value of the £1 has varied, we find that in one respect alone, the subsidy granted to the dairying industry, the Commonwealth Labour Government gave more to the primary industries than the anti-Labour Government gave in the financial year 1938-39 under all heads.

Should our critics still be unconvinced, a perusal of the Commonwealth Attorney-General's reports on bankruptcy should remove all their doubts. In 1938-39, under anti-Labour rule, 1,889 people went bankrupt, and farmers headed the list with 419, but in 1948-49, under Labour's wise Government, only 331 people were forced into bankruptcy, and of this number only 14 were farmers and they did not head the list.

This proves conclusively that Labour is the farmer's true friend, and what is worrying the Opposition is that the farmer is beginning to recognise it.

All fair-minded people will admit that the Budget contains a very comprehensive and soundly based programme of works for the progress of our State. Expenditure has been very wisely allocated, in that it provides for the development of resources in all parts of the State.

The State railways play a more important part in the lives of our people and the development of our State than most people realise. They form a very important and useful unit in our economic life, and render a service that is not fully appreciated by the people generally. Without our railway system we could not exist. In spite of the adverse criticism levelled against the Railway Department it has served the State well and is still serving it well. It is the largest undertaking in the State and the largest consumer

of our coal, of great assistance to the primary producers, and gives direct and indirect employment to many thousands throughout the State.

The value of the railways to the progress of our State is shown by the record amount of business transacted last year. The carrying of almost 7,000,000 tons of goods and livestock is no small achievement, particularly when you take into consideration that in addition to this large and varied range of goods transported the number of passenger journeys made was 32,661,550.

It is pleasing to note that ample provision is being made to meet the immediate and future needs of the railways. While it is noted that the railway workshops throughout the State are working to full capacity, attention is also drawn to the fact that almost £3,000,000 in contracts has been let with Queensland firms for rolling stock. In each of our railway workshops we have a large number of employees who are trained specialists in railway work, and I trust care is being exercised to see that they are not left without work at some future date.

The working of our railways resulted in a surplus of £1,133,064 in cash receipts over expenditure, but a staggering interest bill of almost £1½ million resulted in a deficit of £339,534. This deficiency could have been avoided by following the usual business practice of refusing to render service unless there was profit to be made. However, I feel confident that there are few who would recommend following this line of action after they had given the matter some thought. Generally speaking, the railways have given valuable service to the community and no-one can deny that they have at all times been prepared to help other industries, even when that help meant carrying a burden that was not profitable to the Railway Department. There is not one hon. member in this Chamber who is prepared to advocate the abolition of any of the concessions granted by the railways to various sections of the public, though these concessions, while being of great value to the State as a whole, are unprofitable to the railways, and make their task of earning sufficient revenue to meet a high interest bill and show a profit on the year's transactions almost impossible.

The following concessions granted by the Government on the railways give some indication of the valuable service the railways are giving to the people of our State. The hon. the Treasurer announced in his Budget Speech that railway concessions granted to ex-service personnel had reached £606,000 up to 30 June, 1949. To this date, concessions on special excursion fares granted to the women and children of the West, enabling them to visit the coast, amounted to £788,000. Freight rebates of up to 50 per cent. have been granted to men on the land for conveying fodder for starving stock. The value of rebates on starving stock, fodder for starving stock, restocking freights, and store stock rebates, has exceeded £1,000,000—quite a tidy sum. As considerable railway concessions in addition to those mentioned were granted,

we should feel very grateful indeed to the men responsible for this service, which has benefited every section of the community.

The year has seen the setting up of the State Coal Board; the issuing of the Powell Duffryn Technical Services Ltd. report on the coal resources and the coal industry of Queensland, the provision for the appointment of a tutor in mining engineering at the University and a full-time instructor in coal-mine engineering at the Ipswich Technical College. Individually they should be of great value to the industry; collectively they must provide the industry with the solution of many of its problems.

The National Coal Board of Britain and the Joint Coal Board in New South Wales have more than justified their creation and are continuing their good work. To give hon. members some idea of the work of the National Coal Board of Britain I will quote from a summary of the board's annual report for 1948, which was published in the July issue of "Coal," the official organ of the board. There is a picture of a pithead in Great Britain and when one looks at it and thinks of the conditions and the lack of amenities that prevail in Queensland and throughout Australia, one feels envious. The article is headed—

"1948: A Year of Profit, Settling Down, Advance.

"Here is a brief summary of the N.C.B. Annual Report for 1948 which was presented to Parliament on 22 June. It shows that a trading loss has been converted into a trading profit of £1,700,000, in spite of rising costs of production. The value of consultation is stressed: an example quoted is the ruling that no pit in the Lanarkshire coalfield should be closed down until its Colliery Consultative Committee had a chance to suggest alternative plans . . .

"The previous report for 1947 described the start from Vesting Day with all the hopes, the bad luck of the freeze-up, and the ultimate successes and disappointments. Now, in this year, 1948, we are concerned with less dramatic events, and with the more sober process of settling down. Improvement over the year is seen in this simple table—

	Great Britain.	
	1948.	1947.
Saleable output (tons) ..	197,645,700	187,202,800
Average number of wage earners on colliery books—		
All workers ..	724,030	711,380
Face workers ..	292,759	287,936
Output per manshift worked (tons)—		
Overall ..	1.11	1.07
At the face ..	2.92	2.86
Attendance percentage—		
All workers ..	88.45	87.57
Pithead proceeds per ton saleable ..	47s. 2.5d.	40s. 3d.
Total costs per ton saleable ..	45s. 6.6d.	41s. 3d.
Profit (+) or loss (-) per ton saleable ..	+1s. 7.9d.	-1s. 0d.

"Translated into money, all this has resulted in the conversion of a trading loss into a trading profit. Although profit is not the only criterion of success in an industry which is not free to close up all its collieries that make losses, it is usually regarded as an important measure of efficiency. The profit of £1,700,000 in 1948 is thus an improvement of about £25,000,000 over 1947.

"In an ordinary business, freer to do what it likes, this would be regarded as a remarkably good achievement. The National Coal Board, unlike an ordinary business, has had to increase output and to fulfil the requirements of the Marshall Plan for export, irrespective of the rising costs of production.

"These rising costs are explained in chapter 9, which reveals the complicated arrangements that must be made, if proper control over costs is to be maintained. It will be seen, too, that costs of production have risen mainly because of decisions made in 1947 to increase wages, and also because the cost of supplies of machinery, steel, timber and other goods used in the mining industry has increased.

"Towards the end of the year cost increases due to changes made in 1947 had already begun to be cleared, so that the tendency to increase still further had stopped. Thus of the 4s. 3½d. per ton average cost increase in 1948 2s. 9d. is wages and 1s. 1d. supplies, but the average selling price of coal during the year has also increased by 6s. 11½d. per ton."

"The profit per ton (not counting interest payable to the former owners) works out at 1s. 7½d., or a total of £16,172,694, to which other profits from side-lines, called ancillaries, is added to make £17,514,956 all told.

"From this total, additions and deductions have to be made, of which payment of over £15,500,000 to the former owners is by far the largest item. The final net profit after paying everything is £1,651,965, which helps to reduce the loss of 1947.

"In chapters 1, 3, and 4 many of the new development schemes are set out in detail, but it should be borne in mind that in some cases the plans may have to be changed.

"An analysis of overseas trading is also given, showing that coal is sold to those countries which give the best return in food and raw materials. For this reason it is not unreasonable to ask that domestic consumers make some sacrifice in accepting lower grades of coal.

"Chapter 7 contains an account of progress in carbonisation, briquetting, brickworks, and small mines. Coke supplies to the iron and steel industries were increased by over 20 per cent., and work is going ahead on many projects to replace old and inefficient plant.

"Finally, before passing from the physical to the human side of the business, it should be noted that the scientists have gone well ahead with their essential contribution towards the progress of the

industry. In chapter 8 their work is shown to fall within three main groupings—safety, coal quality, geology.

"The work is largely decentralised throughout the coalfields, but a central research establishment has been set up at Stoke Orchard, near Cheltenham. Research work there is being conducted into such problems as dust measurement, methane and carbon-monoxide testing devices, cleavage tests, methods of washery treatment, lighting intensities, the processes of briquetting, and many kindred subjects.

"An outline is given of 'conciliation,' that is, negotiations with trade unions, during the year. 'Wages of mine-workers are two-thirds of the whole cost of production' and 'mine-workers are now the most highly-paid workers in the country . . . their wages rising to an average of 34s. per shift' in the last quarter of the year.

"There have been no official strikes, but unofficial strikes caused the loss of 1,062,300 tons, compared with 1,652,000 in 1947. To facilitate the speedy settlement of local disputes, the Pit Conciliation Scheme was started in 1948 and has met with much success.

"In the realm of welfare, 1 January, 1948, saw the inauguration of the new National Miners' Welfare Joint Council composed of representatives of the old Miners' Welfare Commission and of the Board. It sanctions expenditure of about 3d. per ton levied to pay for pithead baths and canteens, rehabilitation centres, convalescent homes, playing fields, and leisure pastimes. The board itself pays for the maintenance of pithead baths and for 'capital' improvements to canteens.

"Finally, chapter 5 of the report deals with the problems of education. In order to ensure a flow of qualified engineers, surveyors, etc., about 200 university graduates will be needed each year. One hundred scholarships have been and will continue to be offered annually for three-year courses at universities. Similarly, provision has also been made for other than university students to the extent that 6,500 employees were given time off from work to attend classes started in 1948.

"Of these, some were released for as long as six months to attend full-time courses. Still further provision is made for promising young men to enter an apprenticeship scheme for the training of skilled craftsmen, of which about 2,000 are needed each year. A Summer School was organised at Oxford, designed mainly to deal with the complicated field of technical and administrative problems of the industry. Some miners were also invited to take part, and at the Summer School this year their number has been much increased."

That shows the effects of nationalisation of our basic industry. I have said this in this Chamber on former occasions when this subject has been under discussion that the Government of Great Britain were left with no alternative but to nationalise the industry.

I have given facts and figures that should scotch the damaging and lying statement by members of the Opposition that the nationalisation of coal-mines in Great Britain meant a decrease in production. At no time since the nationalisation has that been so. On the contrary, production has increased, attendance of miners is better, and accidents have decreased. The industry has now become organised, and if the board had full power to close down the inefficient mines, it would be even better.

I now intend to quote from the first report of the Joint Coal Board of New South Wales for the period 1 March, 1947, to 30 June, 1948. It says—

“The productive capacity of the industry is inadequate in relation to Australia’s coal requirements and this conclusion stands apart altogether from the question of industrial disputes.”

I should like to emphasise that, because time and again members of the Miners’ Federation have been accused of creating artificial shortages of coal. Here this board, which had been operating in the industry for more than 15 months before the report was printed, gives us the information that quite apart from industrial stoppages the industry is inadequate to meet the demands of the country.

The report continues—

“The industry is fundamentally inefficient and out-of-date. While there are some properly equipped and efficiently operated mines, many need drastic technical modernisation whilst others should be closed down. In many cases working and living conditions are primitive. Coal quality is often poor.

“The industry by and large is shot through with a bitterness and antagonism between owners and men which derives from its ruthless history and which is not paralleled in any other Australian industry. This has led to a cynicism and pessimism on the part of both parties in the industry which poisons day-to-day industrial relations and undermines confidence in the future. The Board’s task of rehabilitating and stabilising the industry cannot be regarded as complete until this attitude of mind has been eliminated as much from owners and managers as from workers and unions.

“The industry needs many more highly trained men. Reorganisation and stability cannot be achieved until the general standard of the efficiency and status of the technical and executive personnel in the industry is raised substantially and at least to the level of that of other important Australian industries.

“At the present time, the Australian economy is suffering from an acute shortage of capital equipment and basic industrial materials, e.g., houses and building materials, rolling stock, ships and steel, electric generating plant, industrial machinery and coal. The coal industry is basic to all these shortages and it is essential that it be reorganised and output

increased as quickly as possible if the Australian standard of living is to be prevented from declining. In our present situation a sharply increasing output of coal is required to maintain the same standard of living for the people. This implies recognition on the part of all relevant public authorities of the importance of the coal industry and of the need (in accordance with the spirit of the Coal Industry Acts) to grant overriding priorities for buildings, equipment and materials, irrespective of the admittedly pressing needs of other, but it must be emphasised, subsidiary sectors of the economy.”

As much has been said, particularly by hon. members opposite, about the value of the open-cut method of mining in solving our coal-shortage problem, it may do them some good if I read the following paragraph dealing with the production programme—

“In New South Wales open-cut possibilities are relatively limited and cannot be relied upon as a long-term supplement to underground coal production. For this reason the board proposes to expand the capacity of the underground industry sufficiently to meet the estimated future requirements.”

From time to time also the Opposition have criticised the control of industries and the action of the Commonwealth Government in going into the great Coalcliff colliery on the South Coast of New South Wales. For that reason I ask the Opposition to listen to and remember the following paragraph—

“During war-time the Commonwealth Coal Commissioner had power to control any colliery where it was considered that this was necessary or desirable in order to maintain or increase coal production. This meant that, although the ownership of the colliery remained with the proprietor, the day-to-day management was determined by the Coal Commissioner and the proprietor became entitled to claim compensation for any loss which he may have suffered as a result of control.”

“When the Board began operation on 1 March, 1947, it took over the functions of the Commonwealth Coal Commissioner in New South Wales and consequently became responsible for the control of the two collieries (Coalcliff and Commonwealth No. 2) which had been controlled by the Commissioner.

“The Commonwealth Coal Commissioner assumed control of Coalcliff on 9 March, 1944. This control, together with liability for all outstanding claims by the proprietor, was taken over by the Board.

“The difficulties which had beset the management in the early war years were not, however, eliminated by the assumption of control. The legacy of years of excessive dusty conditions caused an increase in the number of permanent compensation cases from 23 in February, 1944, to 74 in February, 1947.”

Mr. Mann, I want to draw the attention of hon. members to this very important statement—

“It was not possible to attract sufficient workers to the mine, and over the same period the number of employees at the coal face fell from 113 to 76, while the overall rate of absenteeism rose from 9.4 per cent. to 15.1 per cent. From an average of about 800 tons per day before control, output fell to about 570 tons per day in February, 1947.

“During the period of control the Commissioner carried out extensive experiments in dust suppression and, in particular, developed a satisfactory technique of water infusion of pillar and solid coal. Costing £2,800, these experiments were extremely successful and established the technique which is now being practised in other South Coast mines.

“Early in 1947 the Board decided that no good purpose would be served by continuing control, and the mine was de-controlled as from 31 March, 1947.

“The proprietors of the mine received £121,777 either from the Commissioner or from the Board for compensation covering the full period of control. This sum included working losses, royalties, and profit margin of 1s. per ton allowed by the Price Stabilisation Committee. In considering the amount of this compensation it must be emphasised that if the colliery had not been controlled it would have been eligible to receive under the Price Stabilisation scheme a subsidy for precisely the same items and on the same basis as other private collieries not under Government control. It is not therefore true to say that control resulted in a loss of £121,777. The mine had been operating at a loss for some years and in the year immediately preceding control the loss amounted to £21,076.

“At the date of de-control the Board owned plant at the colliery valued at £8,640. The proprietors purchased a portion valued at £5,000 and the balance has been diverted to other uses.”

There we have the lesson that when the Commonwealth Commissioner took control, his first duty was to improve the conditions of the mines and to solve the problem that had been exercising the minds of coal workers, particularly in the South Coast district of New South Wales, for many years. That has been done at considerable cost, and as a result many miners are now working under better conditions than before and are less susceptible to the dust menace than they were. That must go on the credit side of the Budget presented. It also shows that this company was carrying on inefficiently, because the Government had to buy machinery to a value of £8,500.

Let me now deal with the other colliery, the Commonwealth. What the report says is particularly significant, because it shows the true picture of open-cut mining. People generally look upon an open-cut mine as something where you have to strip the overburden, and rush in with the steam shovel,

and the production problem is over. It will surprise hon. members to know that the open-cut mine in the western district of New South Wales called Commonwealth was working at a loss. The report goes on to say—

“In May, 1947, the Commonwealth Coal Commissioner assumed control of Commonwealth No. 2 colliery, an open-cut near Lithgow, because in the circumstances then existing this was the only means of increasing production from the cut.”

“Immediately prior to the assumption of control by the Coal Commissioner, the company had sustained a substantial operating loss. Output had declined and the plant in operation required a thorough overhaul. The company's financial position was so insecure that it could not afford the loss of revenue that would have resulted had one major unit of plant been withdrawn for necessary repairs. The operating loss suffered by the company during the year immediately preceding control followed a steady decline in profit and output which had continued since 1942, and there was no likelihood that the company could, from the resources available to it, have arrested the decline.

“Without the financial and technical assistance of the Coal Commissioner and the Board, and the provision by both authorities of plant, the company could not have continued to produce coal from the property even at the declining rate of 1944, quite apart from expanding production to the required tonnages. In addition to the provision of financial and technical assistance, the Coal Commissioner spent considerable sums in the construction of a railway siding and a screening and crushing plant.

“When the Board took over control of the property from the Coal Commissioner, annual output had already been increased to more than twice that produced by the Company during 1942, its peak year, and during the period of the Board's control output has further increased to such an extent that the tonnage produced during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1948, is more than three times greater than that produced by the Company during 1942.”

It has been said that figures cannot lie but liars can figure but we can rest assured that this official report is correct and that the figures I am about to quote are also correct—

“The following table sets out the tonnages of coal produced before and after control:—

Before Control.				Tons.
1940-41	..	..	..	56,172
1941-42	..	..	..	65,510
1942-43	..	..	..	53,223
1943-44	..	..	..	52,662
				227,567
After Control.				Tons.
1944-45	..	..	..	165,637
1945-46	..	..	..	160,542
1946-47	..	..	..	140,409
1947-48	..	..	..	198,081
				664,669**

For the four years before control the production from this open-cut mine at Lithgow was 227,567 tons and for four years after control 664,659, or 437,102 tons more after control than before. That shows how inefficient private enterprise is and just how efficient an industry can become when it is put under some form of national control.

I come now to the subject of pit amenities and I contend that the word "amenities" is often used when it simply means the provision of decent requirements and comforts that are due to the workers—merely things to which the workers are justly entitled. On this subject the report says—

"When the board began operations in March, 1947, the general standard of pit 'amenities' throughout the industry was deplorably low."

This was in New South Wales. The report goes on—

"For instance, there were only three mines in the State which had bath and change houses of a satisfactory standard and more than half of the mines did not have even a satisfactory supply of drinking water on the surface.

"Remembering that there were about 140 mines in operation during the period under review, a general picture of the condition of the industry at the outset and the improvements which the Board has so far been able to make can be obtained from the following table. This shows against each of the main pit 'amenities' the number of underground mines where the standard was satisfactory before the establishment of the Board, the number where the Board has since been able to improve conditions to a satisfactory standard, and the number where work was under construction at the end of June, 1948."

Always remember that there were 140 mines in operation in New South Wales.

The following table shows against each of the main pit amenities the number of underground mines where the standard was satisfactory before the establishment of the board, the number where the board has since been able to improve conditions to a satisfactory standard, and the number where work was under construction at the end of June, 1948:—

	Satisfactory Standard before Establishment of Board.	Since Raised to a Satisfactory Standard.	Under Construction at 30 June, 1948.
Bath and change house ..	3	5	9
Surface sanitation ..	14	1	4
Surface crib rooms ..	..	2	16
Surface cover for workers ..	22	22	11
Surface cycle sheds ..	21	9	2
Surface water supply (bathing) ..	63	11	2
Surface water supply (drinking) ..	60	11	2

I ask hon. members to note that of 140 mines only 63 made provision for surface drinking water. The miners had to carry

it in their billy-cans. Such an elementary necessity as proper drinking water was supplied only to 63 out of 140 mines.

The table continues—

Surface dust suppression ..	13	26	2
Surface telephones ..	71	15	..
Underground water reticulation ..	7	22	14
Underground crib rooms ..	..	12	7
Underground man transport ..	12	6	3
Underground dust suppression ..	3	26	12
Underground sanitation ..	2	4	..
Underground tele-phones ..	58	16	1
Underground tea service ..	..	21	4

"The above table only shows those cases where some physical work has been undertaken at the mines. For instance, in the case of bath and change houses, the table shows that physical work had been begun or completed at only 17 mines. In addition, however, plans have been completed and approved for 10 other mines, and, at the 30th June, 1948, plans were in the course of preparation for 18 more. The proprietors of 43 mines had been precisely advised of the Board's requirements and because of the reluctance of owners to proceed the Board had found it necessary to issue formal directions to the proprietors of a further 10 mines. A similar position applies in the case of other pit 'amenities.'"

I should like to touch on the appalling condition of housing in New South Wales, but time does not permit. Mr. Justice Davidson, who made an inquiry into the coal-mining industry throughout the whole length and breadth of the Commonwealth a few years ago, reported that nowhere in Australia were there such satisfactory housing conditions as there were in Queensland. This was a distinct tribute to the housing legislation of this Government. The reports stated that housing conditions in the Booval, Maryborough and Rosewood districts were far in excess of anything in the Commonwealth.

The report also states—

"In the field of so-called pit amenities, the board has had to contend with an attitude of mind on the part of most colliery proprietors which is entirely unreal."

"With their perspective clouded by the traditional low standards of the industry, many colliery proprietors have been unable to regard expenditure designed to improve working conditions and pit top efficiency as anything but a waste of money. They are unable to appreciate that under modern conditions, the creation of good working conditions is not the appeasement of an irresponsible Labour force, but an essential factor in industrial efficiency. No competent business man in any other industry would believe that inefficiency pays. In the early stages, the board sought, as far as possible, to convert proprietors to its point of view, but later it became apparent that it would often be necessary to issue formal

directions in order to get things done. This, of course, is an entirely unsatisfactory situation because, despite the board's legal powers, it leaves the unwilling proprietor with almost unlimited opportunities for obstruction."

That is only part of the picture of the coal industry in New South Wales, and as it is no brighter in Queensland, is it any wonder that there is recurring industrial trouble on the coalfields?

Our own Coal Board in Queensland is faced with problems similar to those encountered by the Coal Boards in Britain and New South Wales. It has a big task ahead of it, and much is expected of it. The chairman, Mr. Dunne, is well known to most hon. members, and the experience gained during the period he was attached to the Department of Mines should prove valuable to him in his present position. At all times I have found him courteous, obliging and efficient. Mr. Evans came with a good reputation from New South Wales, and prominent members and officials of the Miners' Federation in that State have told me that our Government made a wise choice in appointing him to our Coal Board. The third member of the board, Mr. Crowley, is from the homeland, and is also a highly rated officer; and I believe he has made a good impression on the men in the industry he has come in contact with. It appears that the personnel of the board possess the qualifications necessary to ensure the successful working of the board. As there is a good deal of dissatisfaction in the industry, which is not confined to any section of it, at the board's delay in beginning effective operations, it is hoped that the reason for this complaint will be removed in the near future.

As each hon. member has received a copy of Volumes 1 and 2 of the Powell Duffryn Report, I will refrain from commenting on it, beyond stating that recommendations made by the Miners' Federation and advocated in this Chamber by myself, have the support of these experts.

It is very pleasing to have the assurances of the coal-owners in the West Moreton field that they are prepared to develop this field, the most important in the State, in accordance with the terms of the Powell Duffryn Report. This should benefit not only the coal-mining industry, but industry generally, and result in the economic advancement of the whole of the State.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the men engaged in the industry to the Government for their decision to appoint a full-time tutor in coal-mine engineering at the Ipswich Technical College, as advocated by me when speaking to the Address in Reply.

I am at a loss to understand the reason why the Opposition parties keep referring to the Labour Governments, Commonwealth and State, as Socialist Governments. Perhaps it is because they are bankrupt of ideas and bereft of policy, and, realising that they have nothing concrete to offer the people of our country, they hope they will succeed in frightening the electors. They will fail, just

as they have failed over the years, because the people have confidence in their Labour Governments; like President Truman, who told his critics that he did not care what they called him, Socialist or anything else, they know from experience that Labour Governments will protect them and will legislate for their benefit because the Labour Party is the people's party.

It is Labour's faith to forge right ahead in the battle to give the workers an adequate share in the fruits of their own industry. The Labour Party is not a political party in the same sense as other parties. Those who join it are not linked up to work for some particular object such as free trade, Imperial preference, or higher wages. They are part of a great movement, spread throughout the world, composed of men and women of all races, colour and religion, working not merely for material reforms but for principles and ideals. The Labour Party is Socialist and has clear objectives, both for today and for the future. It aims at achieving Socialism by means of parliamentary democracy and rejects the extreme approach of Communists and others. It wants to extend to industry and economics the democratic principles that rule our political life, and to give the people control over the country's wealth so that it may be used to benefit all of us, instead of enabling the few to control the life and happiness of the rest. It says that no man has the right to exploit another, or to live in wealth while others live in penury. It says also that the first step on the road to the classless society is to extend public ownership or control over industries of the country.

But Socialism is more than a method of organising society. It is a faith that makes men view human relationship in a new light. It will only be completely realised when we get all men and women thinking and acting as Socialists and putting the well-being of their fellows before their own selfish interests. It is a spiritual faith as well as an economic system. John Strachey, present Minister of Food in the Government of the United Kingdom, has said that it is a supremely high ideal of how men and women will one day live on this earth but that it will take the efforts of generations of men and women fully to attain it.

That is why our party is so different from others. It has made mistakes and it will undoubtedly make many more, but they will in the main be mistakes of the heart rather than of the head. But Socialism will remain the ideal, and so long as the Labour Party is committed to Socialism it is the party for the people.

Our movement has grown and developed from the harsh experiences and striving of centuries, and benefited by the blending of different philosophies. It started as far as we know with the early Christian Fathers. It is difficult to decide how far their lives were really Socialist, but we do know that St. Luke tells us in the Acts, ch. ii., vs. 44-45, "And all that believed were together, and had

all things in common, and sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all men as every man had need." It is a remarkable coincidence that today is St. Luke's Day.

Then came the mediaeval teaching of John Ball, a priest from Kent, who ended his life on the gallows for making speeches such as this:—"They have residences and handsome manors, and we have the trouble and the work and must brave the rain and wind in the fields. And it is from our labour that they get the means to support their pomp."

Men like John Ball have appeared time and again throughout the history of the working-class movement.

Sir Thomas Moore put a great deal of Socialist thought into his Utopia, as well as much with which we disagree. A century later the Diggers, led by Gerard Winstanley, called for a social as well as a political change. Then with the advent of the Industrial Revolution a whole school of thinkers argued for a new way of life, towards which we are moving today. Robert Owen was one of them—a practical business man who introduced reforms into his factory and so created a world-wide interest in the principle of co-operative effort.

We in Queensland have travelled a long way along the co-operative road, and have to our credit legislation such as the Primary Producers' Organisation Act, Co-operative Agricultural Production Act, primary-products pools, commodity boards, co-operative fruit marketing, sugar-cane price legislation, legislation to protect and encourage the sugar industry, and many other measures. These and many other enactments have given protection to the primary producers and the workers generally and have enabled the State of Queensland to develop to such a stage that it is the envy of the Commonwealth. Yet the hon. members opposite continue to rise in their places and one after another repeat that we, the Queensland Government, are a Government of plans and blueprints. The great difference between the Opposition and us is that we do think, and after thinking we do plan, and after planning we put our thoughts and plans into operation, while hon. members opposite have never been guilty of thinking, let alone planning anything that was not in their own interests.

**Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert) (2.30 p.m.):** Before speaking to the Budget, I should like to refer to what appears to me to be a growing practice in this Chamber. I have noticed a number of hon. members are now reading most of their speeches. While I have no objection to an hon. member's reading his maiden speech, this is a growing practice and I know what Standing Orders of the House say about it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I do not know whether it is correct that all hon. members read their speeches, but I have allowed a good deal of latitude to new hon. members when making their first speeches. I agree that it is a bad thing to make

a practice of reading speeches. This morning I said something to the Acting Premier about the desks in the Chamber. If I had my way I should have them removed so that hon. members would not be encouraged to read their speeches. It is not my practice to prevent new hon. members from reading portion of their maiden speeches, and I shall continue allowing that latitude.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I agree; I have no objection to that at all. I think that it is a courtesy that should be extended to new hon. members. They should have the opportunity of reading their speeches if they wish, but I have noticed that it is a growing practice for hon. members to read speeches and it would seem to me, from hearing those speeches, that they have been working all night preparing propaganda for new hon. members to use. I merely mention the matter in passing, because this growing practice is not desirable.

The Budget this year is certainly dressed up in its best Sunday clothes. The Treasurer deserves credit for the way in which he has done it.

**Mr. Jesson:** Your party would have us all in bowyangs.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** That is what the hon. member should be wearing.

This Budget is dressed in its Sunday clothes because it is meant to go somewhere, and it also has the New Look about it, making it as modern as possible for presentation to the electors at the forthcoming election. The Treasurer has so designed it as to make it appeal to the people.

**Mr. Larcombe:** And why should it not be?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I wonder that there should be any need to do that with the Budget because the Government have made their seats safe. It would seem that they want it both ways. Of course, whether it wins the hearts of the electors is another matter.

When I realised that there was to be an election next year, I appreciated the reason for preparing the Budget in this way.

Never in the history of this country have we had better opportunities than those of recent years for the progress and development of the State. There is no doubt that our progress and development should have been extraordinary. When you read the Treasurer's Financial Statement and note all he has to say about the credit he says is due to his Government for all these wonderful things, you find that he is not stating the true facts because the progress and development of this country have been brought about only by the high prices we have been getting for our exports. As a producing country we have something to export and the prices we get for our exportable commodities bring revenue to this country so that it was an easy matter for the Treasurer to bring a Budget flowing with all sorts of beautiful things. The statement says that our future outlook is good so long as the reins of Government are held by

Labour. Where is this peace, harmony, and contentment? What is the outlook for the future?

**Mr. Crowley:** In the redistribution.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I do not think the hon. member's new electorate will save him nor do I think it should save him.

I draw attention to the fact that notwithstanding that all these vast sums of money are coming into our country and the extraordinary things that the Treasurer has mentioned in his Financial Statement as to what has been spent and what is going to be spent, we still have controls foisted upon us. Our development is being stultified by the imposition of controls. We are not so prosperous as the hon. gentleman would make out nor are we so content and peaceful as we might be if somebody was not ordering us about. It will be said that that is the policy of the Government, because it is the socialistic method.

This gaudy Budget is being presented to the people as a vote-catcher. It will probably catch a few votes but on the serious side we must realise that we have a country that escaped war damage to any great extent. The fact is that we produce things for which there is a world demand. For the foodstuffs we produce the world is prepared to pay a good price but what have we done towards supplying the world's demands at a good price? Prices are good but production is still as it was. I cannot find anybody who is happy and content with the outlook for the future. There is a heavy demand for our goods from the outside world and we are unable to meet it in full. Our volume of production is down, despite the exceedingly high prices available for the products of this country. Is there something wrong with this country internally? It is something that the Budget cannot rectify and we must get out of our heads the idea that it can.

The Treasurer contended that all good in this country came from the success of his Government but look how difficult his position would be today if the prices for primary products abroad were the same as they were before the war. I intend to quote some figures to remind hon. members that they are foolish indeed to take account of all that is good and ignore anything that may operate to the detriment of the country. The Government have no justification whatever for claiming credit for the high prices of primary products; they are the aftermath of the war. However, these high prices enable Australia to obtain a great deal of the money now being spent in this country and the hon. gentleman is very fortunate indeed to be Treasurer in those circumstances. It would be better if we were to develop our industries to even a greater extent than we do. We made a very unfortunate mistake, and that for political reasons only. We introduced the 40-hour week, we reduced the working hours—a fatal mistake. Let me remind members of the Government party that their beloved socialistic Government of Great Britain are contemplating an increase in working hours.

We must look at the facts and the facts tell us that both Queensland and Australia are

not in good trim financially and if we are not and if we cannot provide amenities for the people there is something wrong with us. The introduction of the 40-hour week was one of the greatest tragedies in the history of Australia because it caused prices to rise very steeply, with the result that everyone is actually earning less real money today than before. That may be a good thing from a political point of view and may be justified when there is a surplus of goods and services but it was wrong in principle to introduce it when we were so short of the things we require.

The impact of the aftermath of war is perhaps not felt so acutely in this country as in many others because we are a primary-producing country and we can stand the strain better than other countries. That is why Great Britain, which must stand the full blast of world influence, has been compelled to devalue the £1 and that is also why the people of that country will be required to work longer hours and accept less wages in the future than they have in the past. Why should that happen there? One reason is the socialistic policy of the British Government, with their tendency to borrow to finance their socialistic ideas.

**Mr. Bruce:** The devaluation of the £1 will benefit every primary producer in Australia.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** No-one knows at the moment what will be the actual effects of the devaluation of the £. If this or any other Government floated loans in dollar countries they must now, instead of repaying at the rate of 4s. 2d. to the dollar, repay 9s. 2d. That indirectly hits the primary producer. It also affects freights, and higher freights mean higher prices of materials used by the primary producer including petrol.

**Mr. Power:** You say that because the "Courier-Mail" said it.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Does the hon. gentleman think the price of petrol should not go up? Anyone who knows anything about Government control knows and common sense tells us, that prices of everything must go up.

**Mr. Power:** Private enterprise controls petrol.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Freight is more or less governed by circumstances, such as the devaluation of the pound, over which we have no control. No doubt after the election the pound will be appreciated to sterling.

Then we are told that with the shorter hours of work and the increased basic wage the people today are more satisfied than they ever were, but this means higher prices.

**Mr. Power:** You are not consistent if you advocated high prices and decontrol.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I do not, but I do say that the high prices have made the Treasurer's Budget for him. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are cases in which controls mean lower prices.

**Mr. Power:** But you advocate lifting controls.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I have not yet seen where the hon. gentleman has done any good for anyone. The fact remains that socialistic control must control someone or order someone about. It all comes down to the fact that Governments want to tell us what we shall do and what we shall not do. After all is said and done, the real money is what is left after a worker pays his way. The policies of the Chifley and Hanlon Governments, with their socialistic ideals, will get us into the same condition as obtains in Britain today. As I said, what matters to a worker is what he has left in his pay envelope after he pays his debts. We have heard a great deal about the basic wage of £3 14s. in 1932 but that amount purchased more in that year than what the present basic wage does now. That in effect shows that higher wages and shorter hours do not work out as the Government promised. It is a great thing to say, "We have given the people high wages" but high wages are of no use if you take them away again by means of high prices and high taxation. The worker is then made to feel that he is not getting enough wages for the work he is doing and he begins to go slow. He goes slow because there is no incentive to earn more money. You prevent him from getting more money even if he is prepared to earn it.

I want to draw attention to the wool position. The present average for greasy wool is 4s. 3d. The average price in 1936-37 was 17.45d. and for 1937-38 it was 13.7d., and for 1931-32 it was 11.3d. Notwithstanding this extremely high price for wool, are the men who are producing the wool making anything out of it? The individual is not getting much out of it, although the country is getting a great deal out of it. There is no incentive for the landowner to get more sheep and produce more wool.

**Mr. Crowley:** Russell is doing all right.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I know a man—and his name is not Russell—who got £87,000 for a wool clip, and it would have paid him better if he got only £36,000.

We can export wheat, beef, hides, skins, sugar, dairy produce and minerals, but in some cases they have not given the full amount to the owners or the producers. That is a frustrating action for a Government to take. It means that we are killing the initiative of our people, because they feel frustrated. There is no encouragement to them to develop their properties at all. These export figures show that our exports are going down and down and down, whereas under ordinary circumstances, with high prices they should be going up and up and up.

**Mr. Jesson:** So they are. You talk rot when you say they are going down.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The hon. member is not aware of the facts. Our exports are going down and down in volume. They are bringing higher prices but it is the volume that we are concerned with. In 1938-39 the exports of butter, wheat, wool, beef, sugar and maize amounted to £67,000,000 and in 1947-48 they were £201,000,000. That money came back to this country. If we had to sell

all those things on the same basis as in 1939 we should have got only £59,000,000. Before the war our exports were worth £67,000,000 at the lower values, and with the higher values—which are due to the world shortages—they have gone up to £201,000,000. I am endeavouring to tell the Treasurer that if we got the same prices for the same commodities sold in 1947-48, we should have got only £57,000,000; we should be approximately £10,000,000 worse off than in 1938-39. There was not the volume last year that there was in 1938-39.

**Mr. Jesson:** How do you work that out?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** We are not producing the stuff. My point is that until we build up our volume of produce we have no chance of overcoming the existing difficulties.

**Mr. Devries:** Are you suggesting that we are not getting costs of production today?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I am suggesting that world shortages and values are dominating the position. Commodities in short supply sold on the world's markets today are bringing extraordinary prices; for instance, wool.

**Mr. Devries:** My information from the statistics indicate that the producer is getting cost of production anyhow.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** He is not getting cost of production for butter. The cost of production of butter has been found by a Commonwealth-constituted body of four high Government representatives, who say that the producers of dairy produce should get 3d. per lb. more for their butter. I did not intend to raise the question, as at the moment it is sub judice, as it were, but that is the position. The States have been bailing up on the Commonwealth Government since 1 July. The hon. gentleman knows that his Government were unanimous in saying, "No increase in the price of butter."

**Mr. Devries:** No, it was not the Government.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Well, a Government representative, a Government nominee, who is carrying out Government policy.

**Mr. Devries:** You are not blaming Queensland.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** No, I would not blame Queensland, it is too good a country. All I can do is to blame the socialistic members who believe in nationalisation one day, socialism the next day, and the next day say they are not Socialists. Where are they? It was only last week we heard two hon. members on the Government benches advocating nationalisation and the same afternoon we had one declaring he was not a Socialist. Government members really do not know where they are. They should make a survey of their own party to make sure that they all agree one with another.

In 1941, when the Commonwealth socialistic Government came into office, the note issue was £54,000,000. It has increased to £188,000,000 but while that has been taking place production has been declining. For any country to be on an even keel, with that

amount of money floating about, it is necessary that there should be increased production. We have reached the stage now at which £3 10s. is worth only what 20s. was before the war. That means less goods can be bought and the people cannot afford to buy all the things they need.

The Treasurer says that the Government's expenditure is a sign of progress and development. It is up to a point, but only for a certain time, on an inflated note issue. The ultimate result must be chaos.

**Mr. Jesson:** And that is what you are hoping for.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I cannot help smiling at the absurd interjection of the hon. member for Kennedy. I have had to put up with him for a long while, but I think that after the next election I shall not have to do so.

I ask hon. members to think back on what happened in Germany when the workers went on strike after the last war, asking for an increase in wages to 600 marks. They got the 600 marks, but because of the inflation that obtained were able to buy only two marks' worth of food or anything else. Our Treasurer says the aggregate of wages and salaries paid since 1931-32 is evidence of prosperity, but irrespective of the wages paid, if the cost of living absorbs them, where is the prosperity? I draw attention to the fact that we are not developing here as we should be, despite the money that is coming into the State and despite all the good things the Treasurer says. This is borne out by the fact that between 1933 and 1947 the population for the State increased by only 158,725.

**Mr. Jesson:** Thanks to a Labour Government.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** That is the reason why the increase is so small. What is this increased population doing?

**Mr. Jesson:** Working:

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The hon. member would not know what working was.

Of that increase of 158,725, Brisbane accounted for 102,424, 11 other cities 41,000, and the towns 18,725, making a total of 162,000-odd for the cities and towns whilst the rest of the State showed a loss of 3,659 in population. It should be the Government's duty to see that the country is developed. We cannot develop the State by concentrating huge populations in the cities and denuding the wealth-producing areas outside.

**Mr. Devries:** Are you advocating regimentation of labour?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** No, that is a socialistic idea.

**Mr. Devries:** How are you going to do it?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** By having more equitable legislation and showing some interest in the country areas. The Labour Government have never been interested in the welfare of country areas.

Let us look at the losses that have occurred in the western parts of the State. Roma has lost 1,101 people. Roma cannot afford to

lose 1,101 people if the State is to keep on expanding. The south-western part of Queensland has lost 658 people, the Central West 2,224 and the Far West 569. From Cape York Peninsula 1,031 people have gone. Those are important parts of the State and we can never expect to get the best out of those divisions of Queensland unless labour is there to help in production. It is not in our interests that all these people should be living in the cities. Those important divisions of the State have lost the whole of their natural increases, and 7,133 people in addition.

I have listened to speeches by hon. members on the Government side about the Government's decentralisation plans. We have heard this kind of talk for years. Is it not decentralisation with a vengeance when we find that country areas have lost 7,000 people as well as the natural increase in population? Where is this decentralisation policy? I am satisfied that the Government are not sincere in their decentralisation policy because everything they do and every Act of Parliament they pass encourage people to come to the city.

The estimated revenue for 1949-50 is £36,391,235 and from the Commonwealth Government we expect to receive £11,535,000. It is expected that the receipts of the Railway Department will be £15,250,000, and from other sources we hope to get £8,500,000. Much has been said about the railways but I am one of those who do not think that we shall go on expanding if we insist that the railways shall be a source of revenue to the country. We must supply rail facilities to the people and the cost should be charged to the country, not to the department. There are now six miles of line less than when the Government took over, and Queensland is losing trade for the want of rolling stock. On the eve of an election the Government suddenly discover all the shortages in the Railway Department. They at last wake up to the shortages. It appears that the Government wake up every three years. The Government have ordered 175 engines, and engines are pretty costly things to buy; for Mount Isa 1,900 wagons are on order—a sop to Mount Isa. A hundred cattle wagons are being ordered for the planned increase in beef production. I suppose the Government will expect Mr. Chifley to pay for all these things because on everything they plan they put a tag, "Provided the Commonwealth Government will help with the finance." Then again 1,100 steel hopper wagons and six modern rail-motors are being ordered. Of our 1,750 engines no fewer than 200 have been out of action at one time.

It is a good thing to know that we are going to get extra rolling stock but I ask: what is wrong with the management of the railways? I also ask: what is wrong with the Government when they come out and place all these orders in election year? Have all these things suddenly worn out? Is it because they have done nothing in the past that they have just awakened to the fact that rolling stock is short and these tremendous

orders must all be placed in the one year? I do not say that these vehicles are not required but why were the railways allowed to get into such a shocking state? It is now four years since the war ended.

I revert again to the subject of price-fixing because I want to emphasise its tragic consequences in certain respects. It has done a tremendous amount of harm to this country. It was price-fixing that prevented the manufacture of galvanised iron and barbed wire.

**Mr. Power:** No.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I say it did. It prevented the manufacture of these two items to this extent, that the manufacturers could make other things that gave a greater profit. That is why there is a shortage of these items.

**Mr. Aikens:** Then you admit that it was because of the rapacity of manufacturers.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The Government have imported 18,000 tons of cement from England and a large quantity of reinforcing steel from France.

**Mr. Power:** There is a greater demand for these commodities today than ever before, despite the fact that we are producing more now than we did before the war. More work is being done. There were six years of war when very little of this work was done.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** That is simply a warmed-up excuse. I am taking the Government to task for neglecting the country and I am reminding them that just before the election year they find it necessary to import cement and reinforcing steel. Why not produce these things in our own country?

**Mr. Power:** Ask private enterprise.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** It is because of price-fixing and men on strike.

The Government find it necessary to import large quantities of structural steel and they are considering the importation of wire and wire netting. Perhaps they are only considering the importation of wire and wire netting. Their socialistic policy cannot develop this country. They should allow the people to exercise their freedom, to do what they think is best in the interests of the development of the country. It was that system that developed the country in the past, the system that built up the British Empire, and it is the only system that will succeed, but hon. members opposite want to substitute something for it. I know that the socialisation of industry and the nationalisation of things are good talking points, but the scheme does not work out. Hon. members opposite know that it does not work out and recent events prove it. The position will become desperate and the sooner hon. members opposite get out of the country and allow private enterprise freedom of action the better it will be for all concerned.

**Mr. Power:** In what way are we hindering private enterprise?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** By price-fixing and the system of control generally.

I am sorry that the Minister for Transport and the Secretary for Public Instruction, and the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock are not in the Chamber, for I want to draw attention to one or two extraordinary things. Recently Cabinet made a decision that the Government would recondition the railway from Alma Den to Forsyth at a cost of £137,000. The Minister for Transport, in making that announcement, said that decision had been reached by the Government because the Secretary for Public Instruction and the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock had made out strong cases for the work to be undertaken. It is 22 years since this line got into a state of disrepair through damage by floods. The Secretary for Public Instruction and the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock have represented the area served by the line for many years, but the Government have done nothing to it since it was damaged. Now, prior to the general election, the Minister for Transport who was previously opposed to the reconditioning of the line because it would incur an additional loss of £22,000 a year, says that the Secretary for Public Instruction and the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock made out a strong case for the reconditioning of the line. You cannot convince me that that is genuine, particularly after we have heard the Minister for Transport state previously that after a proper survey had been made of the line he was opposed to its being reconditioned. Yet this Minister has had to come into this Chamber and tells us that the Government are going to spend £137,000 on reconditioning this railway, which has been left in its present condition for 22 years, and only because two other members of the Cabinet representing the district concerned had put up a good case. Why was this line left in its present condition for so many years? Why is it that the Minister should now come into Chamber and tell us that the Government are going to do the work? Is there any ulterior motive? Is it to make the seats of these two Ministers safe, notwithstanding that they have had a redistribution of electoral boundaries, and that they fear they were going to be on the outer?

I have referred already to what happened in England. I am sorry to see the result. I should like to see Labour make a success of its administration in England, as that success would be reflected in Australia. But socialistic methods will not develop this country. They are quite wrong and more wrong when they are associated with Communism. I know that the Government, who stand for Socialism today, shun Communism, but it is difficult for them to do so. The Government are only trying to shake off Communism for their own protection, but they cannot shake off Communism. It does not matter what the Budget contains. The coming election must be fought on the issue of the freedom of the people versus control by the Government. Government control must cease in this country. Socialism can never succeed in this country. This is a producing country

and it can never be developed without the initiative of the people; it is by that means and not by Government control that we shall progress.

**Mr. Burrows:** Be honest and say that you do not want it to succeed.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** You could not be honest if you tried yourself.

**Mr. BURROWS:** I rise to a point of order. I ask for the withdrawal of that remark. The hon. member said that I could not be honest.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hilton):** I do not think it is right that hon. members should use such terms in this Chamber.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The hon. member said to me, "Be honest and say something," and I retorted that he couldn't be honest.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** That is correct. Both hon. members were at fault.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I apologise to the Chair.

It does not matter what anybody thinks, we must fight the next election on the issue of individual effort as against Government control. We shall have to get rid of this socialistic government. It is all right to get the Communists out of the unions if you possibly can, but that is difficult, because you do not know who the Communists are. The relationship between Socialists and Communists is similar to the relationship that existed between some of our coloured employees when I was a boy. We lived close to the place where the coloured labour used to come into Queensland. There was a camp not far away, where these fellows used to stay. You might have one of these people employed ringbarking or doing something else, and after a while he would bring a stranger along with him and you would say, "Where did this fellow come from?" and he would reply, "He belonga me." When these men were asked about anybody they brought along, they would say, "He belonga me." The Socialists and the Communists are "brothers belonga me." Hon. members opposite are not going to get rid of the Communists as easily as you think. If I could give them a hand to get rid of them I would. At any rate, they cannot get rid of them by associating with them, as they have done and by getting their votes to help them into power. (Government interjections.) If they do not get rid of "brother belonga me" he will get rid of us. There are too many "brother belongas" up here in the North. Yesterday there was a ceremony in connection with the £200,000,000 Snowy River irrigation scheme; but it would not matter if we spent £400,000,000 there if we are going to leave the North of Queensland with an open door for those "brothers belonga me" of yours in those coastal islands.

This is really a national matter, but the people in the South know little about it and the further one goes south the less they know

about it. The population are leaving the North. What will happen? Is it any wonder that the North Queensland Development Committee came into existence? For my part the only thing wrong about it is that it did not come into existence about 10 years ago. The people of the North should not have been put off with all the promises to develop the North. The North is the doorway to Australia, and it is an open doorway, but £200,000,000 is to be spent in developing the South, and would it not be better if £100,000,000 of that was used in developing and populating the northern part of Queensland and producing something there?

**Mr. Burrows:** You do not believe in the Brisbane line.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I believe that Brisbane is not the only thing that is blind. The North Queensland Development League is an organisation pledged to have the North developed. If the people in the league do not do something for their own self-preservation, this Government will never do it. They promise all sorts of things and will promise a jolly sight more now that elections are near. What are the members of the northern electorates doing about it? The hon. member for Kennedy stood up in this Chamber and made a speech defending the Government and what they had done for the North. But the hon. member was so much at a loss for ideas that he finished his speech by saying that somebody up there was murdered because the Herbert River was polluted. If there were any murders about that place—and I do not agree there were—the people who gave the licence to pollute the river were responsible for them and not the tin-dredging company at all. I would point that out to the hon. member for Kennedy, who is so prone to interject, not realising the mistakes that he makes himself.

I firmly believe that the North will have to be given a new status. The North must have an opportunity to produce the commodities it is capable of producing. For instance take the Atherton Tableland. That is a beautiful plateau, everything about it is beautiful, but it breaks one's heart to see how the population there is declining. People are leaving the Tableland and production is declining. Probably the production is decreasing because the people are leaving. Why are the people leaving? They find themselves isolated and nobody appears to care whether they do any good or not.

**A Government Member:** You know that is wrong.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Then what is the reason for it? It is taking place. It is similar to our position as regards Canberra. We are too far from Canberra to get a fair and equitable deal, and in the same way the people in the North are too far from Brisbane. The northern people never get a fair deal from the State Parliament sitting in Brisbane.

**Mr. TURNER (Kelvin Grove) (3.29 p.m.):** I feel sure that the debate on the 1949-50 Budget will go down in the history of this

Parliament as the most amazing debate ever heard in this Chamber. I was amazed last week to hear some of the speeches of members of the Opposition, particularly after the Leader of the Opposition had spoken. That hon. gentleman did attack the Budget for a time, but the hon. members who followed him had nothing at all to say about the document. I feel sure that last week the "Hansard" staff felt that they were celebrating all their birthdays in one when for once the hon. member for Aubigny's speech was heard in silence. I found myself wishing that other hon. members could have the same opportunity to make speeches in such quietude—with hon. members not howling at each other—so that the "Hansard" staff might hear them clearly and therefore not have to worry whether they heard their words correctly.

I was also amazed to find an hon. member of this Parliament, a party to the making of the Laws of Queensland, standing in this Chamber and telling the Committee quite freely that he would defy a law of the State. That is the second time I have heard the hon. member threaten the life of a Minister of the Crown. Last year an hon. member opposite stated that if the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock went onto his property he would shoot him. The hon. member for Aubigny did not go so far the other day as to say that, but he said that he would take the Deputy Premier out to his electorate, at the invitation of those people, but he could not guarantee his return because he did not carry dead bodies in his truck. That is as good as saying that the Minister would lose his life if he went out there. It is bad enough to hear hon. members saying these things outside but when they stand up in this Chamber and say quite frequently that they defy the law it is time we took serious notice of it.

The hon. member for Aubigny openly confessed also that if the price of beef was increased at the abattoirs hundreds of cattle would be available the next day. The only inference to be drawn from that remark is that cattle are being held back deliberately by the producer because the price is not high enough, yet when the worker, who has only his labour to sell, demands a higher price and threatens to strike hon. members opposite want to shoot him, deport him, or throw him in prison. Last year one hon. member opposite said that he would shoot the coal-miners when they were on strike.

**Mr. Brand:** Who said that?

**Mr. TURNER:** The hon. member for West Moreton.

**Mr. Macdonald:** He did not say that.

**Mr. TURNER:** He did say that, yet these producers are doing exactly the same thing, despite the fact that they are getting a higher price now than they ever had. Last week at the abattoir beef brought 84s. a 100 lb.

**Mr. Muller:** That is not right.

**Mr. TURNER:** It is. Last Thursday afternoon my butcher was waiting to show me the prices he had paid.

**Mr. Macdonald:** Not live weight.

**Mr. TURNER:** Yes. He buys his cattle on the hoof, and that is what he paid. If a beast does not turn out to be as heavy as he estimated, he is the loser. Last year I pointed out that it is time we prohibited selling on the hoof and insisted that meat be sold on the hook instead. If we did that the producer would be paid for every 1 lb. he produced and the butcher would receive every 1 lb. for which he paid. Under the present system the buyer inspects the beast in the pen and estimates its weight. If it appears to him to weigh about 750 lb. he bids accordingly. If it should weigh only 700 lb. when slaughtered he is the loser and the producer is the gainer, just as the buyer is the gainer and the producer the loser if the beast should weigh 800 lb. when it is slaughtered.

The hon. member for Aubigny told us plainly that if the Minister in charge of prices would grant an increase in the price of beef hundreds of fat cattle would come to market. He said also that we are eating only the bulls and crackers. We agree with him. He said, too, that we do not know what it is to eat prime beef. If that is so, it is time a law was introduced compelling them to send prime beef to market because they are being paid prime-beef prices.

**Mr. Muller:** You should not steal their hides, either.

**Mr. TURNER:** As I have pointed out before, representatives of the wool-brokers and hide and skin merchants attend the sales, and immediately a man buys a pen of sheep, bullocks or any other animal except pigs, these people throng round him bargaining with him for his skins. The skin dealers value the skin off the sheep's back and give a price accordingly. I have been down there and I know what I am speaking about. They are as keen as the wool-buyer who buys the wool shorn off the sheep.

**Mr. Muller:** The Government fixes the price of hides at 25 per cent. below their value.

**Mr. TURNER:** And it is time they fixed the price of beef at a reasonable price to the consumer.

The hon. member for Cooroora said not one word about the Budget but had much to say in condemnation of the Government in regard to the spread of that noxious weed groundsel. I suggest that the hon. member should have advocated uniform action throughout the State because it is no use the Government's clearing roads and Crown property if private owners and municipal authorities allow the menace to develop. There should be a united effort to destroy groundsel. We saw photographs depicting the seed of groundsel flying in the air but the only mistake the photographer made was that he did not take a picture of the man shaking the bushes causing the seed to fly. Never has anybody seen groundsel seed flying as densely as those photographs disclosed.

The Department of Agriculture and Stock has been offering to supply a destructive agent

to local authorities that have declared groundsel a noxious weed, but those local authorities have done nothing to destroy the pest. Round Greater Brisbane it is prevalent everywhere one goes. What is the use of requiring one section taking action to destroy groundsel unless the other sections of the community take similar action? Why wait until it is flowering and seeding before setting about its destruction? If we planned the destruction of groundsel in its early growth it would cost less and it would be a total destruction instead of a partial destruction.

**Mr. Brand:** Nobody objects to united action.

**Mr. TURNER:** Then why not take that action? The Government have found a destructive agent and are offering it at cost price. Does the hon. member want the Government to do the whole job?

The hon. member for Dalby—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber today—is one of the Opposition who have been roasting the Government because of the handing over of powers to the Federal authorities. Yet he himself advocated the handing over of the railways to the Federal Government. With one breath he spoke of decentralisation and with another of centralisation. He wants centralisation of the railways because he wants to send his cattle to New South Wales and if he and his like had their way Brisbane would become a ghost town, as so many places in Queensland have become.

**Mr. Brand:** He sends his cattle to the yards here.

**Mr. TURNER:** Some of them; he wants to send them to the southern market.

On Friday last we heard that Labour-hater, the hon. member for Mundingburra, who did not say one word on the Budget but gave a demonstration of hate of the Labour Party. Every time he has been on his feet since his election to this Chamber he has set himself out to discredit the city of Brisbane. A reference to "Hansard" will show that he is always saying what a dirty filthy place Brisbane is. The first time I ever saw the hon. member in my life was in this building, before he was elected to this Chamber. I was going home one afternoon and I saw someone lying on the bench downstairs and he had vomited all over the place. I said, "Who is that?" and they said, "That is the Vice-Mayor of Townsville," and I replied, "He certainly has some vices."

**Mr. Aikens:** When was this?

**Mr. TURNER:** The same night, when the hon. member for Townsville was coming back to the House, he saw this fine great man who advocates cleanliness urinating at the top of George and Queen Streets and he took him away from the police.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Mr. Mann, I rise to a point of order. I do not mind anything this bill says, but—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member must refer to any other hon. member by his correct title.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Very well. I do not mind what the hon. member for Kelvin Grove says but when he makes this particularly filthy personal attack on me, which is completely untrue, I resent it, and following the usual procedure adopted by the Labour Party, I ask him to accept my denial.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member is not in order in indulging in personalities and I ask him to refrain from doing so.

**Mr. TURNER:** I am trying to defend the town in which I live. It is as clean as any other city in the State. What I have said is perfectly true.

**Mr. Aikens:** You lie, and you know you lie.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Aikens:** He lies and he knows he lies.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement, "He lies."

**Mr. AIKENS:** It is unparliamentary and I will withdraw it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member for Kelvin Grove not to continue in that strain, not to indulge in personalities.

**Mr. TURNER:** I desire to congratulate the Treasurer on his Budget and on its masterful presentation, and the officers of the department on the ability they showed in helping to compile it. I am not over-pleased when a Government show a big surplus, although it is not as bad as a deficit. If a Treasurer shows a small surplus, as our Treasurer has done over the years, it speaks well for him and for the departmental officers associated with him. A State instrumentality has a tremendous amount of ramifications and the Budget speaks highly of their capabilities. Take the number of Crown employees alone, the various jobs they have to do, and the various matters that have to be cared for. They must have tremendous ability to be able to budget so accurately when a total amount of £25,000,000 is involved. There is a small surplus of £49,723, which is an increase of £34,918 on the previous year. It shows conclusively that the officers associated with this work have excellent foresight and are able to plan all the enormous works planned by the Government and finish the year's transactions with a small surplus. When we look at the amount of £9,570,674 spent on works last year—and we speak of millions today as though they were only pocket money—and actually realise what even £1,000,000 means, we can only conclude that the officers associated with public expenditure must be almost Mandrakes to be able to budget for all the works involved and show just a small surplus.

An amount of £1,525,378 was spent on rural development, soldier settlement and irrigation. It is a masterpiece to be able

to spend that sum of money on such useful work in the interests of soldier-settlers, most of whom must be new to the occupation. Large sums have been spent in providing watering facilities on stock routes. That is something that has demanded the attention and will continue to demand the attention of the Government each year. The Government provide progressively increased amounts for these facilities to enable cattle to travel from one point to another with greater ease and greater security than hitherto. In 1948-49 £42,158 was spent for that purpose. This year £75,000 is provided, an increase over the expenditure last year. The Government are therefore providing progressive amounts for necessary water facilities on stock routes to enable stock to be shifted from place to place with the greatest measure of security.

Last year £53,633 was spent on erosion-prevention works and reclamations. I was one of those hon. members who the hon. member for Cunningham spoke of last week as having witnessed a demonstration in the prevention of soil erosion last Friday week at Pittsworth. I was glad of the opportunity to visit Pittsworth and see how our officers proposed to arrest soil erosion in the future. Quite a large area was treated. Not only will the measures taken prevent the soil from being washed away, but they will enable the soil to retain moisture for a period considerably longer than heretofore; because of the looseness of the soil the water will percolate through the banks and be retained for a longer period than if the topsoil had been washed away. It would benefit settlers considerably to see how the surface soil can be preserved and the moisture retained.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** It is a pity a few more invitations were not extended for such demonstrations.

**Mr. TURNER:** It is a pity that many more members were not present at the demonstration. I heard of it first from a member of the Country Party. More hon. members should be present at such an important function.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** I should have liked to see it.

**Mr. TURNER:** The Budget discloses that last year £722,564 was spent on housing. This year an additional amount of £858,500 has been set aside for house construction. A considerable increase in expenditure is budgeted for rural development, soldier settlement and irrigation. Local authorities carried out a big programme of works for which the Government provided assistance by way of subsidy. Treasury loans and subsidies to local bodies, exclusive of loans and subsidies for Brisbane harbour works and for malaria-prevention works, amounted in the aggregate to £934,523. This year £2,786,977 is provided in the Budget for similar purposes. The Budget reveals that the Government have given every project very thorough consideration. They must have had a very sound knowledge of the cost of these works to have concluded the financial year with the surplus they did.

In addition to the expenditure I have mentioned, £830,854 was expended by the Queensland Housing Commission on houses for

rental, from funds provided by the Commonwealth. This amount is in addition to £722,564 expended by the commission.

When I read the Budget, I was impressed by the Treasurer's reference to John Ruskin in his concluding sentences—

“John Ruskin, the noted writer, reminded us that the wealth of a Nation, as of men, consists in substance, not in eiphers; and that that country is richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble, happy human beings.”

That is the objective we are striving to reach today. If we are successful in providing adequately for humanity and making humanity happy that will be the surest way of eliminating Communism. Unfortunately members of the Opposition do not desire that, judging by their statements in this Chamber and outside. In 1939 Mr. Menzies said that everything in the garden was lovely and that we had only about 250,000 unemployed in Australia. What a tragedy—250,000 able-bodied men who were willing and anxious to work to provide for themselves and their families but who were denied that natural right! That should never happen, especially in a young country like this. If we are to eliminate Communism, the easiest and the surest way is to provide work and wages for those people and then they will not seek some new form of society.

The Treasurer also said—

“I conclude now by summarising and emphasising some of the features of Government policy:—

“A balanced budget.”

That has been achieved.

“Full employment.”

If we can provide full employment that is the easiest way. We do not need to go about saying what the Communists are doing and that we should deport them, because if we give our people full employment and wages and shelter we shall have no Communism.

**Mr. Heading:** That is your job, not ours.

**Mr. TURNER:** For 25 years the hon. member's party controlled the finances of Australia and they never lifted a finger to improve the conditions of the people.

The Treasurer goes on to emphasise other features of Government policy—

“Increased wealth production.”

Through the agency of the Agricultural Bank this Government have tried in every possible way to increase the wealth production of this State. They have endeavoured to do so by orderly marketing. I was pleased to read in the paper that one of the grower's agents has at last awakened to the fact—because of the gluts and the destruction of good cabbages and beans to keep the price up to the producer—that the only way to eliminate these gluts is orderly marketing. When it is urged that the Department of Agriculture and Stock should advise the primary producers what to grow and when to grow it, it is alleged that we are trying to dictate to him. Would it not be better to have our officers scientifically advise the

farmer as to what should be grown in order that he might get a stable price and have no glut, than to leave the matter in the hands of the individual without any guidance at all?

**Mr. Muller:** We should be better off if we could get orderly seasons, too.

**Mr. TURNER:** We are trying to help in the establishment of orderly seasons by means of irrigation. Thank God, none of us has control of the weather, because at no time have I known everyone to be satisfied when it rained. We are trying to assist Nature by harnessing the water and installing irrigation.

Another feature of Government policy is "full assistance for co-operative enterprise and for other industrial enterprise." Have any Government in Australia done more to help co-operative enterprise than this Government? Where would the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation be today if it were not for this Government's bringing in legislation to assist it? Where would the Committee of Direction of Fruit Marketing be today if it were not for the legislation of this Government? Where would the Egg Board be? Or the sugar industry. Where would any of our primary industries be today if it were not for the subsidies granted by the Federal Government? A leaflet I received today shows that since 1945 the Prime Minister and his Government have given to the primary producers of Australia £132,000,000 in subsidies.

**Mr. Muller:** You do not believe that?

**Mr. TURNER:** Of course I believe it.

**Mr. Muller:** I gave you credit for knowing better.

**Mr. TURNER:** I really thought that the hon. member for Fassifern was a man who gave credit where credit was due. If any person disbelieves this he can find the information for himself set out in the Federal Budget. What use would it be for the Prime Minister of Australia to issue a leaflet giving that information if it was not true? Representatives of hon. members opposite in the Federal Parliament would have ample opportunity of correcting the information and showing that the Prime Minister was endeavouring to mislead the people of Australia. In spite of these facts hon. members opposite say that Labour Governments have done nothing for the primary producers.

**Mr. Muller:** He took a lot away from them.

**Mr. TURNER:** I have an answer to that. Since 1945 the Prime Minister has reduced taxation by £280,000,000.

**Mr. Heading:** Why should he not?

**Mr. TURNER:** He is doing that, but representatives of the party opposite said that they would reduce it by only 28 per cent. Mr. Chifley told the people that if he was returned to power he would progressively reduce taxation as conditions warranted and he has done this to the extent of £280,000,000 since 1945. He has also given £108,000,000 to repatriation, £184,000,000 for interest and

sinking fund. He made a gift of £35,000,000 to help the British Government. War relief to war-distressed people amounts to £30,000,000.

**Mr. Muller:** Where did he get it from?

**Mr. TURNER:** He did not get much from the hon. member. He got it from those who can afford to pay and by so doing he eased the strain on the working man. Today no working man receiving below £400 a year with a wife and three children pays income tax or social-service tax.

**Mr. Muller:** Yes, he does.

**Mr. TURNER:** No.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. TURNER:** And it is very important to note that the Federal Government have reduced indirect taxes on everything that applies to the working man, food, clothing and shelter.

**Mr. Muller:** He pays tax on everything he eats and wears.

**Mr. TURNER:** Today indirect taxation applies only to luxury lines, consequently the working man in receipt of below £400 a year is living in paradise today compared with the conditions under which he lived a few years ago. The hon. member for Albert said the basic wage today would not buy as much as the basic wage of 1934, but I ask him: why is it that today so many motor-bicycles are running on the highways? Every young working man today earns sufficient money to buy one but a few years ago he could not afford to buy even a push-bike. A few years ago, if a man owned a pony and sulky he was considered a lord in the district. It is because of the agitation of working men's unions that his standard of living has increased. Goodness gracious me, in my young days a working man went to work in the same clothes in which he worked, today no working man does that, not even the labourer working on the streets. A working man today goes to work respectably dressed and changes into old clothes and boots. He has the facilities of cleaning himself up before he returns home. Why, years ago, he could not even buy a second pair of boots.

**Mr. Heading:** Your Government were controlling the Treasury benches.

**Mr. TURNER:** No, I am speaking of the times we were hunted out of our jobs if it was discovered that we were members of an industrial union. It is to be regretted that the young people of today do not remember these things. It is not so many years ago that I was first appointed a union official and when I was chased out of a place of business because I went to interview an employee there. We could not enter any premises until comparatively recently, when the Industrial Court gave us that right, so long as we did not interrupt people in their work. On one occasion I went into certain premises at the lunch hour to interview the workers. I entered by the front door, as any decent person would do, and introduced myself. I

was ordered out. I then went round to the back door, where I found the men eating their lunches on the street. In those days there was no provision for them to have it in decent surroundings. One man asked me to come inside so that he could pay his union dues. I went inside, and the boss, who was watching for me to come in, again ordered me out, threatening to give me in charge. That was as recently as 1926.

**Mr. Muller:** And 14 years after the Labour Government had been returned to office.

**Mr. TURNER:** Yes, but in those days it was difficult to organise. We can now and have built up unionism.

The Treasurer has made provision for record funds to be spent on water conservation and irrigation. I have spoken on this subject previously and pointed out how essential it was to supplement from artificial sources what Nature provided.

Another very important part of the Financial Statement is that which tells of a provision of greater funds for the Department of Public Instruction to be utilised in giving the fullest opportunities to our young people. This morning one hon. member wanted to know where these fullest opportunities were. All I can say is that he must be blind if he cannot see them all round him. For instance, it is now possible for the children of the worker, if they apply themselves, to avail themselves through our university of the highest education in the land.

I wish to congratulate both the Government and the Secretary for Public Instruction on what they have done in the last 12 months, and I hope that some of these funds that are being provided for the Department of Public Instruction will be used to give children who are eagerly awaiting an opportunity to do so their chance to make good.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** Are you trying to persuade the Government to go on with that conservatorium of music?

**Mr. TURNER:** I am, and as president of the Brisbane Operatic Society I thank the Government for the encouragement they have given the young people of Queensland to show their ability to entertain. The talent quest conducted by the Department of Public Instruction, which ended on 21 June last, was a revelation. Some of the young people whose talent was discovered will play a great part not only in Australia but overseas. Last week we had the courage to play "Faust" despite the fact that many people said that we were over-ambitious, that we could not do it. We engaged Raymond Beatty, the leading bass singer of Australia, a teacher of music in the Sydney Conservatorium of Music. When I was thanking Mr. Beatty last Saturday night at the end of our season for giving us so much encouragement and the benefit of his ability as a singer, he said that several of our people could appear on any stage in any part of the world. He has played the same part as he took here, Mephistopheles, in several parts of the world and he said,

"Never have I played with greater people than those with whom I have played here and never have I sung with a better chorus than this." Such words from a man of his calibre are very encouraging indeed. Although many people have condemned our Government because they have not as yet provided a conservatorium of music, I point out that the Government have never refused a conservatorium. The hon. member for Kennedy was the first hon. member I heard in this Chamber speak of the need for a conservatorium of music, and I suggest that as soon as material and man-power are available we provide a conservatorium. I further suggest, seeing that our Supreme Court and Police Courts are being moved down to Alice Street—

**Mr. Power:** Provision has been made to put them into William street.

**Mr. TURNER:** Seeing that that provision has been made, I suggest that we turn our present Supreme Court building into a conservatorium of music. As a matter of fact, there is sufficient room in it for a national theatre. A national theatre could be built on the Ann street side facing George street and a conservatorium classroom could be provided in the old court building—

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** Are you suggesting that the short supply of material is the only reason why the Government have been held up?

**Mr. TURNER:** It is the only reason. We have to provide homes for our people and until we build a new Supreme Court to house our judges nothing can be done. My second suggestion is that when we get the people out of the present University buildings in the Domain to the new site at St. Lucia we utilise those buildings as a conservatorium. Not much money would be required to make them suitable.

**Mr. H. B. Taylor:** You mean as a temporary conservatorium?

**Mr. TURNER:** Yes. We know that the New South Wales conservatorium started in Government House stables. It was an elaborate building compared with what we know as stables, but that conservatorium has done a mighty job. I am looking forward to the day, as is everyone interested in music, when we shall have our conservatorium to provide the opportunity for our people to reach the greatest height of their ambitions.

**Mr. Muller:** Suppose we make it an election promise for next election?

**Mr. TURNER:** The hon. member can if he wishes. We are honest with the people and say that the building of houses is our first consideration. There are plenty of Government buildings to be built when materials and man-power are available. There is a school to be built in my electorate. I am not pushing the building, because I know that many of my people want homes.

**Mr. Pie:** Are you going to lay the foundation stone?

**Mr. TURNER:** I am not concerned with things like that; they do not flatter me. I want the actual work done and opening ceremonies do not worry me. I do not want headlines in the Press; I want the things themselves done and when I have them done I have my reward.

I take this opportunity of proving to our people the great job the Federal Labour Government have done for the Commonwealth. The article I am about to read is taken from the Sydney "Sunday Herald" of 30 January, 1949, and it states—

"Australia is rapidly becoming a creditor to the nation.

"Australia, 17 years ago one of the world's embarrassed debtors, is now within measurable distance of becoming a creditor nation. Two or three export seasons like the present one should enable this milestone in national maturity to be passed.

"A net amount of only about £195 million is now owed to residents of Britain and America.

"Reserves of international currency (in gold and balances abroad) of more than £338 million offset long-term debts of Commonwealth and State Governments amounting to £533 million."

**Mr. Pie** interjected.

**Mr. TURNER:** The hon. member does not want to hear this. If it was a statement by Mr. Menzies he would keep putting his chest out and saying, "What do you think of that?" A Liberal Party candidate in the person of Mr. David Berry, a self-styled economist, once wrote something about the Prime Minister. Not being satisfied with criticising Mr. Chifley on the ground of his inability to govern Australia, he spoke derogatorily of him and talked about his voice. I was surprised to see that the Country Party members were opposed to the Prime Minister in his attitude towards devaluation, but I am sure that every manufacturer in Australia, possibly with the exception of the hon. member for Windsor will applaud the Prime Minister for not devaluing the Australian pound in relation to sterling. If the manufacturers sold their articles overseas on a sterling basis they would lose a good deal of money.

**Mr. Pie:** Why should we?

**Mr. TURNER:** The hon. member is a manufacturer and he ought to know.

**Mr. Pie:** We can compete with Great Britain on a manufacturing basis.

**Mr. TURNER:** The article from the "Sunday Herald" continues—

"Gone, it is hoped, never to return, is the haunting situation of 1932. The external debt load in that year was £652,000,000, offset by the flimsiest of only £49.9 million international currency reserves. National efforts to honour annual commitments on the debt then took its toll in unemployment and sacrifice.

"Movement of the exchange rate to parity with sterling would leave an even

smaller margin of £156 million between revalued debts of £426 million and oversea reserves of £270 million.

"Lightening of the burden is even more appreciable than is shown by the reduced aggregate amount.

"Annual payments of interest have been about halved. Only £17.8 million a year is now payable on Commonwealth and State debts abroad, compared with £30.9 million in 1932. The current figure may be reduced by an additional £1½ million a year minimum earnings on liquid oversea reserves.

"Each Australian today is responsible for something less than £1 18s. 2d. a year to meet interest on external debt. In 1932 his or her liability was £3 15s. 3d. a year.

"The external interest burden would be clipped still further, if the Australian currency returned to parity with sterling. A reduction of £3½ million to £14.3 million a year would thus be effected.

"National capacity to meet interest payments has increased to a remarkable extent. Reserves of international currency have reached 19 times the amount required in any one year. In 1932 little more than one year's interest was in reserve, allowing for note issue cover.

"The value of current exports is now 28 times the annual charge on oversea public debts against less than 3 times in 1932."

Then they tell us that we are not producing any more now than we did in 1934, whereas it is 28 times greater.

The article continues—

"Ability to resist world depression is now far greater than in the boom year of 1928. Oversea debts then amounted to £570,000,000 with an annual liability for interest of £27.3 million covered only four times (against 19 now) by liquid reserves of £106 million."

I have a graph here showing the difference between 1939 and 1949. In 1939 our reserves stood at £56,000,000, but in 1949 they had risen to £338,000,000, an increase of £282,000,000. The Public Debt in 1939 was £644,000,000, but in 1949 it had fallen to £533,000,000, a reduction of £111,000,000. The net indebtedness in 1939 was £588,000,000 but by 1949 it had been reduced to £195,000,000. What a tremendous reduction! Then they tell us that this engine-driver Prime Minister with the rasping voice, Ben Chifley, cannot govern this country.

I say that Ben Chifley has proved himself to be the greatest financier this country ever had and the greatest Prime Minister Australia has ever had in her history. I predict that not only will the Federal Government be returned at the next election with an overwhelming majority but I say that this State Government, particularly when this Budget is placed before the people and they see what the Government did last year in the way of public works and what we propose to do this year, will also be returned to these Treasury benches. We have fulfilled in the past year everything that the Treasurer set out to do

and we shall have proved when the Treasurer presents his next Financial Statement that the Government have done what they set out to do this year. In the last three years the Government have expended £25,392,999 on capital works, development and useful services, exclusive of expenditure by the Queensland Housing Commission on houses built for rental. The people will be satisfied that we are capable of governing the State and are entitled to a renewal of their confidence.

We talk of millions glibly. If a man had £1,000,000 given to him and was told he had to spend it at the rate of £25 a day he would require to live until he attained the age of 109. That gives some idea of what a million pounds mean. If a man lived for 80 years he would have lived for 700,000 hours, yet we talk about millions of pounds glibly. If the Government are fortunate, as they are at present, in their staff of departmental officers to budget for and design works, and to oversee and put them into operation, they will be bound to succeed, and the people will consider them capable of holding the reins of government for many years to come. I feel that on their record the Government will occupy the Treasury benches in this Parliament for many years.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. HEADING (Wide Bay) (4.18 p.m.):** The Treasurer will be tired of the bouquets hurled at him by members of his own party and I am sure that he would like, by way of a change, to hear something critical. It is easy to quote the millions the hon. gentleman talks about and it is easy to bring down a Budget providing for all the millions he has told us about. I should like to peruse the Budget at the end of this financial year and see how many millions the Government have spent and what progress the Government have made in the programme of works budgeted for.

I congratulate the Treasurer on the fact that he had a surplus of £49,723 for the last financial year, but that is about the end of my congratulations. I know that he has a little fund that is peculiarly handy. The Treasurer is quite equal to seeing to it that he did not have a deficit at the end of the year, seeing that he had at hand his Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund. I congratulate the Government on the fact that they put £10,120,102 into this fund in the period it has been operating. It is a wonderful nest-egg for the Treasurer to draw on. In the years that this fund has been in operation the Treasurer has drawn on it for over £5,000,000 and that would indicate that in a few years this nest-egg will disappear.

Being an observant man I perused the Financial Statement and I found that at page 16 the Treasurer, in referring to the Trust and Special Funds, said—

“Included in the above figures is the provision of £1,667,250 for the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund.”

I am hoping the Treasurer is taking some notice of this because I am not sure whether he meant “for” or “from.” In the paragraph above he said—

“The anticipated expenditure from Trust and Special Funds in 1949-50 is £23,241,853, and details of the proposed appropriations are shown in the Estimates.”

He then says—

“Included in the above figures is the provision of £1,667,250 for the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund.”

I am not sure whether the Treasurer meant he was going to pay that much money into the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund, or whether it was from that fund.

**Mr. Larcombe:** They are both in the Trust and Special Funds, but they are shown separately for the convenience of hon. members.

**Mr. HEADING:** No doubt the Treasurer will give us some further explanation later on. If it means that the £1,667,250 is being deducted from the £5,000,000, then in about three years' time this nest-egg will have disappeared and we shall have to look for funds somewhere else to keep us going.

I note that the railways overspent their appropriation by something over £1,000,000. The Treasurer says—

“The large increase in receipts necessitated, of course, additional expenditure.”

That is open to challenge. On 14 July, 1947, there was an increase in fares and freights by 10 per cent. and on 14 May, 1948, they were increased by 12½ per cent.

**Mr. Larcombe:** We reduced them a good deal before that.

**Mr. HEADING:** I note that the Treasurer said that because of the increase in receipts it cost more to run the railways. Much of that increase came from the increase in fares and freights, and that would not necessitate any more expenditure. Perhaps it would require one more person to carry the money to the bank.

I compliment the Treasurer on the amount he has allocated for irrigation and water supply. I believe it is a very necessary appropriation and I hope that the Government will prosecute the installation of irrigation to the best of their ability. I realise the shortages of man-power and equipment. This is a matter of very serious import and the sooner the projects outlined are carried out the better it will be for the State.

I know that the Government are very good at planning. A couple of years ago the Premier said they had a 10-year plan. I still have a copy of the “Courier-Mail” with the story in it and I am still waiting for many of the projects outlined therein to be carried out. I do not want to criticise the Government plan in regard to irrigation at all; I

approve of the amount allocated. The only point I make is that I hope it is not a matter of election propaganda, to be forgotten after the election.

On page 18 of his Financial Statement the Treasurer has this to say—

“An indication of the growth of land settlement is contained in the fact that for the 17 years period ended 30 June, 1949, the following live stock were carried on the Queensland Railways, 37,184,000 sheep; 12,876,000 cattle; 8,353,000 pigs, and 3,836,000 calves.”

That does not indicate anything, really, except, if I may use the term, bunkum. One has only to remember that in 1894 there were 7,000,000 head of cattle in Queensland.

**Government Member:** The year after the flood.

**Mr. HEADING:** I am not nearly as good as hon. members opposite in going back to the dim and dark ages of the past. That is a thing that hon. members opposite are adept in. In 1949, however, there were only 5,991,797 cattle in Queensland. What is the good of referring to the number of stock carried over 17 years by the railway as an indication of land settlement? That is so much eyewash.

The figures for sheep are—

1892 .. .. .	21,708,310
1949 .. .. .	16,499,957

Does that indicate that great land settlement has taken place? The settlement on the land has taken place but why all this story about the stock the railways have carried? I go back only as far as the year 1943 in connection with pig population—

1943 .. .. .	450,391
1949 .. .. .	407,322

That is a decrease of 43,000. The statement in the Budget is intended merely for election purposes, I take it, not intended to be taken seriously except by those who do not bother to verify the figures of the stock population in this State.

I notice, too, that the Treasurer had some remarks to make about organised marketing—

“The growth of the organised marketing system in Queensland has been remarkable, and has been of great protection and advantage to the primary producer. From its inauguration until 30 June, 1949, the amount of money distributed to the growers through this system was £485,000,000.”

You know, Mr. Mann, it almost staggers me. I do not understand how members of the Government can try to put all this eyewash over hon. members on this side, who are closely connected with the primary producers. We know that that £485,000,000 is for products grown and sold. The Government have lost the true idea of organised marketing. They do not know what it is. Organised marketing, as we understand, is co-operative control and started with that. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove mentioned this a little time ago. The Government have got

away from that idea altogether. Today the Commonwealth Government take control of the meat industry and producers can find out nothing that takes place in the Australian Meat Industry Board unless someone makes a mistake and speaks “out of his turn.” Every member of that board is sworn to secrecy. There are members on it representing the primary producers, men who grow the product, and surely to goodness they have a right to know how their products are sold. What happens today? A matter comes before the board but the producers are not told the decision. I have been unable to get from them yet particulars of any recommendation they have made to the Minister except on one occasion, when the Minister let the cat out of the bag. That was last year when he wrote and told us that the pig producers got the price the board recommended. That is the one and only time when the producers have ever found out anything that took place on the Commonwealth board. The selling of our produce is in the hands of a body of men sworn to secrecy. Those who grow the product are not told any of the conditions or how the amount recommended to the Commonwealth Government has been arrived at, and whether he accepts the recommendation is solely in the hands of the Minister for Commerce. Whether he knows anything about it or not he makes a deal with the British Government. I think it was last time that he sent a civil servant to England to complete a deal. I am concerned with the fact that the primary producer knows nothing about the basis of the price that has been arrived at. The first thing he knows about it is when he finds out to his disappointment that the price is much below what he thinks he should get.

The Government have got away from organised marketing altogether. New Zealand did the same thing at one time, but they woke up to the fact and when they made their last deal for their dairy products in England they sent over three farmers to carry out negotiations on price.

**Mr. Power:** Do you say the price is too low?

**Mr. HEADING:** I do, and I propose showing why. I am here to say what I know about the industry, not to criticise merely for the sake of criticising. When Sir Henry Turner was out here I discussed prices with him and he told me that during the war they bought beef from America at 2s. 2d. a pound and at the same time were buying beef from the Queensland graziers at 4½d. a pound, and he went on to say, “Do you know, the graziers of Queensland were making greater profits than the people of America?” I said, “Can you give me any figures to substantiate that?” He could not do so. I have yet to be convinced that it costs so much more to produce a pound of beef in America that they will not make as much profit out of 2s. 2d. a pound as the Queensland grazer would make out of 4½d. a pound. I told Sir Henry Turner that if he intended to make statements like that to men of ordinary common sense out here he should have figures to prove his statements. I wish to make it clear, however, that

because a certain country is getting a certain price, I am not suggesting that our producers should receive the same price.

**Mr. Gair:** Our graziers are doing all right. I had a letter from one the other day and he tells me that he is buying a new Rolls Royce car costing £6,000.

**Mr. HEADING:** Any damn fool can make any statement at all, but when it is investigated there might not be nearly so much in it.

The point I wish to stress is that the Labour Governments have taken the marketing of our primary products out of the hands of the producers and that is not in the best interests of primary production. That is one instance in which the Treasurer's statement that the Government are giving the greatest encouragement to primary producers is at fault. Primary producers should be given at least the opportunity of stating their case for an increased price, a price that will give them at least cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit.

I come now to the cotton industry. It was established many years ago in Queensland, but today, through want of interest and lack of encouragement on the part of Labour Governments in both Federal and State spheres, it has gone almost out of existence. This is borne out by the fact that in 1936 we produced over 13,000 bales of cotton and this figure has dropped each year until it was down to 1,500 bales in 1947, and we shall be lucky if we get 550 bales this year.

Over 12 months ago the Commonwealth Government were asked to give the growers a guaranteed price. Mr. Chifley, this wonderful Prime Minister with his great knowledge of primary industries, this engine-driver who had all the information before him, could see that the cotton industry was dying on its feet.

**Mr. Gair:** The fact that he was an engine-driver is not to his discredit.

**Mr. HEADING:** I did not say it was.

**Mr. Gair:** You implied it.

**Mr. HEADING:** I do not know what goes through the mind of the Secretary for Labour and Industry, because I was not referring to Mr. Chifley as being an engine-driver. It was the hon. member for Kelvin Grove who spoke of him as driving an engine.

Over the years the cotton industry has been dying. The Prime Minister was induced to look into it twelve months ago, when he said that there would be an inquiry. The months have dragged on and we shall be lucky, as I have said, if we get 550 bales this year. Twelve months, after the granting of the inquiry, we got the story from the Tariff Board that the cotton industry was not worth saving and that we might as well let it die. Where we disagree with the ideas of the Tariff Board and the Commonwealth Government, if they hold to the same view, is that the cotton industry is a very important one to this country. In the event of war, if we were unable to import cotton, the industry

would be a very important one to us. Just at the time we had started to introduce machinery to pick cotton, in an effort to reduce costs we have been turned down by the Tariff Board and denied a fair price. The industry was asking for only 27d. a lb., which is less than the cost of importing American cotton. The price of imported cotton is 36½d. a lb. against the price of 27d. a lb. asked for by the growers in this country. The Labour Government are not prepared to grant that price.

Comparing the cotton industry with the butter industry, we find that in 1936 the average price of cotton was 11.39d. a lb., when butter was 11.2d. Over the years cotton has gone to 15.77d. and butter to 2s. Our friend the hon. member for Kelvin Grove said that the Government would carry out their promises, and if that is so the people in the cotton industry hope that the Government will carry out that part of their promise to encourage this part of primary industry.

The people engaged in the butter industry were promised by the Commonwealth Government that they would get the cost of production. Everybody knew 12 months ago that the contract for butter would end on 30 June, 1949, and that we were entitled to get a new price as from 1 July. Today, four months later, we are still waiting for a decision. Is that the way the Government encourage primary industry? If that is the method the Government are adopting in relation to primary producers, they will not get very far at the next election.

In the Address in Reply speeches much was said about the pig contract with the British Government and the Treasurer made some statements on the Supply Bill to which I will reply. He said—

“Today in Britain and in other parts of the world there are splendid markets at reasonable prices, the cost of production plus profit, for the producers of Queensland . . .”

I do not want to inflict on this Chamber another discussion on the price of pig-meat but in view of some information I have I have decided that I must again take up some time in dealing with this very important industry.

**Mr. Farrell:** Take it as read.

**Mr. HEADING:** Much as hon. members opposite may dislike it, I must do it.

The Treasurer, for instance, had some comment to make on my previous statements. He said that I wanted a 100 per cent. increase in the price of pig-meats and that I wanted to take Great Britain down. The Premier had a great deal to say, too, and so did the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock. I was accused of making loose statements about the production of pig-meats. I had made the statement that the cost of producing pig-meat was 1s. 3d. a pound and that we had asked the British Government to pay 1s. 6d. a pound so as to create an incentive for people to come back into the pig industry again in this State in which there had been a serious falling-off in the production of pigs. I was

subjected to a good deal of criticism because of my statements but at last I am backed up in what I said by other people.

Mr. C. W. Strutt, one of the members of the British Food Mission, who visited Australia with Sir Henry Turner, was later again sent out to Australia as representative of the British Ministry of Food and liaison officer between that Ministry and the Commonwealth Government. He attended a meeting of the commercial pig-breeders in Melbourne during show week recently and this is the report that our delegates brought back—

“Delegates from the Queensland branch of the Australian Pig Society who attended Federal Council meeting in Melbourne told their branch that Mr. C. W. Strutt of the United Kingdom Food Ministry had stated that he considered 1s. 6d. a lb. was a reasonable price and that he was prepared to support a recommendation to his Government that the contract be at that figure.”

I was accused of bleeding Great Britain because of the price that I suggested but I pointed out that it was less than Great Britain was paying in any other country in the world. I quoted the figures. Mr. Strutt agreed that the price was not exorbitant and he said he would recommend its acceptance to the British Government. When I mentioned the figure of 1s. 3d. a pound as being the cost of production the Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Agriculture said that the matter would be investigated.

I have with me a report on pig-meat production costs conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The inquiry was conducted throughout the States of Australia. I do not intend to read the whole report but it is necessary that I should read this pertinent part—

“Estimates vary from 14.6d. for a one-man unit farm to 15d. for side-line production on dairy farm and 15.2d. on wheat farm.”

The cost would vary as between districts according to circumstances but it is rather significant that the figure quoted is the same as the figure given by the Australian Pig Society to Mr. Strutt and the Commonwealth Government as being the cost of production, which is based on a report made by ourselves in both Victoria and New South Wales. I have given the figures before. Representatives of pig-producers in Queensland have said that my estimate of the cost of production in Queensland was quite fair. I wanted to clean up this argument between myself, the Treasurer, and the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock on the cost of producing pig-meat and I have been able to show that the price suggested by me for payment by the British Government was a reasonable one. If the Government are serious in their avowed intentions to help the primary producer they should get in behind the members of the Pig Society and see that the cost of production is paid to the producers.

The contract with the British Government expired on 30 September last. At the moment there is no fixed price for pig-meat. We cannot arrive at any price for pigs, but the

price everywhere has gone up in anticipation of an increase in the new contract. That, of course, is in accordance with the imagination of the buyer. I do urge the Government to do something to see that the new contract price, not only for pig-meat but for all other meat, is announced as early as possible. Our bacon factory is paying 1s. 0½d. to pig farmers on the understanding that if the price of pig-meat is increased from 1 October the increased price will be passed on to the farmer.

I now want to refer to land settlement. I stand right behind the efforts being made to put as many soldiers on the land as possible on as good conditions as we can possibly give them and I am worried because the progress of soldier settlement is so slow. I am afraid that some of the men, who were 30 and 40 years of age when the war ended, will be very old men when they are able to get a block of land unless they are settled more quickly. One man working at the bacon factory, who was a share farmer in my district, has taken part in every ballot for soldier lands, but he is still without a block. He is over 40 years of age. You have hundreds of people putting in for blocks and, therefore, you must realise the necessity for getting blocks ready more speedily. I urge the Minister to do everything he can in this direction.

I want to say one or two things about the freezing of properties for soldier settlement and the taking over of grazing land for that purpose. Graziers are possessed of the fear that their land may be taken from them and naturally they are not doing everything they could to improve their property. A good deal of common sense must be used in taking over land for soldier settlement, particularly freehold land, because these people were led to believe that as their land was freehold they had the right to keep it for all time. It will be necessary to take over certain land for settlement, including the settlement of returned soldiers, but that land should not be acquired on 1942 values. It will be remembered that right from the inception of the scheme the Government compulsorily acquired land on 1942 values. That is one of the worst actions I have ever heard of. Why should the Government penalise the grazier to the extent they are doing? These people have as much right to get 1949 values as anyone else who sells land or any other article. It is unfair to retard the progress of the man on the land and inflict on him what in my opinion is not in the best interests of himself or his family or the industry. It is not fair to ask the grazier to carry a proportion of the cost of land settlement as the Government are doing by taking over his land on 1942 values. The quicker the Government desist from that iniquitous practice the better it will be for the country and all primary industries.

I note that overnight people who held gold got an increase of nearly £5 an ounce but when the primary producer asks for a three-penny increase in the price of butter or meat or a half-penny in the price of sugar there is all the objections in the world. It looks to me as if the Labour Government or the people

concerned were greasing the fat pig's back and leaving the other fellow who works long hours very often under bad conditions, to take what is left. Those people ask the primary producers to feed the people at a price that is less than the cost of production.

There are one or two points I want to make in connection with country schools. I refer first to the practice of closing a school immediately the attendance falls below an average of nine. First the department writes to the school committee and asks it to show cause why the school should not be closed. Unless it can produce an average of nine the school is closed. Conditions are changing in the country every day. Labour is scarce and many of the people have to carry on without any help at all. When a school is closed the children are forced onto the Correspondence School and many parents have not the time—and many not the ability—to help the children. I have schools in my electorate where the average number has fallen to eight and seven and these children are deprived of the benefit of a school education. The position is certainly not satisfactory. The department should consider reducing the average required from nine to seven so as to give these children a chance. Hon. members opposite talk of decentralisation and doing things that will prevent the people from drifting to the cities. There is one thing that this Government could do if they would only take sufficient interest in the education of the country children. I take it there are not many schools where the average falls below nine, so the expense would not be very great. I repeat emphatically that action should be taken immediately.

The Government talk about the vast amount that we are spending on education, but I went to some trouble to get the figures relating to the number of teachers in primary schools to see what the position actually was. They are as follows:—

Year.	No.
1914 .. .. .	3,443
1939 .. .. .	4,292
1948 .. .. .	4,169

I made other investigations and found that the average enrolment of pupils in 1914 was 101,769, in 1939 141,354, and in 1948 137,300, and the average number of pupils per teacher in 1914 was 29.5, in 1939 32.9, and in 1948 33. The Government have not improved conditions at all. Today one teacher is teaching a greater number of pupils than he did in 1914. With the millions of money being spent on education the result is not commensurate with the expenditure.

But I thank God for the fact that Queensland has such an educational system that although it may not teach new members sufficiently to be able to write their speeches it does enable them to read them. From that angle, of course, the educational system has been of some value. What is the cost of the research that has been necessary to find out all about the development, the amount of money expended, and so on, over the past 20 years to enable members of the Government party, especially those representing the North,

to have their speeches prepared for them. On this occasion virtually half the members of the Government who have spoken have read speeches. The cost of this work must have been very high.

As to tobacco, particularly its distribution, I do not believe in monopolies nor do I believe in socialistic control or communistic policy, but I know of a man who bought a store to which was attached a tobacco allotment. His premises were moved into the town, only a couple of miles away and because of this new location the proprietor asked for an increase in his tobacco allotment, but the reply was that he had no right to have anything at all and took away the whole of his allotment. Today he is not getting an allotment.

**A Government Member:** That is a combine.

**Mr. HEADING:** Well, there are a Labour Government in Queensland and a Labour Government in the Commonwealth and the Government of Queensland have allowed things like this to occur in Queensland. This should not be allowed. These people have every right to get a tobacco allotment now that they are on a new site as the store had one before it was moved. Labour Governments are responsible for creating greater combines than any Government in Queensland. On their own admission, this is a combine; therefore it is their responsibility.

The hon. member for Kelvin Grove made a statement that certainly merited a reply, as it showed the depth of his ignorance, a depth to which I did not think anybody, not even a Labour member, could descend. Had the educational system been different, this probably would not have occurred. He spoke of the sum of £132,000,000 as being distributed in subsidies. I do not mind the hon. member's saying it, but he should not hold it up as being something wonderful the Commonwealth Government had done for the primary producers of this State. Is it wonderful that the Government have deprived the primary producers of the world's parity in prices? The only reason given was to enable butter to be sold cheaply to the people of Queensland. It was a subsidy not so much to the primary producer as to the consumer, because had we been allowed to accept world parity the consumers here would have had to pay a great deal more for their butter. As we are deprived of the opportunity of taking that price, as we are compelled to sell on the local market at a lower figure, the Government had to make it up to us in some way, or the dairy industry would have just closed up.

Then, when we look at the position with regard to hides and tallow, we find that during the war and since we have been compelled to take £30 a ton when it is worth approximately £130 a ton overseas. Not only is the grazier forced to sell his beef at much below world parity but he is also being forced to sell his tallow and hides in Australia for as much as £100 a ton less than is paid overseas. And the Government talk about subsidies! Why, they are only returning to the producer what is rightfully his!

The policy of the Labour Government is such that if we should happen to get a little more than they would like us to receive we can rest assured that Mr. Chifley will find means of taking it from us.

By their policy, the Labour Government are breeding a class of people who think only of what they can get from the Government. We have free hospitalisation, free medicine, shorter hours, and so on, but when we analyse the position we find that the worker is paying for most of it. Mr. Chifley did manage to say the other day that someone has to pay for all these things. Unfortunately it is the worker and the producer. All these indirect taxes are passed on to both the primary producer and the worker. As a result of these taxes, the position is that as costs rise so will the prices of everything consumed by the public of the country. I feel certain that if the Treasurer will only give the matter some consideration he will admit that free medicine and all these other free things eventually react to the detriment of the people themselves because many people will take many things if they are free, if they have not to be paid for in cash at the time, and so add unnecessarily to the cost that has to be met by the taxpayers of this State.

So I suggest, Mr. Keyatta, that the Government tighten up on their expenditure and see to it that the people work for what they get. I have never objected to reasonable wages; I pay them myself. I do not object to granting reasonable conditions to working men, because I have worked myself. I have carried my swag. I know what it is to be a labourer, and I know what it is to be a boss. I provide my men with a decent hut, electric lights, and an enamel bath, and give them conditions that I did not enjoy myself.

**Mr. Ingram:** Thanks to the union and the Government.

**Mr. HEADING:** I have never had a representative of the union on my place; there is no need for him to come there. The hon. member is judging me by what he would do himself. If the hon. member knows these things and credits me with doing them we can rest assured that that is what he would do himself.

**Mr. Ingram:** I know too much about your class.

**Mr. HEADING:** The trouble with the hon. member is that he knows absolutely nothing. He reminds me of an advertisement we saw during the war period depicting three monkeys—see nothing, tell nothing, hear nothing—but he does not carry the third one through. He does not listen to anybody who could tell him something about the necessary things of life.

The Treasurer ended his Financial Statement on an electioneering note—

**Mr. Farrell:** You are jealous of it.

**Mr. HEADING:** I know that the Treasurer will not carry out half the things he spoke of.

**Mr. Ingram:** We will not starve the people as your party did.

**Mr. HEADING:** I have found that people who make the most noise usually have the least interest in things that matter. The hon. member knows very little about our primary industries. I have never boasted of what I know about them. I have engaged in primary production since I was able to work. I chopped my scrub and started farming operations in Queensland and I have done everything with my own hands.

The phrase "increased wealth production" intrigues me. Hon. members opposite speak of the wonderful prices we get for our export commodities but they forget that those prices have gone up tremendously only in recent years. Actually we export less but prices are three times as high as they were pre-war. There is nothing to boast about in the fact that we are earning tremendous sums of money. The hon. member for Kelvin Grove spoke of our £380,000,000 credit in London but that money is there because we have not imported from England or the sterling countries goods equal to the sums our primary exports have realised in Great Britain.

When we are able to import all the things that the people in this country so badly need our credit balance in London will gradually disappear. There is nothing surprising about that credit balance, with wool prices four to five times greater than they were before the war, and similar increases in those of other primary products. The credit balance was not brought about by any effort on the part of any Government. It was built up by the hard work of people on farms and grazing properties, who exported produce that realised high prices abroad. Let me remind hon. members opposite, too, that while the prices of primary products are high today the costs of production are mounting up. For example, in estimating the cost of producing pig-meat an expert said that the price of grain had gone up by 147 per cent. Therefore, when a comparison is made of the prices of primary products today and those of a few years ago, it is well worth remembering that the cost of production has increased tremendously.

**Mr. Power:** Did they tell you by how much the cost of producing grain had increased?

**Mr. HEADING:** As we have not had an inquiry into the cost of producing grain to my knowledge I cannot answer that question.

The Treasurer ended his Budget on a note of elation—he promised quite a number of things. I can only hope that he will carry out at least some of them because we should then be a long way better off than we are today. For instance, he has promised to help the co-operative movement in this country, but I can tell him that the co-operative people helped themselves many years before the Government passed the Co-operative Associations Act.

**Mr. Power:** And the Government gave many bank guarantees without which they could not have succeeded.

**Mr. HEADING:** The Government did give a number of bank guarantees to the peanut and other industries, but I do not know of any case in which the co-operative butter factories approached the Government for a bank guarantee.

**Mr. Roberts:** You got a guaranteed price.

**Mr. HEADING:** But if we did not have a guaranteed price we should have a better price than we have today. We have simply asked for the cost of production—nothing more.

**Mr. Brown:** Are you not getting that now?

**Mr. HEADING:** No. According to the investigation into cost of production we are entitled to an increase of 3d. a pound as from 1 July last. We are not getting it and so we are not getting the cost of production.

**Mr. Power:** But you will admit that the dairy farmer is better off today than ever before in the history of Queensland.

**Mr. HEADING:** That is the mistake that the people in the city make. They know that the cost of everything in the city has increased but they refuse to recognise that these higher costs have also to be carried by the producer. Everything has gone up considerably in price since the war.

**Mr. Power:** I know one dairy farmer who is getting a return of £2 10s. per month per cow, grass-fed.

**Mr. HEADING:** That is all right. I know some who get £3, but you must take into consideration the costs of production. Because the cow is grass-fed does not prove anything. It does not prove that it costs nothing to maintain that cow. The Minister reminds me of what the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock said to me at a social gathering tendered to the British Food Mission, when he accused me of having said something to Sir Henry Turner. The Minister said it did not cost anything to feed a pig because the grower grew his own grain between milkings.

**Mr. Power:** There is no comparison between a grass-fed cow and feeding a pig.

**Mr. HEADING:** The cow must be fed. All articles associated with a dairy, as well as local authority rates, have increased tremendously. Labour costs have increased. I remember when I paid a man £3 a week; today I have to pay him £7. The fact that a cow returns £2 or £1 a month proves nothing. What you must do is to take your balance sheet at the end of the year and put your expenditure against the income. When the workers go to the Industrial Court for an increase in wages they must prove that costs of living have increased. The Minister knows that as a result the basic wage has increased tremendously.

**Mr. Power:** I know a dairy farmer who is milking 50 cows with milking machines. He is employing no labour and he is not feeding them either, yet he is making £2 10s. per month per cow.

**Mr. Muller:** That is not right.

**Mr. Power:** It is right and I can produce it.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keyatta):** Order!

**Mr. HEADING:** A dairy farmer may get £2 10s. per month per cow for the first few months when it comes into production but we all know that returns diminish rapidly as the lactation period extends.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (5.18 p.m.):** I join with the other hon. members in congratulating the Treasurer on the excellent Budget he has presented. My sympathies go out to the Opposition in having to face up to the fact that this is the eleventh successive Budget showing a surplus that the Labour Government has presented to Parliament. That fact must be galling to the Opposition. We must concede the many difficulties that the Government have had to face up to in the preceding 12 months and the many problems they have had to overcome. Therefore, the Budget discloses that both the Government and the Treasurer have done particularly good work. It has been said, and said truly, that finance is the test of good government. Today Labour can show it has lived up to its responsibility of government inasmuch as it has brought down a Budget showing another surplus.

The Government are facing another period of progress and I have no doubt that when Parliament meets next year we shall find that the people have entrusted the present Government again with the task of keeping this State on the road of progress. We know that if progress is to be maintained the Government must plan for developmental works and must be prepared to spend large sums of money. The Budget discloses that it is intended in the next 12 months to make a large amount of money available for public works. It sets out estimates of the funds needed for local authorities and local bodies. They are—

	£
Land Settlement (including Soldier Settlement), Irrigation, and Forestry .. ..	2,668,831
Agricultural Bank Advances (including loans to ex-servicemen) .. ..	1,250,500
Main Roads (Permanent Works only) .. ..	1,966,380
Railways (including deferred Maintenance and Renewal Works) .. ..	3,470,010
Water Facilities on Stock Routes .. ..	75,000
Mining .. ..	187,500

Those are some of the items that go to make up the total of approximately £17,000,000 that is provided for works to be undertaken during the next 12 months. Many of them are very necessary for the continued development of the State, and it is fitting that the Government should make available the amount necessary to carry them out.

Much has been said about the development of North Queensland. Many true things have been spoken on the matter, but I feel that certain things have not been said that should have been said. We have heard the Opposition members attacking the Government for their failure to develop North Queensland and for not doing this and that. As a North Queensland conversant with conditions in the North and who realises the potentialities of that area, I defy any hon. member to prove that this Government have not done everything in their power to help in the development of the potentialities of that great area. Although they are doing great work, it will be many decades before North Queensland will be developed to full capacity.

Whilst the Government have a responsibility, so have the people. We have seen many of the wealthy people who have money to invest by-pass the North. They have sought to throw the responsibility on the Government for the conditions in North Queensland. Some of the handicaps North Queensland is suffering from are due to the fact that some people have lost, or are losing, faith in North Queensland. I could mention many of the men engaged in rural industries in the North who, because of improved social conditions and the betterment of their financial standing, have taken their children out of the industry in which they themselves are engaged; and now they find they have to depend on outside labour. In the sugar industry there are many farmers whose children are not engaged in that industry; they send their children into the professions. But the Government are blamed for the lack of labour. The Government are not to blame. The people who get their living from the industry should have sufficient faith in it to encourage their children to continue in it. The position is that when they have reached a better financial standing—and I do not blame them in one respect; every man likes to do something better for his children than he had—they push them into the professional occupations, and this has meant a decline of man-power in the rural industries of North Queensland.

Another angle of this problem is that with the increase in industry, the labour difficulty has been accentuated. The lack of population in North Queensland is attributed to a great extent to continued harping about the lack of amenities in the North. Recently statements were made by Mr. R. G. Menzies, Mr. A. W. Fadden, and other representatives of the Opposition, crying about the neglect of the North. What encouragement is it to the people in the North to remain there or those in the South to go to the North when they hear all this cry about the neglect of the North? The North offers great opportunities and the Commonwealth and Queensland Governments are encouraging migrants to go North, where they are badly needed, and it is a wise man who will go North and work in the industries there.

**Mr. Muller:** How many migrants have you there?

1949—2 F

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I could not tell the hon. member off-hand. We have seen a big decline in the mining industry in the North; consequently, insufficient man-power is available to do the necessary prospecting and development. And that brings to mind another reason for the decline in mining. Today one rarely sees the old type of prospector, the man who was prepared for an adventure, who would go out and prospect and find a new mining field. There has been a gradual decline in the mining area of North Queensland but many districts in North Queensland are rich in minerals; probably there is no known mineral that cannot be found in North Queensland. It is hoped, however, that with the improvement in world prices for minerals there will be a revival of the industry in the North.

Time was when Charters Towers had a population of 30,000 and Croydon and the centres of some of the other mining fields of the North had large populations too. Some of these towns are virtually non-existent nowadays. It is a great pity that the wealth of these districts has been neglected, but people will not go there and develop the fields unless an economic price is paid for the minerals won from the field. I do not think that there will be any further development of these mineral areas until people get some of the old pioneering spirit that induced a number of their forebears to undergo some of the hardships inseparable from the mining development of that area.

**Mr. Kerr:** Give them freedom from taxation.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** It is because of the rise in the standard of living that our people today, many of them, have lost the old pioneering spirit. It is largely changing conditions throughout the world that have been responsible. I believe that with proper attention to the North—and this Government have given and will continue to give it—there will be a sufficiency of population in the North and all these things will return to normal.

**Mr. Muller:** You admit that the people are leaving that territory?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I must be truthful and admit that Croydon and similar places in the Far North of Queensland, which carried large populations, have declined, but I must also say that time and again figures have been given in this Chamber that indicate that the population of the coast belt of North Queensland has increased.

**Mr. Larcombe:** And Mt. Isa?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The Treasurer reminds me of the growth of Mount Isa. This shows that with proper handling and proper production and treatment of ores such places as Mount Isa can be developed. I do not think that the Mount Isa district carries the only rich ore in North Queensland. Many of the areas in the Far North, those about Croydon and Forsyth for example, are just as rich in minerals as Mount Isa, and this wealth can be produced if the area is properly developed. The Mount Isa Company was prepared to go in for large-scale development.

There was an inducement and we find that when the inducement is there population increases, as it has increased two-fold in the past years in such places as Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Bundaberg. Climatic conditions on the coast are better, there are more opportunities for a man's family, living conditions are better and there are more avenues of employment, with the result that people are drifting to the coast from the inland.

**Mr. Aikens:** But the coast will not develop very far if the back country is allowed to languish.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I agree that the development to the back country is essential if the coast is to develop. There is no doubt that we could absorb another 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 people in the North. We cannot hope to achieve this with our natural increase, and we must depend on the new migrants to build up our northern population. Rarely do we hear hon. members of the Government party criticising the North. Most of the criticism comes from the Opposition, their one intention being to endeavour to gain a point against the Government. They advise young men not to go North and at the same time, merely for political propaganda they criticise the Government for not doing this or that in the North.

The decision of the sugar industry to send representatives overseas, led by our Premier, should be gratifying to us all. This industry offers the greatest opportunities of all our primary industries for populating the North. We have seen what it has done for this State in the last 25 years and the possibilities of gaining greater quotas on the overseas market should be exploited to the fullest extent and if obtained it will guarantee the expansion of the industry. Vast areas of land there are eminently suited to cane-growing. No doubt they would have been under cane today but for the policy of restriction of production adopted by the industry. If we have an opportunity of expanding markets overseas we can settle many more men in it. Apart from the returned soldiers who are eager to engage in cane-growing, there are thousands of other men who would seize the opportunity of going into it tomorrow. It is one of the safest and best organised industries in North Queensland. Although the cane-growers have had bad years caused by drought, generally speaking it can be said that the industry offers greater security than any other rural industry, because of the fertility of the North Queensland soil.

It has been very interesting to hear the various dissertations by hon. members opposite on Socialism. I firmly believe that many of them are suffering from socialistic phobia. Being devoid of any constructive criticism or argument as to why this Government should be replaced, they raise the socialistic bogey in an endeavour to mislead the people. They have told many untruths about what happened in England under the policy of the British Labour Government and the statement today

by the hon. member for Bremer about the real position in England's coal mining industry was therefore very interesting indeed. It gave the lie direct to those who criticised the nationalisation of the coal industry by the Labour Government of England. I believe the Labour Party in England did the right thing, just as I believe that it would be a good thing for this country also if we nationalised our coal-mines.

**Mr. Russell:** Do you not think that the devaluation is an admission of failure?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** No, I do not think so. Necessity is the mother of invention, and I believe that the British Government were forced into the position because of the world's economic condition.

What has been said by hon. members opposite about the socialistic policy of the Australian Labour Party will not be accepted by the people. The people of Australia have had ample opportunity over the last 30 years, if they so desired, to defeat the Government on their socialistic policy. We have not changed our policy nor have we changed our name. We are still the Australian Labour Party and still have the same platform to put before the people. Much as the Opposition dislike that platform, it has been accepted by the people before and will be accepted again. We see the socialistic bogey raised only when elections are pending. Hon. members raise it when they stump the country, and only recently Mr. Casey said, "This coming Federal election is the most important election ever held." Of course it is; we know it is. We know that this election will sound the death-knell of the Opposition. In an endeavour to defeat Labour the Opposition are raising bogies that mean nothing in the final analysis. The Opposition are so devoid of a progressive policy and constructive outlook that they must try to raise the socialistic bogey in the endeavour to gull the people into believing that it is time they changed the Government.

Let us go back a few years, to the beginning of the last war, to see the greatness of the Australian Labour movement. We go back to the time when it was necessary for Labour to take Federal control in the interests of the people. We remember the incidents that led Hon. A. W. Fadden, the leader of the Government at the time, to hand over the job to John Curtin. People of this country have received from a Federal Labour Government the greatest administration Australia has ever known. No Government have ever given to the people of this continent such a great lead as the Federal Labour Government gave, because irrespective of what the Opposition may say the Australian economy was never more sound nor were the Australian people better off than they are today. I defy the Opposition to prove that taxation has impoverished one man. The man taxation would impoverish if the Opposition's theory was correct would be the man on the lower wage level. Show me the man who has been impoverished because of taxation. The man on the lower wage level is enjoying a better standard of living in Australia than

any other worker in the world. The Australian economy is sounder than before; because of Labour administration, we have less fear of a recession than other countries have. We can look to the future with confidence. The people will express their satisfaction with Labour in a few weeks' time. We have heard so much poppycock from hon. members opposite, so much tripe they dish out about the weaknesses of the Labour administration, that it makes one sick to hear their arguments against the Federal Labour Government.

Labour Governments in the Federal Parliament and in Queensland have given the people a fair deal. The Commonwealth Government in common with the Queensland Labour Government have adopted the policy of full employment and they are going ahead with many important works. The previous speaker referred to the Snowy River project, which indicates that the Commonwealth Government is a Government of vision, which is a very necessary attribute in any constructive Government. The Commonwealth and State Labour Governments are giving good service to the people.

It was said by that great Australian poet, Banjo Paterson, that Queensland was a land of pests and after listening to the hon. member for Cooroora's contribution I agree with him. The groundsel pest is without doubt a great worry and should be exterminated but it is only one of the pests that we are afflicted with. I believe with the utmost sincerity that the greatest pests we have in the State today are political pests—members of the Q.P.P., now the Liberal Party, and the Country Party.

**Mr. MADSEN (Warwick) (5.42 p.m.):** The presentation of the Financial Statement gives hon. members an opportunity to assess the value of Government activities, to consider the various items of income and expenditure, and to survey the Government's programme of works and services for the year 1949-50. The revenue obtained from various sources, especially in the field of taxation, has been plentiful; undoubtedly more money has been flowing into the Treasury than ever before. Yet, when you measure the effective value of money, that is, what it is capable of buying, relate it to the developmental works and services provided by the Government, you must appreciate the fact that the pound will not go as far today as in other days. This fact is recognised by the individual, who knows that he cannot buy as much with his wages today as he did before. It is also acknowledged by local authorities, who require money to carry out their programmes of progressive works. It is realised by industry which finds that its requirements are much more expensive today than before and of course it is recognised by Governments, who realise that their revenue will not pay for the same amount of work as a similar amount did in other days.

The Treasurer has warned us in his Financial Statement that wealth cannot be distributed until it is produced—a very sound observation to make. At the present time vast

changes are taking place in world affairs, especially in markets and the value of money, and although the Treasurer has been able to present a Budget providing for an estimated surplus for the year, but what of the future? I feel that it is the desire of every hon. member to care for the welfare and security of our people. I would not believe for a moment that every hon. member would not be sincere in that respect. Therefore, we should devote some consideration to the prospects for the future of the national wealth of this State and Commonwealth.

Our minds naturally turn to those wealth-producing industries that will provide the wealth from which each one of us must receive his share. It may still be said that the wealth and the welfare of the people are largely dependent upon the stability of our primary industries. No doubt as time goes on we hope to have many more secondary industries associated with our primary industries, which would enable us to produce not only what we need from the land but our manufactured goods also. We should do what we can to encourage those industries, which in turn would do much towards supplying the requirements of primary industries. That would be a very desirable move indeed. It would enable increased numbers of people to be employed and make it possible for us to productively employ a greatly increased population. We could keep them profitably and productively employed with a reasonable feeling of security. It is rather disturbing to know that although we are enjoying a measure of prosperity at the present time, that is, calculating prosperity in money values, the wealth-producing industries have not gained in momentum or volume in the last nine or ten years.

**Mr. Collins:** Would you not say that the volume of wheat has increased?

**Mr. MADSEN:** Yes.

**Mr. Collins:** Would you not say the production of sugar has increased?

**Mr. MADSEN:** Yes, up to a point. The Minister will agree that the security of those industries, particularly the sugar industry, has always been the envy of every other industry? The sugar industry has always enjoyed a measure of prosperity that no other industry has enjoyed. I am happy to know that the wheat industry, even at this late stage is assured of a fair measure of security by the stabilisation plan recently introduced. However, I would venture to say that although we have the stabilisation scheme introduced by the Commonwealth Government and supported by the various State Governments, coupled with the International Agreement, it nevertheless requires a very close scrutiny with respect to increased costs. Although many statements are made as to the inability of the food-producing countries of the world to produce sufficient food for the ever-growing population, I believe that in a few years, many of the food-producing countries will be producing larger quantities of food but it is doubtful if many of the peoples of the world will have the purchasing power to buy. It is

important that countries such as our own should watch production costs very carefully and endeavour to keep production costs within the range of as many people as we possibly can.

Of course, I am a strong advocate of ensuring to the primary producer a fair measure of security by giving him costs of production and a little more. Many of the leaders of our primary-industry organisations are somewhat concerned about the ever-increasing trend of the cost of production. Even though attempts may be made to evade the issue the fact remains there are costs that are inescapable. I believe it would be very desirable if the State and Commonwealth Governments investigated many of these requirements of industry, such as imported machinery, with a view to seeing whether it is possible to remove duties or other costs that tend to raise prices. I believe the benefit would be two-fold. If the primary producer received his cost of production and a fair return for his labour it would be beneficial to him, and it would make a substantial contribution to the supply of food at a reasonable cost to our own people, and it would enable us to place our commodity on the world's market at a price at which it could compete with our rivals and thus bring the product within the range of many more people. Some years ago much was said about the over-production of food, but probably never in the history of the world was there over-production of food; rather was there under-consumption because many people were not in a position to buy their requirements.

Sufficient national wealth is produced by our industries to give all our people the security that is the primary desire of everybody. Most people will agree that few of our primary industries made any great expansion during the war years. As the Minister interjected, the wheat crop in Australia was greater than ever before, but that was largely due to the stability brought to the industry by the guaranteed price; I believe that was the main reason for its recovery. As to the international food contract, I doubt very much whether, if the value of wheat recedes to its minimum, if many of the growers could produce it at the price stipulated.

Speaking broadly, I venture the opinion that most of the wheat-growers on the Darling Downs could not grow wheat at less than 7s. a bushel. I admit that there may be an isolated instance where it could be produced at a lesser figure. I venture the opinion that in the course of a few years growers will be very lucky to get that price; after all, 7s. per bushel on the farm or at the grower's siding means that 8s. 3d. per bushel would be required to cover pool expenses, freights, railway and shipping costs. Most hon. members will agree that with wheat at that figure the big percentage of the people of the world, particularly those on the lower living standards, probably would not be in a position to buy bread. Therefore, the case I put forward for a contribution towards reducing the costs of production merits a very close examination.

Of course, I realise that many of the measures to which I refer were introduced some years ago for the protection or the development of some of our secondary industries, such as the manufacture of farming machinery. Probably many of the duties on industrial requirements were imposed for the purpose of raising revenue and to protect local industry and at that time were considered very necessary. But I believe at the moment the most practical means of obtaining revenue is to provide for that revenue after the article is produced—from the production side rather than before production. I am referring to what might be termed indirect taxation. That statement applies fairly generally to most of our primary industries. We know, of course, that those industries that have enjoyed the world market prices such as the wool industry and, up to a point, the wheat industry, can stand some of these costs at the present time, but the suggestion I make is made more from the point of view of meeting the rather drastic world changes that will occur in the near future. It is incumbent on the State Government to make these suggestions to the Commonwealth Government at the periodical conferences or meetings of Premiers with the Prime Minister, conferences of Ministers of Agriculture of the various States, and so on. It would certainly be very useful if we could induce those in high places to look at these matters from that angle.

Since I have been a member of this Assembly I have noticed that when the disabilities of a primary industry have been mentioned hon. members have been inclined to think only of the effects of those disabilities on that particular industry. They have not seemed to realise that if any one of these wealth-producing industries suffers any disability the whole economy of the country must suffer in consequence. Primary producers, during the war years and since, have had to contend with ever-increasing costs of production. During the course of this debate many hon. members have said that the primary industries have never been better off than they are now, and they speak of what a cow produces, for instance, but I remind them that if a cow returns £2 a month that is no guide to the economic position of the industry. That £2 can only be treated in the same way as the Treasurer would treat receipts when compiling his Budget. He makes provision for receipts and expenditure during the year, and in the same way the producer treats the returns from his produce as receipts, and on the expenditure side he has the costs of production.

In the main, our primary industries have endeavoured to compile sound information on their costs but have experienced far too much delay on the part of the Commonwealth Government in dealing with the reasonable requests they have put forward. For instance, we have the delay now taking place in arriving at a decision on the case put forward by the dairying industry for an increase in price to cover increased costs to the farmer and to the manufacturer. As one who has been

fairly closely associated with the compiling of costs, I have no hesitation in saying that it would be very difficult indeed to find any weakness in the method adopted by that industry in arriving at costs of production.

The Joint Advisory Costs Committee of the dairying industry has been able to submit a case satisfactory to the Commonwealth Government. This case is a matter of concern to the Queensland State Government. We know that the reason for the delay in the decision as to price has been thrust upon the shoulders of all State Governments. This is very disturbing, especially when we know that it was in June, 1948 that the Commonwealth Government notified the State Governments of the intention to make the survey in the industry. Promises were made to the industry by the Commonwealth Government and I feel that in all fairness to the industry action should have been taken immediately to have State representation on that committee to satisfy the States that the costs were being taken on a fair and reasonable basis so that they would have been satisfied to take the recommendations of the Commonwealth. I know many producers are not conversant with the position and they believe that the recommendation of the Commonwealth Government was thrust suddenly on the State Governments after the report was made.

I am certain that the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock and the Premier will agree that the State Governments were notified in June, 1948, of the promise made and the method to be followed in arriving at the cost of production. There is no better method of development and settlement in this State than by means similar to the dairying industry. In the main the dairy farmer is a man with a reasonable area of land, usually between 200 and 600 acres. There is no more desirable form of land settlement than to have a family man established on such a piece of land following a pursuit that will use that land most efficiently. It is a grave injustice, indeed a folly, for a State Government or any Government to hold up an industry that offers probably the best form of land settlement. No industry can offer a better form of settlement on land. We know that that form of settlement can be of great benefit to the State.

I urge the Queensland Government to make every effort to investigate the recommendations of the Commonwealth Government at the earliest possible moment. The industry is satisfied that the recommendation will stand any investigation that may be made. I hope the Government will do everything in their power to bring about an early decision. There is no more desirable way of settling our fertile areas than to have the small family man who is prepared to take a reasonable area of land and work it to the best possible advantage.

Passing from the dairying industry, I desire to say that our marketing methods during the past 9 or 10 years have not been conducive to land settlement and the encouragement of young men to stay on the land. As I said earlier, the sugar industry has been

established on a good sound basis; indeed, it is the envy of most other primary industries. However, we can say that the wheat industry has been placed in a sound position but there are many other industries that remain to be developed. One I have in mind is the sunflower industry, which has come into prominence of late. Attractive prices were being paid for the seed from which vegetable oil is extracted. In view of the scarcity of vegetable oil it has filled a very urgent need and its production has increased but with the extraction of these oils in the hands of a few manufacturers it was not long before the growers were exploited by people who realised that they had the growers in the palms of their hands. While it was very desirable that export restrictions should be placed on this crop, which was urgently needed in Australia for the production of oil, the growers were entitled to some measure of protection from these people, who would exploit them by paying them a reduced price for their seed, knowing full well that they had no other market.

**Mr. Theodore:** You mean protection from the private-enterprise exploiter.

**Mr. MADSEN:** Not so much the private-enterprise exploiter as from whoever attempted to pay them less than an economic price. While the manufacturers were protected, similar protection was not extended to the people supplying the seed. I believe that that applies also to the linseed industry, which is gradually developing in this State. While the price offering at the present time is quite attractive, I foresee that in a few years the linseed-growers may be placed in a very similar position and the Government should set up a joint committee comprising Government representatives and representatives of the growers with a view to arriving at a reasonable cost of production. I agree that the manufacturers are entitled to a margin of profit but we repeatedly see that export licences are refused—and I think there is a certain amount of wisdom in that when the product is required in this country—but the growers are entitled to some consideration and protection against a flooded market.

I think the same may be said of the sorghum- and maize-growing industries. It is all very well to say that the maize and the sorghum are required within the State or the Commonwealth but a temporary glut occurs at the time between harvesting and marketing, with the result that the farmer has to pay the penalty.

I think it is essential in the case of all these industries that we should set up cost committees comprising Government representatives and representatives of the producers concerned so as to give the farmers a reasonable return for their labour.

**Mr. Aikens:** You know you are advocating a form of Socialism now.

**Mr. MADSEN:** I should say I am not advocating a form of Socialism but a form of producer-control and organised marketing. It is absolutely essential, if we are to progress and develop the State that this should be done.

**Mr. Roberts:** Do you not think there should be consumer representation, too?

**Mr. MADSEN:** An organisation has already been established, namely, the Australian Dairy Produce Board, that has consumer representation. No-one has had any cause for complaint about that representation. In all sincerity I urge the State Government, in order to expedite the implementation of the recommendations of such boards in the future, to give some consideration to my suggestion. It is very desirable than an industry of such value to the State from economic and settlement standpoints should receive every consideration.

**Mr. Power:** Every industry is entitled to a reasonable margin of profit.

**Mr. MADSEN:** Many of these industries go along for a few years while the demand is such that they are profitable, but as production increases the producers find they do not get a return for their labour. That is one of the greatest tragedies of our primary industries.

**Mr. Power:** They are all right as long as they have a stabilised price.

**Mr. MADSEN:** You cannot get a stabilised price unless you have a committee to establish that price. The primary producer is entitled to a fair return on the home market. I should like to remind hon. members that the committee that inquired into the dairying industry's costs took into account labour costs at award rates plus a small allowance for managerial expenses.

**Mr. Duggan:** Was there not a tremendous variation between the lowest and highest costs?

**Mr. MADSEN:** Representatives on that committee excluded the highs and lows. Some of the producers' costs were certainly exceptionally high. They were excluded for certain reasons. Their properties were considered uneconomic for dairying. The lows were in the main not dependent on the industry for their livelihood.

**Mr. Power:** There was a tremendous difference between the highest and lowest costs.

**Mr. MADSEN:** That is so, but 85 per cent. of the dairy farmers lay within the range on which the cost was established. A very reasonable cost was established by excluding the highest and lowest costs. I would say to the Minister handling this question that the investigation will stand the closest scrutiny. Further than that, the industry will be quite happy to have State representation on that committee with a view to offsetting any delay in any further price considerations.

I do not wish to dwell on that question any further, but I do want to remind the Committee of the position prevailing in the pig industry at the present moment. There again we have the same set of circumstances that unquestionably are having an adverse

effect on production. There are many who make the statement—and I have heard it made in this Chamber—that where a pig-producer produces his own grain it should not be taken into account in the cost of production of the pig. Whether the grain was produced for sale or not, if it had a value of 5s. a bushel it would still have that value if fed to the pigs.

**Mr. Theodore:** Of course it would; it should be taken into account.

**Mr. MADSEN:** There may be little variations. For instance, if it was fed on the farm he would save the cost of the bag, but that may be offset by the cost of the crushing of the grain to feed the pigs.

**Mr. Power:** Many feed them off the cob.

**Mr. MADSEN:** That would reduce the cost in that case, but in the main the bulk of our grain for feeding purposes is crushed; and it would be a pretty fair statement to say that the average cost of the grain would be equivalent to the market price. It is not an industry that you can get in and out of, you are in or out, and I hope that the recommendations that have been made for an increase in the price of pigs will receive early and favourable consideration.

I mention these facts because I believe there is a very urgent need for the Government to take these matters into consideration if they hope to develop the State in the way that we all hope it will be developed in the future. I think it is a matter that concerns every thinking person that our volume of production has been almost stationary for the last nine or 10 years. The money value has increased about threefold; but surely one does not require to have letters after one's name to realise that the field from which we shall draw the revenue for the development of the State by Government works and services must be seriously affected as those prices recede to normal. I think it would be foolish for any of us to try to convince ourselves that those price levels can be retained; therefore, as I mentioned earlier in my speech, I think it is very desirable that we approach this question with the object of bringing our production costs to the minimum. I feel sure that it would not only be an advantage to the primary industries concerned but it would make for the happiness and welfare of the people and the development of the State as a whole.

**Mr. BARNES (Bundaberg) (7.39 p.m.):** I rise on this occasion not to work the parish pump, but to speak about the health of the people.

About seven years ago I started my speeches about the health of the people by startling hon. members with a medical word that none of them had ever heard before, namely, endocrinology. Before I decided to speak about this subject I was well aware that I not only had to encounter ignorance but clear-cut hostility, inasmuch as any discussion on endocrinology without mentioning sex-glands would be scientifically stupid. It

happened that I had to study this subject under a condition of great strain to myself, being a layman, as I had to know it in the defence of a doctor to whom obviously a gross injustice was done by ignorance and malice. I might state here that because of that study of endocrinology my constituents in Bundaberg have benefited greatly and in the long run that benefit will be extended to the whole of Queensland.

When I began my crusade on the importance of the glands, and particularly the sex-glands, as regards their importance, not only in the diseases of the body, but also disturbances of the mind and even the common behaviour of the people, nothing was known here about this matter, which is now recognised by advanced medicine to be of the utmost importance to the health of the people. You remember well, Mr. Mann, how they regarded my early speeches as crackpot ideas and quackery, just as Galileo was ridiculed when he said the earth went round the sun and not vice versa, and just as Galileo muttered when leaving the court, "Eppure si muove" meaning "And yet it moves"—Galileo went out of that court alive purely because he was of high standing in the community—I tolerated stupidity and ridicule in the sure knowledge that eventually, as in the case of Galileo, my words would be proven.

You can just imagine how difficult it was for me—when Dr. Michel himself was ridiculed in the course of defending himself when he spoke about endocrinology in court—to make clear to you how much medicine depended on endocrinology for its further advance. All that you knew about medicine was how to remove something by operation. You did not realise that to remove something is, in itself, a clear admission of failure, meaning failure to cure it. For example, take the millions of women who have had their ovaries and wombs removed, whereas today, owing to the progress of the science of endocrinology such operations should have been almost completely eliminated. I well remember one of the boyish interjections that came from the Government side, "He only gives you tablets," during the course of a speech I made in defence of Dr. Michel. Well, even atomic energy treatments are now given by tablets or injections.

One may regard such ignorance as a kind of joke, but it ceases to be a joke when the people's health is at stake and I again charge the Government with an utter disregard of this vital part of medical advance. No wonder that in such governmental environment even the Press fears loss of respectability should it mention such a terrible thing as sex-glands. As a matter of fact, for the last seven years I have collected all medical articles printed by the daily Press here and they constitute the lowest conglomeration of rot that you would ever wish to read. In an article printed in the "Courier-Mail" in 1948 sex-glands hormones are referred to, only somewhat contemptuously, for a "bucking you up" purpose, with the comment that the case for that story is unproven.

An article appeared in the "Sunday Mail" last Sunday headed, "Hormones?" and beginning as follows—

"Do you remember the excitement about monkey glands and sex hormones years ago? We were all going to live as long as Methuselah, but it didn't quite work out. Sex hormones are in the news again, but this time as a cure for arthritis . . ."

The author of this article must have slept for 30 years, as the monkey-gland-Methuselah period of excitement and the discovery of a male hormone, with its following triumphal medical achievements, are as widely separated as the bow and arrow from the guided missile.

Voronoff, with his monkey-gland theory, created a world sensation at a time when sex hormones were not even thought of.

In 1935, Lacqueur, a German Jew, discovered the male hormone and named it testosterone. In the same year the Yugoslav, Ruziska, and the German Butenand, produced it synthetically and were awarded the Nobel prize for that work. From here on an enormous development took place, of which you will have some indication by the time I have finished my speech.

The progress made in medicine after the 1935 discovery and other discoveries later, can only be compared with the change that revolutionised medicine after the discoveries of Pasteur and Koch.

Whilst during the last dozen years all modern medical developments, with the exception of penicillin, sulpha drugs, etc., were based on research of endocrine glands, particularly the sex glands, the latter were carefully kept out, not only out of the Press but—what is almost incredible—out of a Royal Commission on Sex Crimes some years ago. I don't need to remind you how I slated that report in this Parliament.

It is almost uncanny how my predictions, received with such hostility and ridicule in this Parliament, have one by one proven to be true. Today, endocrinology is recognised in all advanced medical circles to be that branch of medicine which has already brought about and, I predict, will bring about still further, a revolution in the conception of medicine that will finally mean turning our so-called beautiful hospitals into boarding-houses, and our surgeons into scientists. From now on, all self-styled moralists have my permission to leave the Assembly Chamber, as from here on I cannot speak in other but frank language. It is impossible to speak about endocrinology without giving most of the time to sex glands, and it is not possible to speak about sex glands without speaking about sexology, meaning the science of sexual activity, whether mutual or not.

I do not intend to repeat myself by explaining the ABC of the endocrine system and its functions, except to mention that there are organs in the body that discharge secretions called hormones into the blood-stream, from where they exercise their vital effects on the whole system. They are called glands with

internal secretion or endocrine glands, and work in conjunction with one another. The main glands of this kind are: the pituitary, ovaries, testicles, adrenals, thyroid, etc.

In this speech I propose to give you a description of the enormous advances made in this science during the last few years, and its applications to all phases of human life. I begin by referring to the sensation created in U.S.A. by the publication of Paul de Kruif's book, "The Male Hormone." To judge the enormous strides endocrinology has made in a few years, one need only to compare the Voronoff monkey-gland rejuvenation theory with the streamlined version of modern rejuvenation as indicated in Paul de Kruif's book. Voronoff found that by transplanting the testicles of monkeys into impotent and aged men, he did restore sexual and other energy, but for a short period only. Long before Voronoff's time the famous Brown-Séquard in 1889, with his testicular juice injection failed, but at least he was on the right track.

Paul de Kruif bases his book on a chemical substance called testosterone, which modern development had shown to be the factor responsible for Voronoff's temporary successes. And more than that, Paul de Kruif describes, with the help of the findings of modern scientists, how lack of this substance in the blood of aging men is accompanied by the whole lot of illnesses that we usually associate with the decline beginning in middle age, for instance, angina pectoris, a serious heart disease, mental depression, decline in working capability, loss of memory, frustration complex, impotency, headaches, irritability, vague pains over many areas, like gall-bladder, stomach, prostate gland trouble, certain kinds of deafness, eyesight deterioration, &c.

If lack of the substance in the blood, is responsible for such symptoms as I have described, the restoring of its normal level in the blood by injection or tablets, would of necessity have a beneficial or even curative effect on these symptoms. Paul de Kruif shows, by means of medical publication, experiences of his friends, and his own experiences, that this is really so.

Somebody may ask: "If that is the effect of the male hormone in the case of men, must it not be similar with the female hormone in the case of women? Now, in the case of women, we have the advantage that for a long time already we have recognised certain disturbances as change-of-life symptoms, as they are called.

We have recognised the existence of such change-of-life in men only in recent years. And in fact, the treatment of the change-of-life disturbances with female hormones, was known long before we even hoped to have a similar effect in men with the male hormones.

Now, what effect will appear when a woman is getting the male hormone? First, we must mention here that treatment of women with the male hormone is in certain conditions now quite a recognised and even important treatment. Suppose a woman has an over-production of the female hormone, meaning an excess

of female hormone in her blood. The logical thing to do would be to give male hormone to balance it. And in fact this is done, although both hormones are not entirely opposed to each other. I mention the latter so as to show that I have to simplify certain of those complicated inter-relations for making myself better understood.

An excess of a female hormone, called estrine, in a female body, will create the following symptoms: irritation of the breasts with following inflammation, and in some cases, cancer. In the lower sex organs it will be followed by certain irregularities of menstruation. And in connection with lack of another hormone called progesterone, as is the case in a certain type of hypo-ovarianism, it will be followed by habitual abortions, and sometimes a sort of inflammation of the neck of the womb.

Nowadays, in all these cases the male hormone, or progesterone in the second form, is given either as the only, or as an additional treatment where low-dosage X-Ray is not available or cannot be made technically perfect. To show the power of these modern endocrine drugs and the necessity of restricting their use to skilful medical hands, I must mention that from a certain dosage limit a true masculinisation will take place in women, such as an enlargement of the clitoris to a penis-like organ. To reverse the position, what will be the result of using the female hormone in men? Different results follow, one of which is the formation of large breasts.

Most necessary to mention here is the fact that the foetus, in the first few months of pregnancy, has the foundation of both sexes, meaning male and female sexual organs. With the further development of the foetus, one sex becomes predominant, and the foetus develops either to the male or the female side, and the opposite sex organs and sex characteristics regress. Yet, still after birth, the opposite sex organs, are in an extremely stunted form in the system. For instance, the female clitoris corresponds to the male penis, and the middle lobe, or part of it, in the prostate gland corresponds to the female uterus.

Concerning the gland secretions, it is of extreme importance to know that in the male system not only male hormones are secreted, but also female hormones to a lesser degree, and vice versa in women; excess of the opposite sex hormone makes feminised men and masculinised women.

It is easy to understand that with the diminishing sex hormone during the change of life, in both male and female, the opposite hormones begin to come more into the picture in some respects. We have then enlargement of the prostate in cases where men show this dys-balance in a higher degree than usual. It is under those circumstances only natural that increase or decrease of the level of one or the other hormone in the blood has the most decisive effect. By giving, for instance, female hormones you can arrest the growth to a certain extent of prostate cancer.

In giving an introduction in advanced endocrinology, I cannot make my explanation scientifically perfect. In studying the findings of modern gland scientists, you find many things that appear to be contradictory and can be explained only when one takes into consideration the extremely complicated construction of the gland system, and the fact that there are still many things to learn about certain aspects of glandular function.

One of the complications is based on the fact that a gland is not discharging one hormone only but several. For instance, the pituitary gland, the master gland, situated on the base of the brain, is at present claimed to secrete 20 hormones, of which 13 are produced in the frontal part of the gland and 7 in the back part. All these 20 hormones have different functions and you will easily understand that endocrinology is the highest form of modern medical science, as it is the base of everything medical.

To hold a course of medical post-graduate study for instance in neurology, psychiatry and psychology without having a special lecture series concerning endocrinology only, is an absolute waste of time, as I have already said years ago.

One could compare the function of the master gland with that of a conductor of an orchestra, who at one part brings the violins into prominence, at another part calls up the clarinets, and so on. Thus the master gland sends out hormones activating the ovaries and others activating the thyroid and so on. And like a good conductor of an orchestra the master gland becomes upset if one of the instruments tries to play its own version and disturbs the harmony.

Another complication arises from the close inter-relationship of the different glands, some of which we may not even know yet. To quote only one typical example, we know that growth is regulated by the pituitary-produced growth hormone. I remember a would-be scientific article printed by "Smiths Weekly" not long ago in which the author said it was still quite unknown why growth stopped at a certain age. I will supply the necessary information in the following: Growth stops when the development of the sexual glands has reached a certain stage and a suppressing influence is exercised on the growth-hormone production of the pituitary gland. You notice the proof of this every day when you see the extremely tall, thin men and women in which the growth hormone worked overtime, so to speak, because sexual glands were under-developed or developed too late.

If I mentioned 20 hormones of the pituitary, I can mention only three coming from the ovary, although I am convinced that there are in reality more. Two of these ovary hormones are mainly responsible for the menstrual cycle and their names are estrine and progesterone. Under the influence of estrine, the inner lining of the womb is built up and under the influence of progesterone it is prepared for the pregnancy stage. If the egg is not fertilised, that built-up inner lining of

the womb is discharged. That we call menstruation. In this stage of being destroyed the inner lining of the uterus produces another hormone-like substance, called menotoxin. From this endocrine function of the decaying inner lining of the womb, you will now understand that scraping out the womb, what is called curetting, must have a deep effect on the normal endocrine balance.

Hon. members will remember that I told them six or seven years ago that Dr. Michel was ridiculed when he said that a woman, having been curetted twice within a fortnight, was endocrinologically disturbed, more so as she showed clear signs of hypo-ovarianism, such as habitual abortions, &c. Now that the existence of menotoxin has been established, the laugh is on our side.

I now outline one of the consequences of endocrinological disturbance in men and women. I intentionally restrict myself here to the more advanced developments in endocrinology and therefore omit such diseases as diabetes, toxic goitre, Addison's disease, hyperostosis frontalis interna, &c. I also omit all disturbances and diseases in which an endocrine factor is suspected, but not yet proved. The latter is necessary, as at the present time the whole of medicine is in a state of review inasmuch as endocrine influence may be the real source of still more illnesses than we at present know.

Most obvious to the layman is, of course, the bearing endocrine disturbances have in the sexual sphere. People's curiosity was excited by Voronoff's monkey-gland experiments which never reached a decisive stage. Since the male hormone produced by the testicle has been isolated and produced in the laboratory in synthetic form, doses of it given by injections and otherwise have been used successfully in certain kinds of impotency. I will quote you one case, which appeared in the British Medical Journal:

Dr. George L. Foss, of Bristol, England, treated a 38-year-old patient, who had lost his testicles 18 years before in the first world war, for a nasty skin rash, swollen eyelids and conjunctivitis, with testosterone injections. Within 6 days the rash, &c. disappeared, and to the surprise of the doctor and patient alike, his sexual activity returned, and was kept normal by taking testosterone. Exactly the same applies to eunuchs. They also lose their flabby fat and become hard-working males.

On the other hand excess in sexual activity of the male or female sex can be successfully checked by application of the opposite hormone in cases where it is caused by over-production of the corresponding sexual hormone. Abnormal sexual habits such as homosexuality in both men and women, which an authority like Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld claims is caused entirely by endocrine disturbance, can in many cases be successfully treated with hormone therapy, which does not always mean the application of the opposite hormone.

All this has a great importance, not only in medicine, but in criminal law. Hypersexuality and abnormal sexuality are in many cases the causes of crimes, not only sex crimes. Sex glandular underfunction also has a criminal importance, inasmuch as sufferers become habitual liars and perjurers. Juvenile delinquency of sexual character has a still more pronounced endocrine source. Take a look sometimes at the features of the wayward girls or women and you will find Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld's and other authorities' statement about hypo-ovarianism, hypothyroidism and hypo-pituitarism meaning an under- or dis-function of these glands, clearly proved.

Another point of utmost importance concerning the treatment with sex-gland hormones, is the maintenance of pregnancies and the elimination of habitual abortions. Here the main point of attack is the maintenance of the progesterone level in the blood, whether by hormone application or by low-dosage deep X-ray therapy, as I have emphasised for years.

The most urgent problem, of sterility in men and women, is so complicated that it would take me hours to cover it. Therefore, I take only one angle of it and speak about sterility without referring to impotency. This problem is of particular importance here inasmuch as we are reported as having one of the highest sterility rates in the world.

In the early 40's, when I brought up in this Parliament treatment by low dosage X-ray for endocrine disturbance at a time when X-ray therapy here was still regarded as being useful solely in cancer for destructive or "burning-out" purposes, I proved the "stimulating" effects of small doses. Then in 1947 I was in the lucky position of being able to verify my statements by quoting the highest overseas authorities concerning the excellent results in treatment of sterility of women by low dosage X-ray therapy. I re-quote—

"At the Atlantic City 100 Year Medical Conference doctors described how small doses of X-ray deep-therapy applied to the ovaries and the pituitary gland enabled 43 out of 57 women to become pregnant after all other methods to overcome sterility had failed."

I now come to another problem, that of so-called frigidity in women. I will first have to give you some introductory explanations. Frigidity means sexual coolness in women and is more common in this country than any one of you realises. It is the real cause of the high divorce rate here. I am not concerned with what I may term artificial frigidity, a kind of intentional suppression of feeling, caused by an early Victorian type of education, or by bad sexual behaviour of the male partner. Sooner or later such artificial frigidity, owing to the effect on the endocrine system, will change to real frigidity. We are concerned only with real frigidity and its relationship to endocrine function. This

relationship is two-fold. Endocrine disturbance may cause frigidity, and frigidity, once existent, can cause further endocrine disfunction, sometimes followed by abnormal habits.

**Mr. THEODORE:** Mr. Mann, I rise to a point of order. A question was raised this morning about the reading of speeches by hon. members on this side of the Chamber. I should like to know whether the hon. member for Bundaberg is in order in reading his speech.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I have allowed the hon. member for Bundaberg a good deal of latitude. I have allowed him to read his speech because I feel he is giving what might be regarded more or less as a lecture on medical science than a contribution to the Budget debate. I have allowed him to read his speech up till now for the purpose of greater accuracy but I hope he will not continue doing so as I know he is quite capable of making a speech.

**Mr. BARNES:** In the last seven weeks I have passed five kidney stones. Notwithstanding that I have suffered in consequence, I studied this subject up to 3 o'clock in the morning in between times. The hon. member for Herbert knows that fact, as I believe I have kept him awake in consequence. Hon. members opposite have read their speeches for years. Here today, two members read their speeches. My whole matter is scientific. I can speak for hours. I have done so plenty of times. I have spoken for 3½ hours without a note on the soap-box. No man is more capable of making a speech than I am without notes. The matter I am dealing with now is highly scientific and delicate and I thought I would be extra-careful, by reading a few paragraphs on this delicate matter because anything appertaining to sex can be dynamite. When I spoke scientifically six years ago hon. members started a whispering campaign throughout Queensland. This time I am going to be scientifically correct and nobody will be able to start a whispering campaign that anybody will take notice of. I remember that on one occasion I quoted two extreme cases, one case of extreme chastity and one case from a harlot, showing how the highest form of chastity and the lowest form could be affected by an endocrine disturbance, and some members started acting as though I were a heel. In order to eliminate that I am trying to be technical and trying to be scientific. I have brought up a subject that not one hon. member understands anything about. I have noticed the appearance of hon. members on both sides and they have been looking at me through their mouths, not their eyes; most of the subject matter is brand new to them, despite the fact that it was established in 1935, and, as I said, suppressed by the Press and other circumstances. However, Mr. Mann, I bow to your ruling.

The dominant position of the endocrine system extends of course to the nervous system also, meaning the autonomic nervous system, and to the brain function.

In 1941, one year after the Michel Case, the British Medical Journal had a leading article on "Endocrine Interactions" which contained the following quotation from E. C. Dadds:—

"There is abundant evidence that the functional activity of some endocrine organs affects the mind and can in turn be affected by the mind."

No listener, having followed my explanation, will be surprised about that statement. Despite the obvious, the Government and a certain medical clique, otherwise not friendly to each other, have in this regard combined to suppress the truth and one of the reasons for my speech is to force the issue in the interest of the health of the people.

To quote an example to Dadds's somewhat late statement, we know that hypo-ovarianism is followed by neurotic symptoms, but it would be stupid to say that the patient is suffering from nerves, the usual diagnosis. She is suffering from an under-function of the ovaries, which causes nerves.

On the other hand, even shell shock has a connection with the endocrine system, but in the reverse direction. Meaning that, although primarily the consequence of an emotional upset, it affects secondarily the endocrine system. In this case the correct diagnosis would be "Nerves, followed by endocrine disturbance." Even that was made clear by Dr. Max Michel before the court in 1940, as I have already pointed out in earlier speeches.

In 1945 a memorandum was published in the American Medical Journal by the Chief of the Convalescent Service Division, Army Air Force, asking for reports concerning the incidence of endocrinological disturbance in soldiers affected by battle fatigue. And only a few months ago, the world was surprised by a report that many soldiers participating in the Bataan Death March developed large breasts.

As the endocrine system, on which, *inter alia*, the procreation and the conservation of the species depends, is already to be found in the lowest form of animal life, whereas the development of the nerves system is already a higher form, the influence of the endocrine system as a primary cause of disturbances is therefore predominant.

Concerning the relationship of endocrine disturbances and clear-cut mental cases, world leading endocrinologists contend that many of the inmates of mental institutions are there on account of some endocrine disturbance. In cases of involuntional melancholia, meaning a depressive state connected with the decline of male and female hormone production, this claim is of course irrefutable. In other cases, such as "split personality," in which there is not yet a clear definition of the cause, further research might find some justification for the claim. In fact, Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, for instance, says that 81 per cent. of the inmates of mental institutions are there because of sexual abnormalities, meaning of course endocrine disturbances.

I should like to bring you some obvious examples. Cretins, of course, are well known to have endocrinological abnormality, in this case hypo-thyroidism. This disturbance appears in the first year of life. I might mention that it can be cured within three months of its being seen, but today the prisons of the country are full because of ignorance. Cases of deaf-mutism are frequent. Cases of sexual excesses, like nymphomaniacs, show the relationship quite clearly.

Besides such clear-cut mental cases, we have the multitude of border-line cases, where there is only a slight difference from the normal, for instance cases of infantilism, meaning those who never or only slowly grow up mentally and sometimes even physically.

Of course, all endocrine treatment has to be done in the interest of humanity and not from any ulterior motives, having no connection with therapeutic purpose. It can be expected, once knowledge of endocrinology has become popular, that quacks will jump on it, recommending rejuvenation cures by hormone drinks, hormone face cream, hormone tonics, &c. I am of the opinion that hormones should be regarded as dangerous drugs and be reserved for treatments only by qualified—I emphasise "qualified"—medical men and dispensed only on medical prescription.

What possibilities otherwise would exist might become clear when I mention the story of the broken-down 19-year-old trotter, the gelding named "Holloway." I emphasise that the experiments were done for scientific purposes. The story is taken from Paul de Kruif's book. A doctor implanted testosterone in a gelding that was a good pacer, but had broken down six years previously. The success was amazing. He began to get a shining coat of hair again, his muscles built up, and his whole behaviour was completely changed. In the same summer in which he was treated, he began his series of wins again, to the general surprise of the public and established an official record of 2.10 for the mile at nineteen years of age. His behaviour was that of a stallion including the serving of a mare. He even developed an arched neck. That happened in the late '30s. This case was quoted in the American Medical Journal of Veterinary Science. If that is not true I will resign from Parliament and save the Government from trying to defeat me at the next election. But the most amazing part of the story is that the American racing commissions do obviously not regard the implantation of testosterone as an illegal practice that would bring about disqualification.

Before concluding my speech, I feel it necessary to touch the delicate subject of masturbation for the benefit of young people who by worrying about such acts could easily lose self-confidence and self-respect. Masturbation in almost all cases represents an infantile expression of sexual activity and is perfectly harmless. It could be asked whether long-continued masturbation represents a serious endocrine disturbance. **To**

this the answer is: fortunately not, except where as a sequel of excessive habitual masturbation a state of congestion followed by exhaustion of certain glands takes place.

The same principle applies to excessive intercourse. As regards the latter, I mention only one extreme case, published by Dr. Steckel of Vienna of a Mr. "X", an Austrian Officer who after excessive intercourse developed an acute goitre within hours. Not to be misunderstood, goitre, although being an endocrine disease, need not be caused by any abnormality of the sexual glands, but hypo- or hyper-thyroidism invariably has an effect on the sex-glands.

Diabetes also need not be caused by any abnormality of the sex glands, but certain cases of diabetes are the consequence of an under-functioning of the sex glands or an over-function of the pituitary gland, and appear sometimes after uterus or ovary removal or in the menopause. Perhaps I should tell hon. members that diabetes is caused by lack of hormones. Although ordinary medicine did not know anything about the relationship of endocrinology to sexual relationship, at least it knew that insulin, the pancreas-gland hormone, was some material—that if injected regularly into the system caused a balance and the patients could live happily with the exception that they were unhappy each day when they put the needle into their bodies. The effect of the injection of insulin into the blood stream is that it replaces in the blood stream that which is lacking and allows a person to live a normal life. The same applies to sex hormones in middle and old age.

It might not be exaggerated to say that testosterone therapy or female-hormone therapy would at least add 10 years to the life of a man or woman, but it could be more accurately said that it would add 30 or perhaps 40 years to the life of a man or woman by perhaps improved products. By that I mean that the trouble often starts with the failure to function of the ovary or testicle at the age of puberty. Those of you who have daughters, cousins, nieces or nephews, know that it is common to see in an adolescent child a pimply face or rash. That is caused by the fact that the sexual hormones of the system are not balanced, as stated in my quotation from the British Medical Journal. In that case the rash was completely eliminated within six days. It could add a minimum of 10 years to everybody's life, and look at the advantage that would be to this Government. For instance, they would save millions of pounds on whole-of-life policies or endowment policies issued by the State Government Insurance Office. The teaching of the science of endocrinology could lead to that saving.

**A Government Member interjected.**

**Mr. BARNES:** I am not going to ask the Government to compensate me by making me an honorary LL.D., as they did with Forgan Smith, but if they did, at least I should not wear my headgear back to front.

This is a delicate subject. When I first spoke on it in this Chamber in 1941 or 1942, I had no illusions about the opposition I should meet, because I knew I had to contend with the ignorance and hostility of hon. members on the Government benches. Actually, that ignorance and hostility led to my being thrown out of the House for six weeks, and I lost six week's pay, amongst other things, on one occasion. The Speaker did not know the difference between habitual abortion and criminal abortion, and because I said so I was thrown out of the House for a fortnight. I was thrown out of the House for a fortnight because of his ignorance of the English language, and I consequently lost a fortnight's pay. Despite the fact that I won the court case I lost, because the money went in costs.

As my time is moving on, I want to say just a few words about another suspected consequence of over-action of the pituitary gland, that is, the causing of arthritis of a particular kind. In isolating the chemical substance that the adrenal gland, a small gland situated above the kidney, produces in counteracting a substance which the pituitary produces in large quantities, we may therefore expect help for arthritis sufferers who are particularly numerous in middle age.

The general stimulation, with its beneficial effects on a multitude of disease, which is obvious after testosterone treatment, is nowadays called upon to remove or improve the dreaded heart disease, angina pectoris, which takes such toll in men, particularly of the professions. The cause of death for instance of the doctors in the U.S.A. is predominantly in that direction. It has been suggested that 80 per cent. of doctors die of angina pectoris. I said in this Chamber some years ago that the average life of a doctor was 46. I am not joking. I am serious. I am waking up the medical profession to help themselves, and in turn to help the public.

**Mr. Aikens:** They will be grateful to you.

**Mr. BARNES:** I will give proof of that shortly. I cannot afford to give names, particularly where the B.M.A. is concerned, because in defending Dr. Michel I have proved to what extent the B.M.A. will go. I have with me a copy of a letter written consequent upon the speech I delivered,—I refer to the speech I made upon the kidney disease known as pyelo-nephritis. I sent a copy of that speech to a leading urologist of Australia and although I did not expect a reply, here is the reply I received dated 13/10/1949—

“Dear Mr. Barnes,

“Many thanks for the copy of ‘Hansard.’ I read your address with great interest and must congratulate you on the marshalling of your facts. I cannot agree with everything you said, but I must confess it would be very hard to argue against them.

Yours,

.....”

**Mr. Aikens:** It is not our friend Cilento?

**Mr. BARNES:** No, and that is certain. Some hon. members with the intelligence of a eight-year-old child will imagine that what I am saying is not true, that I have composed it for publicity purposes, or to cause alarm. If there is anything I have quoted in my speech tonight that cannot be confirmed I will resign from Parliament and that will save the Government the trouble of working out whether Ted Walsh will stand in Bundaberg, Bowen, or somewhere else. I have always controlled plebiscites in Bundaberg and the one I want to win will win. On one occasion Barney McLean won by 576, Jack Dufficy was next with 276, and so on down the list. At the last plebiscite in Bundaberg one chap won with 109 and the second one 30, and so on. What I am trying to say, Mr. Governments—that is correct English, to say “Mr. Governments”—is that if Mr. Walsh comes to Bundaberg to contest the plebiscite and the local A.L.P. want someone to stand against him I can guarantee Mr. Walsh to get him through the plebiscite.

**Mr. Marriott:** What, sliding panels?

**Mr. BARNES:** No, not A.L.P. sliding panels but honest methods. He is seeking support from the Country Party and Liberal Party by asking them to keep out of Bundaberg, in order that he might have a straight contest with me. He is doing the same in Mr. Paterson's electorate.

Before I conclude I want again to refer to the fact that Dr. Michel was struck off the roll but fortunately for him he was completely vindicated by me. He was a German Jew and when he approached me in 1941 I treated him with suspicion. He approached every member of the Opposition but not one hon. member would take up his case. Being a judge of character I knew he was right, although it was hard to understand his broken English. I said to him, “Come back tomorrow” or something like that, and I would go further into the case. Knowing that he was being abused and maliciously treated by a certain section in Queensland I had to study the science of endocrinology. That has helped me in Bundaberg. With apologies to Dorothy Dix, I acted as adviser on one occasion between a man and his wife—unknown to each other on the question whether they should part. I have had numbers of people come to me in Bundaberg on such matters as well as to be advised on sexology. I am capable of doing it; about that I have not the slightest doubt. On top of my studies of the science of endocrinology I have had to study the science of sexology. I was in a position to advise these people and advise them correctly. I have never had a failure. Tories have approached me, as well as workers on this matter.

I have here a letter, the head written in a number of languages—German, then English, French, &c. There are four captions in all. It is from Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld. One caption in English is “World League for Sexual Reform,” of which he was chairman, and one of the founders, the other two being such well-known men as Havelock Ellis and Auguste Forel. I am not going to read the

whole of it but the last paragraph says that Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld is introducing Dr. Max Michel to his friends in India. The pertinent part says that Dr. Michel is an eminent scholar.

Dr. Michel speaks seven languages. I have heard him speak them. If, for the sake of argument, a Greek in my electorate interviewed Dr. Michel and Dr. Michel answered him I should know, although I do not know Greek, that he was speaking Greek. He speaks and writes Italian, French, and English.

**Mr. Roberts:** How do you know?

**Mr. BARNES:** I have sufficient intelligence to know Dr. Michel can speak Italian and that goes for French likewise and other languages I have heard him speak. This man had to sell the mattress off his bed and lie on his spring mattress in order to get tucker, because the Government were 100 per cent. up against him. He is known as a deep X-ray therapist all over the world. He lectured on radiology in Leipzig, Paris and Stockholm in 1922, 1926 and 1931 congresses. He was interned by Hitler on 9 March, 1933. He was one of the first men that Hitler interned. He came to this country but got ruthless Nazi treatment in this country. At least he had some protection in Germany because the little freedom he had allowed him to escape. His treatment here caused him to put his microscope in the pawnshop to get tucker; in fact, he had to pawn nearly everything in the pawnshop to get tucker (Government interjections) because skunks like the hon. members for Baroona and others vilified him.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

**Mr. BARNES:** I withdraw that remark. It was because the Government would be a party to ruining a man's livelihood. In this particular case the two complainants were Drs. Stark and Crouch, one of whom has since been struck off the roll.

**Mr. Aikens:** What was he struck off for?

**Mr. BARNES:** I forget the professional term but it was for carrying on with a female patient.

**Mr. Power:** That is not as bad as interfering with a woman in a lodge.

**Mr. BARNES:** You are a skunk. You were born a skunk and will never be anything else.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member will have to withdraw that remark.

**Mr. BARNES:** I withdraw it, but the hon. member for Baroona made a statement that is offensive to me and I ask that he withdraw and apologise. And he is going to withdraw and apologise or wish he had of.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member made no reference to the hon. member for Bundaberg. If the cap fits any hon. member of this Assembly he may wear it. There was no implication.

**Mr. Pie:** There is no need for the Minister to laugh.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BARNES:** When the Minister made that interjection I was the only hon. member speaking and he meant me. I ask that the hon. member be asked to withdraw and apologise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member is assuming something.

**Mr. BARNES:** There is no assumption in it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The remark was not directed personally to the hon. member and there is no point of order. I ask him to continue with his speech.

**Mr. BARNES:** In this world some people are born bastards but he developed into one. He is a skunk of the lowest type.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw. He cannot go on repeating that language and if he repeats it I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr. BARNES:** I repeat it again.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. BARNES:** I repeat that the hon. member is a skunk and I won't withdraw it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I warn the hon. member for Bundaberg that if he does not obey my instructions and if he will continue to disregard the authority of the Chair I shall have no alternative but to name him.

**Mr. BARNES:** He is a skunk. He was born one and has been one all his life.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I name the hon. member for Bundaberg for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

The House resumed.

#### SUSPENSION OF MEMBER.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I have to report that in Committee I named the hon. member for Bundaberg for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** The Chairman reports that in Committee he named the hon. member for Bundaberg, Mr. John Francis Barnes, for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

**Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca—Premier):** Mr. Speaker, before moving any motion I should like to give the hon. member an opportunity of making amends and apologising to the Chair and the House.

**Mr. Pie:** Why do you not make the member for Baroona do the decent thing and apologise and withdraw too? Power for the people—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! If the hon. member does not obey my call to order I shall have no hesitation in naming him also for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

**Mr. BARNES:** For the Premier's sake I should like to withdraw but seeing this skunk also said that I was had up for assaulting a male child in 1941 I will not withdraw. He is a stinking rotten liar. Words are not strong enough to express my opinion of the biggest skunk in Queensland.

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

“That the hon. member for Bundaberg be suspended from the service of the House for one week.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jones
.. Bruce	.. Keyatta
.. Burrows	.. Larcombe
.. Collins	.. Mann
.. Davls	.. Marsden
.. Devries	.. Moore
.. Donald	.. Moores
.. Duggan	.. Power
.. Dunstan	.. Roberts
.. Farrell	.. Smith
.. Galr	.. Taylor, H. B.
.. Graham	.. Theodore
.. Gunn	.. Turner
.. Hanlon	
.. Hilton	<i>Tellers:</i>
.. Ingram	.. Clark
.. Jesson	.. Crowley

NOES, 11.

Mr. Barnes	Mr. Russell
.. Brand	.. Wanstall
.. Chalk	
.. Decker	<i>Tellers:</i>
.. Luckins	.. Aikens
.. Marriott	.. Pie
.. Müller	

Question resolved in the affirmative.

#### SUPPLY.

##### COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT—

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

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

Debate resumed on Mr. Larcombe's motion—

“That there be granted to His Majesty for the service of the year 1949-50 a sum not exceeding £557 to defray the salary of the Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor.”

**Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (8.44 p.m.):** I assure you, Mr. Mann, that I will not take a great deal of time and that I will not deal with hormones. I take this opportunity of congratulating the Treasurer on very ably submitting the annual balance sheet to the people of Queensland in such a way that it might bring a favourable verdict at the forthcoming election. The Treasurer is noted for having been an agile footballer in his day. I understand he played half-back in his team. Certainly the hon. gentleman is playing half-back in presenting the financial affairs of this State. Considering the case submitted by the Treasurer, it is remarkable that he has endeavoured to show just how close he can get to his estimate, and that again on this occasion he has balanced the budget; in fact, he has been able to show a favourable balance of £49,723.

The Treasurer goes on to say that he estimates a favourable balance of £35,365 at the end of next financial year. I should not have been at all surprised if he had told us that next year he expected to show a surplus of £35,365 10s. 11d. I believe that would be possible for him to do that, with all the facilities at his disposal.

It is remarkable how one can juggle figures and mislead the people. I think it was the hon. member for Wide Bay who referred to the fact that the Treasurer had so much money up his sleeve that he could play the part of a magician and show you almost any balance he wished. He had this wonderful rich uncle to whom I referred during the debate on the Address in Reply—the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund, the credit balance of which was approximately £9,000,000 a few years ago. In addition to his ordinary income, the Treasurer had loan and trust funds, including this Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund, from which he could take almost any amount he wished and at the end of the term could wangle his balances to almost any decimal point he wished.

Another fund at his disposal, a fund that was created a few years ago, was the State Transport Facilities Fund. This was created under the State Transport Facilities Act and the Financial Statement discloses that it has a balance of approximately £504,000. This money should not be used to bolster Consolidated Revenue. When we examine the legislation under which that fund was created we cannot help feeling that the money rightly belongs to the local authorities of this State. The Act is called the State Transport Facilities Act, but the only real facility about it is that which enables the Government to take money away from the local authorities of this State. This is a most regrettable state of affairs. On the one hand the Treasurer is endeavouring to prove that by wise and sound administration his Government are able to balance their Budget while on the other hand the fact is that they are encroaching upon a field of revenue that rightly belong to our local governing bodies. If this continues, it will not belong before local government as we know it must collapse, because the local authorities cannot help going bankrupt.

In addition to taking all moneys collected under the State Transport Facilities Act, this Government, in conjunction with the Federal Government, are taking a good deal of money collected through the petrol tax, money that also rightly belongs to our local governing bodies. The Government are bringing pressure to bear upon the local authorities to do certain works, and as a result of this policy of taking from those bodies moneys that rightly belong to them, the local authorities are more or less obliged to borrow money necessary to carry out the services the State Government are pressing them to undertake. They have no other funds available than the money received by loans and when you examine the position closely you have to realise that this excessive borrowing eventually leads to confiscation.

By confiscation I mean the confiscation of people's property, farms, land, and their homes. In other words, it must lead in the end to ruination. When I say that excessive rating leads to ruination, I am certainly not exaggerating the position. Rates on homes, business premises and farms are becoming so high that it is almost impossible for local governing bodies to collect sufficient money to carry on essential services.

The Government have an additional field of revenue that rightly belongs to local governing bodies. I refer to the tax known as the State development tax which was imposed in 1930. When uniform taxation was brought about that tax was continued. I think the taxpayers of Queensland are entitled to know the whole of the facts and I want to remind the Committee that local authorities are not, as is often alleged, receiving generous treatment through the payment of subsidies. Of the subsidies Brisbane and other cities receive the lion share.

I will deal with the history of the payments to local authorities. These payments to local authorities are made from unemployment relief taxation—(1) the Income (Unemployment Relief) Tax Act of 1930 and (2) the Income (State Development) Tax Act of 1938. The latter Act was a change in name only as the same tax was collected under it. When uniform taxation was introduced by the Commonwealth Government during the war, under the States Grants (Income Tax Reimbursement) Act, the State was allowed an annual grant equal to half the total amount of income tax and State development tax it had collected in 1940-41 and 1941-42. The State development tax was (38 per cent.) being £3,353,880.

The grant from the Commonwealth was £5,821,000 per annum from 1942-43 to 1945-46, both inclusive. Thereafter it increased annually and was £8,826,000 in 1948-49, the portion attributable to State development tax (38 per cent.) being £3,353,880. Subsidies for 1948-49 totalled £1,149,544, equal to only 34 per cent. of State development tax receipts. In 1931-32, the last year of the Moore Government, the whole of the tax receipts, except a small amount for administration, was spent on works and unemployment relief; 70 per cent. of the total was paid to local authorities.

In answer to a question asked on 13 September, the following information was supplied with regard to subsidy figures for 1948-49:—

Local Authorities.	Approved for 1948-49.		Percentage of Population.	Percentage of Subsidies.
	Loans.	Subsidies.		
Brisbane ..	£ 116,080	£ 590,695	36.5	51.3
Other Cities ..	121,651	169,242	19.4	14.7
Towns and Shires	571,122	389,607	44.1	34.0

Brisbane, with 36.5 per cent. of the population received 51.3 per cent. of the subsidies. Towns and shires, with 44.1 per cent. of the population received only 34 per cent. of the subsidies. All this has been done under an alleged policy of decentralisation. How can the Government in one breath stand for a policy of decentralisation and in the other admit that the city of Brisbane, with 36.5 per cent. of the population, got 51.3 per cent. of the subsidies?

**Mr. Larcombe:** Now quote the figures for 17 years.

**Mr. MULLER:** I will come to that in a moment. For each £1 of loan Brisbane received a subsidy of £5 ls. 9d., other cities £1 7s. 10d. and towns and shires 13s. 7d. These are not my figures. They have been properly compiled. Local authorities include local boards such as hospitals, fire brigade, and harbour boards. A few moments ago the Treasurer asked me to give the figures over a period of 17 years but I would remind him again that those figures were supplied to the Chamber on the 13th of this month. In his reply to a question that day the Treasurer said that the total subsidies received by Brisbane was £3,827,327 and that the total given to Brisbane and local authorities, which included local boards such as hospitals, fire brigade, and harbour boards, was £6,386,305 and the percentage of population 36.5 and percentage of subsidies 51.3. Other cities got £3,484,964, the percentage of population was 19.4 and the percentage of subsidies 27.9. The amount given for all the cities amounted to £9,871,269 with the percentage of population 55.9 and the percentage of subsidies 79. Towns and Shires got £2,623,482, the percentage of population 44.1 and the percentage of subsidies 21. Those figures clearly show the small amount given to the towns and shires.

I said a moment ago that not all the money collected under the State development and unemployment relief taxes had been returned to local authorities. As a matter of fact, not nearly half the money collected for a specific purpose was returned to the local governing bodies. The Treasurer said in his Financial Statement that local governing bodies had got very large sums of money by way of subsidies. The future of local governing bodies is a very important matter but if they are compelled to drift downstream at the rate at which they have been drifting in the past 16 to 17 years it will not be long before they cease to exist.

On 15 September last I asked the Treasurer a series of questions. The hon. gentleman tabled a reply this morning. I asked first what was the loan liability of the Brisbane City Council. The reply was that the loans guaranteed by the Treasury aggregated £20,079,045. The amount of loans guaranteed by the Treasury with respect to other cities amounted to £3,674,556, while those guaranteed with respect to towns and shires totalled £3,065,443. The total Government-guaranteed loans amount to £26,819,044. In addition to these Government-guaranteed loans the Brisbane City Council, other cities and towns

and shires received Treasury loans to the extent of £7,744,883. This is a grand total of £34,563,927. You will see by these figures that the position is becoming very desperate.

The total liabilities of the local authorities under the various headings are—

	£
Brisbane City Council ..	23,034,140
Other cities .. ..	5,283,164
Towns and shires .. ..	6,236,626

That is quite bad enough but in addition to those loans, over the last 17 years additional loans for purposes including hospitals, fire brigades, harbour boards, etc., increased the liability of the various local authorities as follows—

	£
Brisbane City Council ..	15,118,888
Other cities .. ..	13,380,858
Towns .. ..	2,102,000
Shires .. ..	7,681,000

That makes a grand total of £38,283,770.

I know the figures are very wearying but the position has become so serious, in fact so desperate, that this Parliament and the people should stop and for a moment examine what our financial commitments are, and whither we are drifting. Any fair-minded person must realise we are bordering on ruination. Whilst the Government might be successful in showing a surplus for the year of £49,723, this other stark naked fact confronts us. The Government are throwing additional responsibilities on local authorities, which in turn are charging them up to the people in their areas. It is quite common to see rates increasing so rapidly that rate-payers do not know how they are going to meet them. This is a charge that is not made on one section of the community only; it is placed on everyone alike. Business houses are obliged to pass it on, but eventually every section of the community contributes to it. As I said, as a result of this policy, thousands of people are facing ruination. If we carry on in this way, it is only a matter of time when we shall come to a halt, as farms and homes will not be of sufficient value to meet the liabilities.

Perhaps there is a more serious aspect. We have to realise that a good deal of this money will have to be repaid when conditions and prices become normal. It must be very evident to people who think for themselves that the present world high prices, particularly for foodstuffs, cannot continue, and when we reach that stage we shall be in a very difficult situation indeed. We cannot go on inflating our currency for all time. There is not the slightest doubt that Labour Governments throughout Australia have very largely survived under a system of inflation; and we have carried that system so far that it cannot be carried any further. Labour Governments throughout the Commonwealth have created such an attitude in the people that they are looking in every possible direction for Government assistance. People are encouraged to lean heavily upon the Government. In my opinion this cannot possibly go on.

I read an article the other day that applies to some extent to Great Britain and New Zealand, and is applicable to the position in Australia today. It reads—

**“The Poor Begin to Pay.**

“Unfortunately for its sponsors, Socialism keeps on handing out terrific shocks to its alleged beneficiaries, not the least of them being repeated revelations of the cost. The British are discovering, as are Australians, that the idea of plucking the rich to help the poor is all right until there are no more rich to pluck, whereupon the poor have to find the cash.

“It has come out that the Attlees lost, or are losing, £388.5 million on bulk-buying of food for one year. That’s more than a million a day, and, though a lot of it represents subsidies to keep food prices down, the British suspect that too much is caused by the inevitable extravagance and bungling of Government control.

“A few samples of what bureaucracy is capable of have appeared, and it is small comfort to the taxpayer to realise that, whereas in private business those responsible for idiotic blunders and loss are quickly rendered powerless, in Government departments no such rule applies:

“The British Food Ministry brought more grain and meat than it could handle or store, so it is actually hiring ships as storehouses. The Potato and Carrot Division, which employs over 1,500 and costs £500,000 a year, lost £10 million by buying too many potatoes, those which didn’t rot being sold at a loss. The Auditor-General says that one of the reasons why £2 million was lost on meat-buying was that heifers were bought as cows or vice versa. Thousands of tons of stored maize, bought at top price, is weevil-infested, and more grain is on the way from abroad. Another ‘miscalculation’ resulted in 50,000 tins of orange juice being kept so long that the lot went bad.

“Meantime Food Minister Strachey and his offsidiers are blithely committing British taxpayers to wild overseas food-production experiments such as the Peak Downs sorghum-pig stunt in Queensland, nut production in Kenya, and a vast poultry farm in Gambia (Africa), where some poultrymen believe no poultry can thrive.”

I will not continue reading the article, but the hon. member for Keenedy guessed right when he said it came from the “Sydney Bulletin.”

**Mr. Jesson:** That is the greatest Labour-hating paper in Australia. It is the opinion of one man, but you believe it.

**Mr. MULLER:** I believe it and I think most sensible people will agree that the article is fairly sound. I merely quoted it because the opinion expressed is the general opinion of the people today. The subsidies and bounties cannot be provided unless the money is first of all taken from the people.

There is an example of just where this policy of popular government leads to. All these inducements are being thrown to the people. They are encouraged to idle away their time in many different ways, knowing perfectly well that they can look to the Government for almost any help they want. Now, Mr. Hilton, the time has come when we shall have to call a halt to this, and point out to these people that there is only one way to solve the problem and that is to work. If this is not done a race of parasites and loafers will be bred.

This afternoon I was greatly interested to hear an interjection from the Secretary for Public Works when the hon. member for Wide Bay was dealing with the economy of our export industries. The hon. member endeavoured to show that because of this interference many of our primary industries were getting out of balance. The Treasurer referred to this system of organised marketing and pointed out that over a period the primary producers had received approximately £480,000,000. The hon. member for Wide Bay pointed out that the Treasurer’s income was quite out of focus, that the primary producers sought to organise to attend to their own marketing, but as the result of the socialistic policy of Labour, not only in Queensland and Australia but in New Zealand and Great Britain, it can be rightly said that today there is a federation of socialistic Governments. There is not the slightest doubt that there is collusion between the Labour Governments in England, New Zealand and Australia. I am referring to marketing or, in other words, to supplying the food needs of Britain. I should like to know what the Treasurer means when he refers to “organised marketing,” as this is not organised marketing but socialistic marketing. The producers are not consulted. Today the producers of dairy products are not consulted on the contracts made overseas, nor are the producers of meat consulted in reference to meat contracts. You could not call that organised marketing. The contracts are made and the producers and their elected representatives on the boards are told nothing until after they are made. That is not organised marketing by the producer. These Socialists have taken control entirely out of the hands of the producers and made it a socialised rather than an organised market.

**Mr. Collins:** You know that is not true.

**Mr. MULLER:** I do not know why the Minister should imply that I am lying. He knows that every word of what I say is true. The Dairy Produce Board did not know the contract prices for butter and cheese until some time after the last contract was made.

**Mr. Collins:** But you have the cost of production guaranteed for a period of years and you agreed to it.

**Mr. MULLER:** That is another matter. I repeat that these contracts were entered into by the British, New Zealand and Australian Governments without conferring with the producers. They were made without

even consulting the elected representatives of the producers on the boards. That cannot be called organised marketing by any stretch of the imagination.

When the hon. member for Wide Bay was speaking, the Secretary for Public Works and Housing interjected along similar lines to the interjection of the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock now. He implied that dairymen were getting payable prices for butter and pigs. He also said that he knew a dairy farmer who was milking 50 cows that were returning him £2 10s. a month each and that he was doing the whole of the work himself. That is a return of approximately £30 a year for each cow. All I can say is that the man to whom he refers must be a superman, and if he cannot introduce me to him I should like him to send me his photograph.

**Mr. Power:** You would very much like to get him on a share-farm.

**Mr. MULLER:** There is no need for the Minister to be personal, and if the Minister knew anything about farming at all he would realise how silly his statement is.

**Mr. Power:** You also misquoted me because there is a certain period of the year when a cow is dry. I did not say he got a return of £30 a year; I said he got £2 10s. a month from each cow.

**Mr. MULLER:** Now the Minister is watering it down.

**Mr. Power:** You know as well as I do that a cow does not milk for the whole of the year.

**Mr. MULLER:** Judging by his other remarks, I feel that somebody has told the Minister that cows do not milk for the 12 months of the year. I should like to tell him also that there is more to it than just milking the cow. When the costs committee inquired into the cost of producing dairy produce it estimated that it would take a man and a boy with a machine to look after 40 cows. If a man can look after 50 cows by himself he must be an exceptional man.

**Mr. Power:** He has three milking machines.

**Mr. MULLER:** Again the Minister is exposing his ignorance. Milking machines do not feed cattle nor can they milk them without being attended.

**Mr. Power:** I said this man was milking 50 cows, getting £2 10s. a cow a month, and I said that they were grass-fed.

**Mr. MULLER:** The Minister does not know what he is speaking of. He has repeated what he said this afternoon, namely, that dairy farmers are getting too much for their produce.

**Mr. Power:** No.

**Mr. MULLER:** Then his statement is equivalent to that. The Minister is suggesting that the price is quite a payable one and that a man can look after 50 cows.

**Mr. Power:** That is what is happening.

**Mr. MULLER:** That is not happening. At least he does not do it in 40 hours a week. He would have to work 80 hours a week, and the statement is so ridiculous that one should not take notice of it.

**Mr. Power:** Dairying is a seven-day a week job.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Hilton): Order! I wish to remind hon. members on my right and my left that the hon. member for Fassifern has the floor and that I will not tolerate any further interruption.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. MULLER:** I now wish to reply briefly to the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, who said that the Commonwealth Government have guaranteed to the producers of Australia the cost of production. So far it is only a guarantee and, furthermore, as a result of this guarantee the Commonwealth Government have not given the dairy farmers one penny, despite the fact subsidies have been paid. If you examine the position very closely, Mr. Hilton, you will realise that the subsidies paid to the industry over the last five or six years have not been sufficient to offset the prices dairy farmers could have got for their produce if they sold it themselves.

**Mr. Collins:** They have security for the future.

**Mr. MULLER:** That is doubtful, in view of what happened in the last few weeks. The Minister introduced this argument; I did not want to introduce it. The costs committee said that the price of butter should be 2s. 5d. a pound from 1 July. Dairy farmers are not getting their price, and so far they have not received more than 2s. 2d. The Commonwealth Government again made promises that they would give us the cost of production, but when it comes to a fulfilment of that promise the responsibility is passed on to the States. The States in turn can use the argument that as the Commonwealth Government have promised this money they should pay it and fulfil their promise. There is a responsibility on the part of the States.

**Mr. Collins:** You opposed the central system of price-fixing yourself.

**Mr. MULLER:** The Commonwealth Government's argument is that after they fixed the price down—not up—they gave the industry £5,000,000 a year. That was given on the condition that the price in Australia was kept at a certain level. They then said that there was no reason why Consolidated Revenue should carry the whole of it and that the people should carry some of it. The extra increase of 3d. a lb. would cost someone an additional £2,500,000 and the Commonwealth Government said that the people should carry that additional amount, not the Commonwealth Treasury. That aspect of the matter never entered into the question when the negotiations were in process and the contract was made. Now that the contract is made the producers are told that it is the responsibility of the States and the States retort that it is the responsibility of the Commonwealth.

**Mr. Collins:** You opposed the system of price-fixation by one authority and thought six different authorities could do it better.

**Mr. MULLER:** The hon. gentleman cannot draw me into an argument of that sort. What I said was that in October, 1947, when this question was being considered, the industry had to decide whether to take the risk itself of what the price would be in the future or enter into a contract with the Commonwealth Government under which the Government took the risk. As a matter of plain fact, there was no choice for the industry. It was not permitted to export because all exports had to go through the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Government fixed the price.

**Mr. Collins:** There was a guaranteed price for the farmers for years ahead. What was wrong with that?

**Mr. MULLER:** Let us suppose the contract had been carried out to the very letter. Even so, the Commonwealth Government would not have given the dairy farmer one penny.

**Mr. Collins:** The Commonwealth Government have given the dairy farmer security for the future and you know that to be so.

**Mr. MULLER:** We want to know where the security is. Actions speak louder than words. There is not a bit of good in simply making promises—that is a weakness with Labour Governments. We want something more than promises. The Minister should not get excited. I am trying to get him out of some trouble that he may get into. There is no good trying to misconstrue the position. What I say is correct. The Commonwealth Government have not given the dairy farmers one penny under the contract during the period of about two and a half years that it has been in operation.

**Mr. Collins:** They gave the dairy farmer security for the future.

**Mr. MULLER:** That remains to be seen. In the past few months we have had positive evidence that the Commonwealth Government are not prepared to carry out the contract and we begin to wonder just what the security means. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the Chifley Government will be in office next year. (Government laughter.)

**Mr. Collins:** It will be a great loss to the dairying industry if they are not.

**Mr. MULLER:** I do not know so much about that. Let me tell the Minister that if the Chifley Government are returned the dairying industry will be ruined. The Commonwealth Government have virtually ruined many other primary industries.

**Mr. Gair:** Have you any guarantee that Fadden will not stab Menzies in the back again?

**Mr. MULLER:** That is typical of the attitude of mind of the hon. gentleman. Has he any guarantee that Coles or Wilson will not stab Menzies or Fadden in the back again?

**Mr. Gair:** What did Earle Page say about Menzies?

(Interjections.)

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Hilton): Order! I call hon. members on both sides of the Committee to order and ask them to allow the hon. member for Fassfern to make his speech. I hope I shall not have to appeal to them the third time. It is only common courtesy to allow an hon. member to deliver his speech without interruption.

**Mr. MULLER:** The interjection of the Deputy Premier is really beside the question. I have every confidence in Mr. Fadden and Mr. Menzies, more so than in Mr. Chifley.

**Mr. Collins:** You are implying they will not honour the contract.

**Mr. MULLER:** The Minister is attempting to act as a phrenologist, but he is a bad one. (Interjections.)

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the Chair. If he will do that it will save a lot of trouble.

**Mr. MULLER:** I am trying to do that. The Secretary for Agriculture and Stock said that the Chifley Government had given the dairying industry security. I said that so far they have given them a promise; they have not given them any money. The net overseas price or London parity for butter is higher today than the stabilised price in Australia.

**Mr. Devries:** You got nearly £3,000,000 from that stabilisation scheme.

**Mr. MULLER:** You wait a minute and I will try and improve your knowledge. (Interjections.) Hon. members do not like my argument but they must sit down and take it, for what I am saying is true. It will stand examination. They have time to reply to it and point out where my argument is incorrect. The point is that if during the last few years we had sold our butter in Australia at the London parity the dairy farmers would have received more than they obtained in subsidies.

**Mr. Gair:** Why did the dairying industry want a guarantee?

**Mr. MULLER:** Apparently this question gets under your skin. (Interjections.)

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MULLER:** The Deputy Premier asked why the industry had entered into the contract. They did so because Mr. Chifley said, "We will guarantee this until 1952." The contract has gone 2½ years and has already broken down. Up to date he has not given the industry anything.

**Mr. Collins:** He has given the industry security.

**Mr. MULLER:** He has not given the industry anything, only words he has repudiated when the occasion arose. The only thing he has done is to take something away from the industry.

**Mr. Collins:** You are challenging the butter-factory leaders for entering into the contract.

**Mr. MULLER:** Someone has to present the industry's case.

**Mr. Collins:** You said the butter-factory leaders in Australia were wrong.

**Mr. MULLER:** I did not say anything of the kind. You are assuming that. I say that the butter-factory leaders were let down.

**Mr. Collins:** You said they bungled their business.

**Mr. MULLER:** I did not say anything of the kind. You said that. I am not responsible for what the Minister said, nor am I responsible for his irresponsible statements. Mr. Chifley so far has given the industry nothing.

**Mr. Collins:** He has given it security for a few years.

**Mr. MULLER:** Rubbish! Somebody else will probably be called upon to finance Mr. Chifley's promise. Supposing in the end money had to be taken from some source, it will have to come from the people. If you provide subsidies and give something for nothing, you have to get the money before you can give it away. The point about it is that for the first 2½ years it has cost the Government nothing.

**Mr. Collins:** They have security for the future.

**Mr. MULLER:** It may cost them nothing for the next 2½ years.

**Mr. Collins:** And they agreed to it.

**Mr. MULLER:** So did I, thinking we were dealing with honourable men. Supposing, during the latter part of the contract, that additional money has to be found, Mr. Chifley may not be called upon to find it.

**Mr. Collins:** It is a good thing if he is not.

**Mr. MULLER:** You have done it already. The commencement was the Commonwealth Government guaranteed the money; then they said that the State had to find it; and if, in the latter part of the contract, Mr. Chifley is out of office, he can say to Mr. Fadden or Mr. Menzies, "You will have to find the money." It would be an easy thing for me to make a promise to the hon. member for Isis if I called upon the hon. member for Stanley to find the money. (Laughter.)

Senator Rankin, after her return from New Zealand a few weeks ago, made a statement that everyone knows to be a fact. She said that when Labour got into office in New Zealand there was a lower rate of taxation, but the social-service tax is now higher than the other tax. Hon. members cannot deny that that is what happened. If Mr. Chifley finds any extra money for one section of the community he has to take it away from the people first. That is the reason why I read that extract from the "Bulletin." If you are going to provide subsidies or bounties

you have first of all to take it from the people. You cannot exploit one section without exploiting everybody. (Government interjections.) I have not time to answer silly interjections. I want to draw attention to how this policy of the Socialists throughout Australia, Great Britain and New Zealand is retarding industry.

**A Government Member:** You know that is not true.

**Mr. MULLER:** I know it is true. There have been complaints that people have not been able to get certain lines of foodstuffs. The export values are higher than the local values, and much of our foodstuffs are being exported for that reason. About three weeks ago an article appeared in one of the daily papers complaining that we were short of dried milk powder. That would be supplied to the full if the policy in operation made it possible for the people who were prepared to engage in that industry to become established. A number of us have investigated the possibilities of establishing a dried-milk factory in Brisbane for a considerable time. We have come to the conclusion that it will cost approximately £150,000 to £200,000 to build a factory and provide the necessary equipment. Under present conditions this is what it amounts to: if we found the money, established the factory, and then made a success of the business and showed a profit, the taxation would be so high that we should not be able to repay our bankers. It must be realised by any person with any business sense at all that to conduct a factory such as this it would be necessary to set aside large sums from profits but the Commissioner of Taxation would take so much of that profit that it would be impossible to make a success of the undertaking.

**Mr. Collins:** Why is private enterprise establishing it?

**Mr. MULLER:** Private enterprise is not doing this and the hon. gentleman should wait until it does it. They are merely talking about it. Again I would remind you, Mr. Hilton, that if the concern happen to be a failure the loss would be the concern of that business. If a success was made of it then such a large part of the profits would be snapped up by the Commissioner of Taxation that the undertaking would lose.

**Mr. Collins:** Why does private enterprise do it?

**Mr. MULLER:** Private enterprise might be able to do certain things that a co-operative concern cannot do. However, I am not in a position to know that. As a matter of fact, private enterprise throughout the Commonwealth would be doing it if there was any inducement to do so. One reason why private enterprise is not doing it is, as I have stated, that taxation is so high that it is not prepared to take the risk. I know the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock is an out-and-out Socialist. He is a great advocate of a scheme such as that at Peak Downs, which we know was born because of the Socialist federation. I have mentioned the Labour Government in England wanted to reduce the

cost of living and came to their brother Socialists in Queensland and Australia and got them to establish the Queensland-British Food Corporation. This they have done but again with somebody else's money. The State is finding part of the money but it does not matter to the hon. gentleman on the front benches if the money is lost; it is the people's money.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. MORRIS** (Enoggera) (9.43 p.m.): Much has been heard in recent months about the very greatly increased cost of living. We must realise that it is such that the amount left in the purse of the wage-earner after the week's expenditure is becoming worse as the days come and go. We must realise also that the real burden today is felt not so much by the single man or woman or even the man with a wife and one or two children as by the parents of large families. The full cause of the rapidly increasing cost of living is the socialistic experiments of the Chifley Administration. I realise that many aspects of the cost of living are Federal and not State matters. I do not propose to touch on those but in passing I would mention that the severe cost of living for the married man with a wife and large family is reduced considerably by that very munificent scheme known as child endowment. As we know, that was introduced by a Liberal Government, just as all these other great reforms in Australia have been for the past 50 years.

I believe that a very large part of the responsibility for the cost of living in Queensland rests with this State Government. I refer in particular to the special tax, the education tax that falls on the parents of school children in Queensland. More and more are parents called upon to pay for the ancillary requirements of education. Why the Government do not realise that they have a responsibility to provide not only the teachers and buildings but all the ancillary requirements of the educational service, I fail to understand. I remember that a couple of years ago I instanced what is being done in England and many other countries, where the Government are paying schools a bonus of 7s. 6d., 5s., and in some cases 10s. a year for each child to provide the amenities required. Here in our own State we have a Government who talk about being the Government of the people—which is all nonsense and hypocrisy anyhow—and they do not provide anything in the way of amenities or subsidies for the school children. I have advocated this many times, because I believe it is right, but this Government are not concerned with what the family man is required to pay. I am a parent, and I know what the costs are.

**Mr. Bruce:** What do you supply for the children?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have been over this time and time again in this Chamber and if the Minister cares to ask his officers to turn up "Hansard" he will see that I have enumerated article after article paid for out of funds raised by the parents.

**Mr. Bruce:** What do you supply?

**Mr. Gair:** He buys the school-bag.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I ask the Deputy Premier to listen to what I am about to say because he is now a parent and will be called upon to pay for these things when his children are older. Is it fair to expect the parents to pay for the telephones in the schools? Is it fair to ask them to pay even for the paper that is used in the half-yearly and yearly examinations in school? The Minister is silent because he cannot answer that.

**Mr. Bruce:** I am silent because I do not believe you.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I can name dozens of amenities provided by the parents that I think should be supplied by the Government. All parents of children attending school today know that what I am saying is true. They are more than annoyed about this because they realise they are having a severe injustice thrust upon them.

I intended to mention that point only in passing because I had intended to deal a little more fully with another branch of education, which perhaps comes within the scope of the Department of Public Instruction or the Department of Health and Home Affairs. I am going to speak about the requirements of kindergartens in the metropolitan area and in Queensland generally. I know that it is right against the policy of this Government to provide any help whatever in a general way to any pre-school activity. It has been their avowed policy and they are sticking to it. I maintain that it is a lousy policy and one that should be broken down and changed immediately.

**Mr. Jesson:** If we do all these things Bruce Pie will not have any profits at all.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Replying to the interjection of the hon. member for Kennedy, I say that if he was called upon to pay for anything out of money he had earned by his own ability he would be bankrupt.

The Government have great responsibilities for the pre-school children of three, four, and five years. I should like the Committee, if it can be patient with me for a few moments, to take notice of what I am saying—although I have doubts whether Government representatives are interested in the problem—I know there are some hon. members who will—to know that children of three, four, and five years require two very important factors in their lives. The first and by far the most important is a happy, loving home life.

**Mr. Bruce:** You will take the children from the maternity home shortly and not let the mothers have them at all.

**Mr. MORRIS:** That interjection, coming from a person who holds the office of Secretary for Public Instruction, is an absolute disgrace. Heaven help the Department of Public Instruction if it is to be controlled by a gentleman who makes such stupid and childish interjections. I repeat, in the face of opposition from the Government, that the Government are responsible for the child of three, four, and five years. (Government interruptions.)

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Hilton): Order!

**Mr. Pie:** We should be put out for less than that.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MORRIS:** I repeat that the first prerequisite of a child of three or four or five is a home where he or she will receive the loving and careful care—

**Mr. Bruce:** Hear, hear! A loving home—his own home.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Exactly. That is the first requirement of every child but, Mr. Hilton, it is not the only requirement. I believe 99 per cent. of the parents of Queensland do provide the loving care that is needed to a great extent in the development of the child. I know that there are many authorities on education in Queensland who agree with me absolutely and utterly on this point.

In addition to this home life, the child needs some place where he can learn to co-operate with other children, learn to play with other children and develop his own personality. In other words, he requires a place where he can learn from the time he goes to school and is forced to assimilate the academic knowledge he requires in after life. For that reason I believe that a kindergarten is an absolute necessity for a child of that age. In many instances throughout the metropolitan area the Government provide land for the building of kindergartens, but whether they do it in the country I do not know. As a matter of fact, the Government carry the cost of running a kindergarten in the electorate of the honourable the Premier. Therefore, it should be acknowledged that there is a necessity for kindergarten work. However, they do not provide any other assistance whatsoever in connection with the erection of kindergartens, either in the suburbs or in the country. Sometimes the Government provide the piece of land on which a kindergarten is to be built in the metropolitan area and I suppose they think that this is a considerable gift to kindergarten work.

Let us examine their so-called generosity. The Government are not giving away the piece of ground but merely lending it for use for the erection of a kindergarten building. And here is the catch about it. If the parents of the children in an area are keen to provide extra amenities and they raise money, for instance, to build a hall for kindergarten work and build the hall on the ground owned by the Government, immediately the building becomes the property of the Government.

**Mr. Low:** And then they will not repair it.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Are they so very generous? The position is even worse. The Government then own the building and they own the land, but they will not paint the building or repair it. They call on the parents or the people working hard for this particular purpose to do the repairs, the painting and other necessary work. I know

that sometimes the Government provide the ground for the erection of child-care centres and the work of child-care centres is closely related to the work of the kindergarten. I know that many people take their children to the child-care centres so that mothers can do some shopping or something like that.

**Mr. Jesson:** Go to golf, and play bridge.

**Mr. MORRIS:** What a stupid, silly, childish approach to the problem! How many people rearing young children in the metropolitan area have the time to play golf or bridge? And how many have the money, at present, to do that? They have neither the time nor the money because of the rotten, miserable Government that we have in Queensland, and if the hon. member for Kennedy likes to use the grain of intelligence that he might possess he will realise that.

I repeat that sometimes the child-care centres are used for the purpose of helping mothers to go out shopping and to do other necessary work, but they exist for a very much greater purpose than that. I happen to be very closely interested in a child-care centre in my district. I know that the parents bring their children to the child-care centre, not because the parents want to go out and enjoy themselves, as the hon. member for Kennedy says, but because they want their children to have the opportunity of playing with other children. They want their children to have the opportunity of developing and learning to co-operate with other children, so that when they go to the State school they will be ready to assimilate the knowledge that is forced down their throats. To support that argument I should like the hon. member for Kennedy to know something else about child-care centres. Such a centre is usually conducted and controlled by a director who is a qualified person but with assistance from the very mothers themselves who go along and help the director so that the children can have the benefit of playing with other youngsters.

It is all very well to talk about this, but there is another way in which the Government can help child-care centres in a more material way. It is the duty of this Government to provide free buildings for kindergarten and child-care work. That is their clear duty. If it is against their policy to do anything to help the pre-school child in this way—and I know it is—there is another avenue that can be explored and in which they can help child-care centres and kindergartens and young mothers and fathers in a district to provide what is needed for their children. Let me tell hon. members opposite an experience we have in Ashgrove at the present time. There is a committee of people there who are working actively to provide a child-care centre in this district. It began operating a few months ago with three or four children. Today the maximum number of children who have attended is 28, and the numbers are increasing nearly every week. This committee wants a building to carry on its work. Buildings have been lent by various churches in the district and they are very grateful for

that help, but the buildings are not suitable. The men on the committee have decided that if they can raise sufficient money to buy the material required they will erect the building required.

**Mr. Wanstall:** They will not get a permit to erect it.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I believe they will. The Minister in charge of that department knows in his own heart what a great job these people are doing, not only in Ashgrove but in various other districts, and will give the permit to erect the building.

The greatest problem facing this committee is not in finding the people to erect the building, but in finding the money to buy the material. They have even gone to the extent of devising a scheme whereby they propose to raise money by issuing debentures. These parents are also assuming the liability and responsibility of repaying all the money necessary to buy the material over a period of 20 years. It is a mighty responsibility for young men and women with young families to assume. They should never be called upon to provide these necessities for their children, or what they believe to be necessities for them and what many great authorities also believe to be necessities for the children. I maintain it is the responsibility of the Government. If they are not generous enough to say, "Here is the cost of the material, you can have it," they can at least lend the money for the purpose free of interest, on condition that it is repaid over a period of 20 years. Surely that is a small enough thing to ask any Government to do. Surely if the people in some districts are prepared to accept a scheme such as this the Government who claim to be acting for the good of the people will assume a similar liability. I do put that up to the Premier—that he consider that suggestion of providing free of interest money for the erection of buildings for child-care centres on condition that the committees of the people responsible assume the liability of repaying it over a period of 20 years.

I should like to speak on many matters in regard to the Budget, but I do want to mention educational matters in particular. If we had been as fortunate as we were last year, in being told by the hon. member for Nundah that the Education Estimates were, or were not, coming on, we should be in a position to know whether to debate these subjects now or on the Estimates. The hon. member has been a little bit shrewder this time and he has not given us any tips as to whether the Education Estimates will be on or not; so I will deal with education now. Before doing so I wish to make passing reference to a speech delivered in this Chamber this morning by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove. I was amazed to hear that hon. member treat with levity the remarks that had been made in this Chamber by the hon. member for Cooroora, who referred to a pest that is an extreme danger to land-owners on the North Coast of Queensland.

**A Government Member:** Spray it with a little D.D.T.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I know probably better than most members of this Chamber the values of D.D.T. I know it is fatal to insects but not to humans and there are many occasions when I am tempted to bring a spray in and spray it around certain of the back benches on the Government side. (Laughter).

To return to the point I was making about the speech delivered by the hon. member for Kelvin Grove, I wish to point out that since 1912 my relatives have lived in the district adjacent to the area represented so well by the hon. member for Cooroora. I know it intimately; I have a brother on the land there and he has told me on numerous occasions that this pest, groundsel, is ruining acres and acres of otherwise extremely valuable land in that area. The hon. member for Cooroora, knowing this, mentions this problem so that it can be faced up to; and the hon. member for Kelvin Grove gets up and attempts to ridicule him for mentioning it.

**Mr. Gair:** It is not as big a pest as Mrs. Groom will be to you, though. (Laughter).

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have always in the past managed to overcome satisfactorily the pests that worried me, and I have no doubt I shall overcome them in the future; I even think I have overcome—and this is a big thing—pests like the Acting Premier and his like, who are interjecting so much tonight. It was a shock to me to hear the hon. member for Kelvin Grove ridiculing the suggestion by the hon. member for Cooroora, because I know it is a problem that must be faced, and the sooner the better.

Now I will return to the speech made by the Governor some little time ago. It is related to this debate, because it is on education. It is the intention of this Government to return to the system of pupil-teachers in the State Schools in Queensland. If there has ever been an admission of failure and of complete inability to overcome a problem, this is the greatest. The policy of providing pupil-teachers in the State schools in Queensland is even older than that great old skeleton dragged across this Chamber day in and day out by the Secretary for Public Works, who in a loud voice is wont to talk of the dreadful days in 1929-1932. The Government of the day, this so-called Labour Government, this crowd of Socialists, are bringing back a system that is as dead as the dodo, a system that will do more to kill the educational system of Queensland than any other, a return to the system of pupil-teachers, which was discarded away back in 1914—35 years ago. The Minister has to admit abject and utter failure to cope with the teacher problem and is trying to cope with it by returning to the pupil-teacher system.

I wish here to refer to some of the things said some years ago about the teacher problem facing the Department of Public Instruction, which is a very great one, and I will quote first from "Hansard" of 1947-48, page 321. These extracts are from a speech I made in this Chamber then and they

are truer now than they were then. The first is a quotation from a statement made by the Director-General of Education, Mr. Edwards, who said—

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

To digress for a moment, the position today is so acute that they have to go back to the archaic system of pupil-teachers which, as I said, went out 35 years ago.

Mr. Edwards said also—

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

I will return to that quotation later. In that lies the kernel of the problem facing us in regard to teachers today.

The Queensland Teachers’ Journal, which is the organ of the Queensland teachers, said—

“Even if the school-leaving age is not raised, and it is quite clear that it cannot be raised for some time the position for, at least, the next 10 years will be chaotic unless a courageous approach is made to the whole problem.”

The “courageous approach” to the teacher problem is a return to the pupil-teacher system which went out of date 35 years ago.

The quotation continues—

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

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

“There is no possibility, I repeat, of implementing the other of the Government’s promises, that of raising the school leaving age to 15.”

I will refer to that again later. The quotation continues—

“According to the report I have read, we see also the great danger, in fact the certainty, of the chaotic position that will present itself within the next five years.

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

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

I do not propose to mention salaries tonight because I know that the question of an increase in salaries for school teachers is the subject of an application to the Industrial Court at the moment and I do not think it wise to make any reference to it. The point I am trying to make is that the greatest problem facing us today is the shortage of teachers. I propose to investigate that a little later and see whether it can be overcome in a wise way instead of the miserable way in which the Government are trying to do it now.

**Mr. Bruce:** You believe the teachers should not go to the Industrial Court for their reward?

**Mr. MORRIS:** Is there anything in the remarks I have made that suggests that teachers should not go to the Industrial Court? I have not said they should not go to the Industrial Court; I have merely said that I do not propose tonight to discuss the salaries of teachers because that subject is now coming before the Industrial Court and I do not believe I should discuss it under those conditions.

**Mr. Bruce:** If they go to the court they have the same privileges as other people in the State and they are not entitled to any more.

**Mr. MORRIS:** What has that got to do with it? I am not discussing the salaries of teachers because that matter is before the court. Surely that is clear enough, even to the Minister?

**Mr. Bruce:** After you said you would not discuss salaries you spoke about miserable treatment of the teachers.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Miserable treatment in introducing the system of pupil teachers, which has been dead for 35 years.

I propose to go over those points I have made a little later, but before the opportunity passes, I should like to refer to something I mentioned a while ago. Years ago this Government promised to raise the school-leaving age to 15 years. They were committed to that, they were bound to the raising of the school-leaving age to 15 years. What have they done towards it? They have done nothing.

**Mr. Power:** You know the reason for that.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I do know the reason.

**Mr. Power:** You know it is a sound reason.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Because they cannot get teachers.

**Mr. Power:** We cannot get buildings or materials.

**Mr. Bruce:** Or men to do the work.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Here come the excuses. Here we have a repetition of what goes on with this Government throughout the years. When we come to an election they come out with all the marvellous promises of what they are going to do. They are going to construct buildings, they are going to do this for irrigation, they are going to do that for electricity supply, they have marvellous plans and promises of what they are going to do, but when the election is over and they have caught the people, fooled the people, as they have done time and time again, they come along with this miserable plea put forward by the Secretary for Public Works and Housing that they cannot get the materials, they cannot get this, they cannot get that. Why, goodness gracious me, if they had the slightest bit of ability they would, before the election come on, know whether they could get it.

**Mr. Power:** A new school has been erected in your electorate and you know it.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I am glad the Minister said that. A new school has been erected. The old school was in such a shocking state of repair and was so completely inadequate that it was impossible for the education of the children to be carried out in it. Many protests were made to the Minister and many requests to have a new school built. For a long time nothing could be done and it was only because the committee of the school went to the Press and published pictures of the miserable school, worked hard agitating for a new school, that they got it. As a matter of fact, to digress, I say to the Committee that in another part of my electorate there is a Mitchelton State School which is in almost as bad a state of repair.

**Mr. Power:** Tell the truth. That matter has been investigated and there is plenty of room.

**Mr. MORRIS:** There is nothing of the sort. There is not plenty of room, and as a matter of fact, the square footage of the school, if you exclude the verandas, is not sufficient to meet the requirements, as was stated in this Chamber by the Minister himself only a few days ago.

**Mr. Power:** We will put another building alongside it, as we have done in other places, to give you temporary accommodation.

**Mr. MORRIS:** The condition of the Mitchelton State School in relation to the number of children going there and the number that will be going next year, inevitably, because of the rise in population and because of the housing scheme put into operation very close to the school, is and will be shockingly and totally inadequate. As a matter of fact, the kiddies will want to be mountain goats to get over the playground. The present school is built on two acres of land. There are over 500 children. The Government own a piece of land very close to the school. This land would be adequate for school requirements but the Government are too miserable to put up a decent school out there. I say that there is virtually no school in Brisbane

in such a bad state of repair and unless the Government do something about the Mitchelton school they will find themselves faced with such a problem that they will not be able to overcome it.

The Government promised years ago that the school-leaving age would be raised to 15 years. They cannot bring it about and they knew they could not live up to that promise.

**Mr. Bruce:** We did not know the war was coming on. We promised it before the war.

**Mr. MORRIS:** They did not know the war was coming on! Evidently the Minister himself does not know when they promised to raise the school-leaving age.

**Mr. Bruce:** I do, because I was Minister at the time.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope hon. members will allow the hon. member for Enoggera to make his speech without interruption.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I thank you, Mr. Mann, for your protection.

The Government have stated they are going to do everything they can to reduce the size of classes. In this respect how far have they gone? They have not gone one yard in the reduction of the size of classes and teachers are asked to teach classes as big as they did five or six years ago. I am arraid that with this out-of-date Government the same thing will continue for the next 10 to 15 years.

**Mr. Roberts:** They have been reduced.

**Mr. MORRIS:** The classes are as big as ever they were, and in my own electorate some are bigger than they were five years ago, because the Government cannot get enough teachers to reduce the number.

What have the Government done to help education in the past few years? They created regions throughout the State and made a great song about them. The people thought that at last the Government were sincere in doing something for education, but has the establishment of regions brought help to even one child in the schools?

**Mr. Ingram:** Yes.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Has it brought one more teacher into the department?

**Mr. Smith:** Yes.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I defy the hon. member to show that the regions have brought one more teacher into the department. (Interruption.)

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** (Mr. Dunstan): I find it very difficult to hear the hon. member for Enoggera. I ask hon. members on both sides of the Chamber to cease interrupting.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Thank you, Mr. Dunstan. I find it hard to hear myself.

Has the establishment of these regions brought one more school throughout the State? Of course not. Have they given us one extra teacher or helped even one child? The problems facing the department are twofold. First of all, there is the problem of buildings. The Deputy Premier told us a few days ago in this Chamber that the State's housing position would be cured in two or three years. If the solution is as near as that, it is the duty of the Government to do something about the wrecks of schools throughout the State—leaking roofs, verandas unsafe to walk on, schools that need repairing and painting. There are schools that are falling to bits through lack of repair and the want of paint. They cannot be allowed to go on any longer.

**Mr. Power:** You know that is not true.

**Mr. MORRIS:** It is true. Parents and school committees are pleading with the Government to have schools painted. Is that not the case with the Wilston school? Have they not asked the Government for some assistance?

**Mr. Power:** No.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I say they have. I have handled the matter. I know all about it.

**Mr. Gair:** Remember Ananias.

**Mr. MORRIS:** When I look at the Deputy Premier I cannot forget Ananias.

The first problem is the buildings, and the second, the big one, is that of teachers. I quoted from "Hansard" of 1947-48 and showed that the problem was severe then. I have quoted what the Director-General of Education said in his report. He said that they cannot get teachers because many apply but do not take positions as teachers, as they want it only if nothing better offers. There is the crux of the problem. It is the Government's policy of building up their Government employees throughout the State that is taking away the reservoir of potential teachers that would otherwise be available. This morning the Premier supplied me with certain figures in this Chamber which I shall quote. I wish to inform the Committee that according to the figures supplied me by the Government Statistician the number of Government employees in Queensland and Federal spheres has increased since July, 1946, by approximately 17,000. That is a shocking thing. Everybody must realise that only a certain potential of teachers is available every year. If the Government would refrain for two years from recruiting Senior standard pupils into the Public Service, both Federal and State, we should immediately have our teaching problem solved. That is the way to overcome the problem of intake of teachers. At any rate if it did not overcome it, it would solve it to a great extent.

There is another way to help towards a solution. It is not only the intake that is worrying the department; it is the large number of resignations that are being received from young people who recently joined the Service. I will tell one reason

why these young people are resigning. Probably it is a major one. They are resigning because they are being sent out by the Government to distant country areas.

**Mr. Smith:** Why shouldn't they go to distant country areas like Normanton and Burketown?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I repeat that the reason why we are losing teachers is that young girls of 16, 17 and 18 are being sent out to one-teacher schools.

**Mr. Smith:** They are not.

**Mr. MORRIS:** If the hon. member says they are not, he is a liar because they are.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member for Enoggera cannot speak in that strain here. I ask him to withdraw it, as it is unparliamentary.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I did not say he is a liar. I said if he is making the statement that it is not happening he is a liar.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. The inference was there.

**Mr. Wanstall:** What about the other inference?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MORRIS:** Yes, I will withdraw. The inference was there and the inference expressed my thought.

**Mr. Smith:** Tell me of one lonely area they are sent to.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have a niece who was sent out into a far distant country area to a one-teacher school. She had to travel miles to the school every day.

**Mr. Gair:** How long ago?

**Mr. Smith:** Where was it and how many miles?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I am not going to be questioned. I am making the statement. I am making a statement and if the hon. member likes to question my word he can do so and I will deal with him in my own way.

**Mr. Smith:** I am questioning it. Tell me the country area.

**Mr. MORRIS:** He only wants to get me to mention the name so that he can have this young person persecuted.

**Mr. Smith:** Not me, boy. If you tell me where she is I will get her back to the city.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MORRIS:** This person happens to be discriminating and she would not like to have anything to do with the interjecting member.

**Mr. Smith:** Tell me where she is.

**Mr. MORRIS:** That is one of the greatest problems facing us today and the Minister himself knows the department is receiving many resignations because of the transfer of young girls to lonely country areas.

**Mr. Smith:** I deny that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. MORRIS:** The people of Queensland know that the denial of the hon. member for Carpentaria is of so little use that it would not be accepted.

**Mr. Smith:** I deny that: You tell me the lonely area.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I would say to hon. members that I cannot be continually appealing for order. I ask them to obey my call to order and allow the hon. member to make his speech without interruption.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I repeat that the Department is sending out girls to lonely country areas—

**Mr. Smith:** I say you are wrong.

**Mr. MORRIS:** And I say if anybody contradicts that he does not know what he is talking about—he has not the intelligence of a louse and should not be in this Parliament.

**Mr. Smith:** You do not know a lonely area.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member to allow the debate to continue without interruption. The hon. member for Enoggera just made an imputation; I am not sure whether it was parliamentary. Did he say that anybody who contradicted his assertion did not have the intelligence of a louse?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I used that word.

**The CHAIRMAN:** If he did I ask him to withdraw it. It is not language that should be used in this Chamber. And I would say to the hon. member for Carpentaria that if he continues to interrupt I will deal with him.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I withdraw the word, Mr. Mann.

In addition to that I would say that this practice of sending out young girls to country areas is losing us many teachers. I have another problem, too, that is, that the one-teacher school has never proved as satisfactory as has the larger schools. I have pleaded time and again with the Government to develop the policy of area schools. I know they are in operation in certain parts of the country.

**Mr. Roberts:** In certain parts of the country you could not do that; for instance, in a sparsely-populated area.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I know it is not possible to develop the system of area schools in every part of Queensland. Everybody with any intelligence will realise that. There are many areas where the policy can be developed. I believe the department has fallen down on its job because it has not provided for the development of area schools. I do plead with the Government to investigate that; when they do that they will overcome not only the problem of one-teacher schools but that of teachers who have to teach in lonely country areas where they should not be asked to do

so. That would not only get over that problem but it would solve to a very great extent the shortage of teachers facing the department at present. If they can overcome the shortage of teachers, perhaps they may then reach the stage where they could fulfil at least one of the promises they made in regard to education, that is, to raise the school-leaving age to 15.

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.