

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 3 AUGUST 1950

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 3 AUGUST, 1950.

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

QUESTIONS.

INVESTIGATIONS OF POWELL DUFFRYN
TECHNICAL SERVICES LTD.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Mines and Immigration—

“1. Have the investigations into the coal industry by Powell Duffryn Technical Services Ltd. yet been completed?

“2. What is the total cost to date?”

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) replied—

“1. No. The present Agreement will expire on 21 September next.

“2. £154,984.”

TOWNSVILLE Q.A.T.B.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

“1. What was the total amount expended by the Townsville Branch of the Q.A.T.B. for the year ended June 30, 1950?

“2. What amount of subsidy was granted to the branch by the Government for the same period?

“3. In view of the fact that the Government recently, through their agents or nominees arbitrarily took control of the affairs and activities of the branch, do the Government propose to also assume full financial responsibility of the branch, or, alternatively, do the Government propose to increase the rate of subsidy commensurate with its controlling interest?”

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

“1. The information has not yet been furnished by the Ambulance Committee.

“2. £2,075 15s. 9d.

“3. The Townsville Ambulance Brigade is still being controlled by its Committee and the financing of the Brigade is being carried on in the usual manner. The Government was not satisfied with the manner in which the affairs of the Townsville Ambulance Brigade were being conducted and took the opportunity of appointing a number of Government representatives to strengthen the Committee with a view to ensuring that the Committee will carry out its functions in the best interests of the public.”

CENTAUR MEMORIALS, BRISBANE AND
TOWNSVILLE.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—

"1. How much did the Government subscribe or donate to the Centaur Memorial Appeal Fund for the purpose of erecting a home for nurses in Brisbane?"

"2. How much do the Government intend to donate or subscribe to the Townsville Centaur Memorial Committee for the purpose of erecting a home for nurses at Magnetic Island?"

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr) replied—

"1. £500 has been donated to the Executive Committee of the Centaur Memorial Fund whose stated objective includes the establishment of Centaur House Centres for the benefit of nurses in other important cities outside the metropolitan area. Assistance has also been rendered to the Committee in other ways in its appeal for funds.

"2. See reply to No. 1. Freehold land on Magnetic Island comprising 1 rood and belonging to the Townsville Hospitals Board has been offered free of cost to the trustees of the Centaur Memorial Fund for the provision of a hostel for nurses. New nurses' quarters with the most modern amenities and facilities are now under construction at the Townsville Hospital at a cost of £222,624, exclusive of furnishings and equipment."

FLOODING OF ROADS GLENORE GROVE AND
GRANTHAM.

Mr. CHALK (Lockyer) asked the Treasurer—

"1. Has he noted Press reports recently that on several occasions road traffic to both South-Western and Western Queensland has been cut off because of flooding at the low-level crossings at Laidley Creek at Glenore Grove and Lockyer Creek at Grantham?"

"2. In view of the importance of uninterrupted traffic facilities to these areas for both State and Interstate purposes and also in the case of defence emergency, will he agree to having his departmental officers prepare a report and estimate as to the possibility and cost of having suitable all-weather crossings laid down at these points?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Main Roads officers have already looked into this matter on several occasions, but consider it is impracticable to make all-weather crossings at these points."

RUGBY LEAGUE FOOTBALL MATCH, IPSWICH.

Mr. MARSDEN (Ipswich) asked the Premier—

"1. Did he see a report in the "Sunday Mail" of 9 July, 1950, in which it was stated that, at the Rugby League football

match between the England and Ipswich teams at Ipswich, 'police stood along the sidelines at 10-yard intervals,' and 'took many broken bottles from spectators who swarmed along the sidelines'?"

"2. Was any report made by the police on this matter?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"1 and 2. I read the "Sunday Mail" story and asked the Commissioner of Police to have inquiries made as to its truth or otherwise. The Commissioner subsequently informed me that there was no truth whatever in the statement that the police took broken bottles from spectators attending that football match or stood at 10-yard intervals along the sidelines. I am assured that the conduct of the spectators was good and the police had no trouble at all."

SILTING OF BRISBANE RIVER.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) asked the Treasurer—

"Is the navigable depth of the Brisbane River less today than it was in 1926, and is it silting up more quickly than it is being dredged?"

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

"No. Advice of the navigable depths of the Brisbane River is contained in Sailing Directions issued by the Department of Harbours and Marine. In 1926 the navigable depth from the Bar to Bulimba was 24 feet and from Bulimba to Victoria Bridge 22 feet. In 1950 the respective depths are 24 feet and 18 feet. Since the Story Bridge was built the use of the wharves at South Brisbane by large vessels has ceased, which accounts for the reduction of 4 feet in the navigable depth of the section of the Reach from Bulimba to Victoria Bridge. The deepening of the channel is being undertaken so that at low water a depth of 30 feet will be attained from the Bar to Bulimba. The first stage of this programme is complete with the deepening at Lytton Rocks to at least 30 feet at low water. The present navigable depth of the river is sufficient for the satisfactory accommodation of vessels requiring the use of the Port, inclusive of some of the largest vessels trading within the Commonwealth."

STATE SCHOOL CLEANING.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. What arrangements exist whereby school cleaning is carried out?"

"2. Who is responsible for ensuring that this work is carried out efficiently?"

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“1 and 2. School cleaning is carried out under the arrangements prescribed by the Regulations under the State Education Acts. The relative regulation reads:— ‘Head Teachers shall arrange to have the school buildings kept clean and, for this purpose, the Department will pay allowances at the rates prescribed for the cleaning of school buildings of the Department under the Miscellaneous Workers’ Award—State Government.’ ”

STATE SCHOOL LAVATORIES.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“In State Schools where no septic or sewerage systems are installed, what is the basis on which lavatory cabinets are provided to ensure a satisfactory service when clearances take place weekly?”

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

“The basis for the provision of lavatory cabinets at State Schools is that prescribed by the Sanitary Conveniences and Night-soil Disposal Regulations, 1936, under the Health Acts.”

IDLE GARRATT LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. How many Garratt locomotives are at present laid up in Queensland?”

“2. How many of these are owned by (a) Queensland, and (b) the Commonwealth, respectively?”

“3. If any are owned by the Queensland Government when were they purchased and at what price?”

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

“1. Fifteen.

“2. (a) None, (b) Fifteen.

“3. See answer to No. 2.”

COMMONWEALTH FUNDS FOR ROADS.

Mr. LOW (Cooroola) asked the Treasurer—

“1. What amounts were received from the Commonwealth in each of the last three financial years for road purposes?”

“2. What were the unexpended balances of such Commonwealth funds at 30 June of each such year?”

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

“1. 1947-1948, £1,088,756; 1948-1949, £1,316,311; 1949-1950, £1,693,537.

“2. 1947-1948, £75,458; 1948-1949, £290,650; 1949-1950, £548,282. The sum of £548,282 shown as unexpended as at 30 June, 1950, has actually been allocated to Shires and other Authorities for road works, but for various reasons this sum has not been expended.”

Mr. McINTYRE (Cunningham), for **Mr. PLUNKETT** (Darlington), asked the Treasurer—

“What was the unexpended balance of money received from the Commonwealth for the purposes of the Main Roads Fund at May 31, June 30, and July 31, 1950, respectively?”

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

“At 31 May, 1950, £540,572. At 30 June, 1950, £548,282; figure for 31 July, 1950, is not yet available. These figures include amounts in the Commonwealth Aid Local Authority Trust Fund. The attention of the hon. member is also directed to the answer to Question 11.”

REVENUE UNDER STATE TRANSPORT FACILITIES ACTS.

Mr. LOW (Cooroola) asked the Minister for Transport—

“1. What was the total amount of collections for 1949-1950, under the State Transport Facilities Acts?”

“2. What were the separate amounts collected on account of road, air, and water facilities, respectively?”

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

“1. £509,214 0s. 3d.

“2. Air, £82,538 1s. 2d.; Road, £426,675 19s. 1d.; Water, Nil.”

REVENUE OF RABBIT BOARDS.

Mr. McINTYRE (Cunningham) asked the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“In view of the invasion of rabbits into Southern Queensland because of the present condition of disrepair of rabbit fences and the much heavier commitments with which rabbit boards are now faced, will he give favourable consideration to a change in the basis of revenue of such boards from an assessment on stock to a tax on the unimproved value of land within the rabbit board districts concerned?”

Hon. T. A. FOLEY (Belyando) replied—

“The matter of a change in the basis of assessment for revenue purposes for rabbit boards has already had consideration and preliminary action has been taken towards that end.”

FOOD AND FODDER FLIGHTS.

Mr. EWAN (Roma) asked the Premier—

“(1.) In reference to the food and fodder flood relief flights, will be kindly indicate what charges (if any) are being made?”

“(2.) As the people concerned are suffering from an Act of God as in previous disasters from floods and cyclones, will the Government make an appropriate contribution towards the cost of whatever relief measures are required to be provided in this case?”

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"1. Following representations by the Secretary for Public Works, Housing and Local Government and the hon. member for Balonne in regard to the severe flooding in their particular districts, the Commissioner of Police at my request, furnished an urgent report which indicated that a shortage of certain essential foodstuffs existed at Dirranbandi, Hebel and on some of the surrounding stations. The Government accordingly arranged with the Royal Australian Air Force authorities to undertake two food lifts, one on Tuesday and one on Wednesday of this week. This food will be charged to recipients on the basis of normal landed cost on the assumption that the State will not be charged for the use of the aircraft. In the event of a charge being made for the aircraft it is naturally expected that station owners who apparently have failed to maintain adequate stocks of food to meet such a contingency as that which at present exists, will share with the Government a proportion of the cost involved. No fodder air lifts have been arranged by the Government. It is understood, however, that certain graziers have engaged private airline operators to undertake such flights. If the hon. member desires to obtain particulars of the charges levied for this service, he should communicate direct with the operators concerned.

"2. Full information as to the nature and extent of the damage caused by the present floods has not yet been received by the Government."

EROSION AT REDCLIFFE.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Murrumba) asked the Premier—

"In view of the severe nature of the erosion of the foreshores of the Redcliffe Peninsula, which is now beyond the financial resources of the Redcliffe Town Council, will he give favourable consideration to an adequate increase in the Government subsidy on the cost of the necessary works for prevention of such erosion?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"The Government already grants substantial subsidy at the rate of 33½ per cent. of the cost of works necessary in respect of erosion. If warranted, consideration is given to an increase in this rate where Crown interests are involved."

EROSION AT SOUTH COAST.

Mr. GAVEN (Southport) asked the Premier—

"In view of the disastrous extent of the erosion of the foreshores of the South Coast, which is threatening the destruction of the Pacific Highway and public and private property generally (including perpetual leaseholds owned by the Government) and which has now become beyond the capacity of the Town of the South Coast Council, will he (1) have a thorough

investigation made into the best method of overcoming such erosion, and (2) undertake to provide an adequate share of the cost of avoiding such destruction?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"1. and 2. The foreshores of the South Coast referred to are vested in the Council of the Town of South Coast which has consulted with the Commissioner of Main Roads and the Chief Engineer of the Department of Harbours and Marine as to preventative measures necessary regarding erosion. The normal rate of subsidy granted in respect of erosion is 33½ per cent. of the cost of the necessary works. If warranted, consideration is given to an increase in this rate where Crown interests are involved. There is, of course, an obligation on the part of owners of freehold and Crown leaseholders to take remedial measures for the protection of their interests."

FLOOD LOSSES BY TOMATO- AND POTATO-GROWERS, BOWEN, HOME HILL AND AYR DISTRICTS.

Mr. COBURN (Burdakin), without notice, asked the Premier—

"1. In view of the widespread and severe losses experienced by the tomato- and potato-growers of the Bowen, Home Hill and Ayr districts, many of whom are in necessitous circumstances as a result of total loss in crops due to the unprecedented and prolonged rains this year, will he kindly investigate the serious position of such growers with a view to affording appropriate relief to those concerned?

"2. Will he also consider the possibility of securing the assistance of the Commonwealth Government in this matter?"

"3. Will he request the State Government Insurance Commissioner to give consideration to the practicability of an insurance scheme to cover future losses of such nature?"

Hon. E. M. HANLON (Ithaca) replied—

"I desire to inform the hon. member that we have not yet received any accurate account of the damage done in that area; the matter is being investigated and will be kept in mind. Insurance is available against flood at any time. The Treasurer has for some time been going into the possibility of arranging a cyclonic insurance fund but reports received so far indicate that the premium required would be very heavy indeed. However, the whole matter has been kept in view. I cannot approach the Federal Government for financial aid until I know the amount of damage incurred but if it justifies an approach I will make one."

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Diseases in Plants Acts, 1929 to 1948 (9 March).

Order in Council under the Fauna Protection Act of 1937.

Order in Council under the Milk Supply Act of 1938.

Order in Council under the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1946.

Regulations under the Dairy Produce Acts, 1920 to 1944 (20 April).

Regulations under the Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1945 (15 December (6), 1949, 26 January).

Regulations under the Poultry Industry Act of 1946 (23 March).

Regulations under the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Acts, 1926 to 1946.

Regulations under the Wheat Pool Acts, 1920 to 1930 (18 May).

Orders in Council under the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund Act of 1943 (8 June).

Orders in Council under the Succession and Probate Duties Act of 1904 (9 March).

Proclamation under the Farmers' Assistance (Debts Adjustment) Acts, 1935 to 1945 (25 May).

Regulations under the Explosives Act of 1906 (15 December, 1949, 20 April (2), 15 and 22 June).

Regulations under the Navigation Act of 1876 (7 March).

Regulations under the Navigation Acts, 1876 to 1939 (27 April).

Regulations under the Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1949 (15 December, 1949, 29 June).

Regulations under the Workers' Accommodation Acts, 1915 to 1946 (22 December, 1949).

Regulations under the Fish Supply Management Acts, 1935 to 1946 (26 January, 23 March).

Order in Council under the Factories and Shops Acts, 1900 to 1945 (6 April).

Rules under the Coal Mining Acts, 1925 to 1949 (6 July).

Regulation under the Weights and Measures Acts, 1924 to 1931 (16 February).

Balance-sheet of the Union Trustee Company of Australia Limited.

Orders in Council under the Aliens Acts, 1867 to 1948.

Orders in Council under the Coroners Acts, 1930 to 1947 (16 March).

Orders in Council under the Financial Emergency Act of 1931 (15 December, 1949 (2)).

Orders in Council under the Jury Acts 1929 to 1934 (8 December, 1949).

Orders in Council under the Landlord and Tenant Acts, 1948 to 1949.

Regulations under the Elections Acts, 1915 to 1948 (19 January, 30 March).

Regulation under the Motor Spirit Vendors' Acts, 1933 to 1934 (12 January).

Order in Council under the Roofing Tiles Act of 1949 (23 February).

Proclamations under the Sewerage, Water Supply, and Gasfitting Act of 1949 (22 December, 1949, 22 June).

Regulations under the Sewerage, Water Supply, and Gasfitting Act of 1949 (2 March, 22 June).

Order in Council under the Sewerage, Water Supply, and Gasfitting Act of 1949 (22 June).

Regulations under the Censorship of Films Act of 1947 (8 June).

Ordinances under the City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1949.

CONVERSATIONS IN CHAMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to refer to the fact that there is a tendency for some hon. members to indulge in conversation in loud tones when another hon. member is speaking. I ask hon. members to give some consideration to that fact in the future so that the hon. member who gets the call may have a reasonable opportunity of being heard in silence.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

SITTING DAYS.

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

"1. That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 10.30 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and after 2 o'clock p.m. on Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.

"2. That Standing Order No. 17—'Debate on Address in Reply'—shall be construed as if 5.30 o'clock p.m. were substituted for 10.30 o'clock p.m. wherever it occurs in the Standing Order, and 12 o'clock noon for 4.30 o'clock p.m.

"3. That Standing Order No. 307—'Days Allotted for Supply'—shall be construed as if 25 minutes after 5 o'clock p.m. were substituted for 10.30 o'clock p.m. in paragraph 5, and '5 o'clock p.m.' were substituted for '10 o'clock p.m.' in paragraphs 6 and 7.

"On the last day but one of the days allotted for Supply, the sitting of the Committee and of the House shall be continued until the whole of the Estimates for the year, the Supplementary Estimates for the previous year, and the Vote on Account for the ensuing year have been decided, reported to the House, and an Order made for the reception of the Resolutions. All such questions shall be put by Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, without amendment or debate.

"On the last day allotted for Supply, it shall be within the discretion of the Leader of the House to extend the sitting for the purpose of dealing with and bringing to a conclusion all the necessary proceedings for the founding and passing of the Appropriation Bill through all its stages. At 8 o'clock p.m., subject to the following proviso, the question under consideration and every question necessary to bring to a conclusion the proceedings of

the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means and the passing of the Bill through all its stages shall be put by Mr. Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, as the case may be, without amendment or debate:

“Provided that if, at 8 o'clock p.m., the question for the Second reading of the Bill is under consideration the sitting may be further extended to enable the mover of the motion or his deputy to speak in reply.

“4. On the days allotted for Supply, Government Business other than Supply may be proceeded with until 12 o'clock noon, at which hour the proceedings on such business shall be interrupted and the business of Supply proceeded with.

“Business interrupted under this paragraph shall stand as an Order of the Day for the next sitting day.

“5. That, if occasion arises to put into operation Standing Order No. 249, the Standing Order shall be construed as if ‘11.30 o'clock a.m.’ were substituted for ‘4 o'clock p.m.’ and ‘5 o'clock p.m.’ were substituted for ‘10 o'clock p.m.’ in paragraph 2.”

Motion agreed to.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. J. H. MANN.

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

“That Mr. John Henry Mann be appointed Chairman of Committees of the whole House.”

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

“That the Standing Orders Committee for the present session consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Decker, Mr. Hanlon, Mr. Hiley, Mr. Mann, Mr. Nicklin, and Mr. F. E. Roberts.”

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY, REFRESHMENT ROOMS, AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS COMMITTEES.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

“That the Library, Refreshment Rooms, and Parliamentary Buildings Committees for the present session be constituted as follows:—

‘Library—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis, Mr. Dunstan, Mr. Keyatta, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Morris and Mr. H. B. Taylor.

‘Refreshment Rooms—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chalk, Mr. Heading, Mr. O’Shea, Mr. Plunkett, Mr. Rasey, and Mr. J. R. Taylor.

‘Parliamentary Buildings — Mr. Speaker, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Müller, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sparkes, Mr. Turner, and Mr. Walsh.’”

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

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

“That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by Order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members. That such Committee consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Graham, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Low, and Mr. Moores.”

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

TEMPORARY CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY AND WAYS AND MEANS.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

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

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day.”

Motion agreed to.

FEEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern): I move—

“That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing the payments made by the Government to barristers and solicitors for the year 1949-50, stating the names of the recipients and the amounts received, respectively.”

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. McINTYRE (Cunningham): I move—

“That there be laid upon the table of the House a return, in the usual form, showing the number of Government employees at 30 June, 1939, and at 30 June, 1950 (all departments), paid from Consolidated Revenue, Trust Fund, and Loan Fund, respectively.”

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL EXPENSES, 1949-50.

ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate): I move—

“That there be laid upon the table of the House a return, in the usual form, of expenses of Ministers for the year 1949-50.”

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

VOTE ON ACCOUNT—£18,000,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from His Excellency the Governor of a message recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services for the year ending 30 June, 1951:—

“From the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland (exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account) the sum of £8,500,000;

“From the Trust and Special Funds the sum of £6,000,000; and

“From the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account the sum of £3,500,000.”

COMMITTEE.

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

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Treasurer) (11.36 a.m.): I move—

“That there be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1950-51, a further sum not exceeding £18,000,000 towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State.”

This Bill is a very usual one at this stage of the session. The financial needs of the State require an Appropriation Bill early in each financial year.

Last year provision was made in the final Appropriation Bill for Supply to cover the requirements of the State for a short period in the present financial year, in addition to the expenditure provided for in the Estimates that were submitted to Parliament for 1949-1950. That limited sum having been exhausted it is necessary, pending the submission of the Estimates and of the main Appropriation Bill, for the Government to seek Supply from the House to carry on till then.

As hon. members know, moneys are required to pay wages and salaries of Crown employees and to maintain Government institutions. Funds are required also for Agricultural Bank advances, for housing, public bodies, for loans and subsidies for local authorities, and for other purposes. In

the Bill that I shall present for consideration later provision will be made for the following appropriations:—

	£
Consolidated Revenue Fund ..	8,500,000
Trust and Special Fund ..	6,000,000
Loan Fund Account ..	3,500,000
Total	18,000,000

Those amounts, with the provision for the current year made in the final Appropriation Bill of last year, will bring the total provision on account of 1950-51 to £29,400,000, of which the appropriation from the Consolidated Revenue Fund totals £14,000,000, from Trust and Special Funds £10,500,000, and from Loan Fund Accounts £4,900,000.

Appropriation Bill No. 1 passed last year made the following appropriations—

	£
Consolidated Revenue Fund ..	7,000,000
Trust and Special Funds ..	5,500,000
Loan Fund	3,000,000
Total	15,500,000

It will be noted that the increases asked for over the corresponding amounts in the Bill last year are—

	£
Consolidated Revenue Fund ..	1,500,000
Trust and Special Funds ..	500,000
Loan Fund	500,000

making a total increase of £2,500,000. Those increases are necessary in order to meet the additional cost of services to the State generally and the anticipated expansion of the Government works programme, which involves the importation of rolling-stock, plant and materials from overseas.

As I said previously, in due course, Estimates for the various departments, which will show the expenditure over the last financial year and the details of the appropriation for the ensuing year, will be submitted to Parliament and thereon will be based a further and the final Appropriation Bill. Until then, Mr. Mann, I will reserve comments and remarks about the financial position of this State.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) (11.42 a.m.): Mr. Mann, as this is the first opportunity I have had of speaking since you were elected Chairman of Committees, I congratulate you on your re-election to that office. You have always conducted yourself in the chair with credit to yourself and the office as a whole, and we sincerely wish you well during your occupancy of the chair in the current Parliament.

As the Treasurer has said, it is usual at this stage of each Parliament to grant the Government supply to enable them to carry on the services of the State, and at this stage also one appreciates the fact that we cannot get the details of the expenditure, consequently it is necessary for us to examine broadly exactly how the money to be voted is to be expended and used, and for what purposes.

It is noted that on this occasion the Treasurer is asking for approximately £2,500,000 more than was asked for at this time 12 months ago. But that does not mean that we are to get a greater amount of public works carried out; rather does it mean that the rise in costs that has occurred in the last 12 months have necessitated the Treasurer's asking for the extra sum, particularly from Consolidated Revenue whence comes most of the money to carry on the services of the State. When asked to vote such a large sum of money, naturally we are interested as to whether this money is to be expended wisely and well for the development of the State or whether it is to be used by the Government to achieve their socialistic objectives and put into effect their socialistic projects which they went to such great pains to conceal during the election campaign.

Mr. Larcombe: Do you not know that the elections are over?

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes, but we want to know exactly the Government's intentions in regard to the expenditure of this money asked for to-day. It must not be forgotten that the Treasurer has not given any clear indication as to how he intends to use the money beyond saying that it was necessary to carry on the Government services. The Governor's Speech is particularly barren of indication of the Government's intentions and it is therefore wise to endeavour to ascertain the Government's intention, particularly in view of the result of the recent elections.

Let us look at the result of the recent election. The outstanding feature of the election just concluded is that the Government have no mandate for socialistic measures or enterprises of any kind during the term of this Parliament. The election result is very clear on this point, and for two reasons. The first is that after the Labour Party reaffirmed its socialistic objective at the Toowoomba convention in February, the Premier and his team, during the election campaign in particular, continually assured the electors that it was something to be achieved in the far-distant future and they had nothing whatever to fear. The second point is that even if the Government had had the courage to stand up to their socialistic objective and advocate socialism—which they did not do during the election campaign—they still would not have had a mandate, because they obtained only 46 per cent. of the total effective votes cast whereas the Country-Liberal Parties obtained 50.2 per cent. of the total effective votes. It must be remembered also that during the election campaign the Country-Liberal Parties voiced total opposition to Socialism and the socialistic objective of the Labour Party.

In view of those facts, it is necessary not only for us in this Parliament but also for the people of Queensland to have the Government's intentions made very clear. The people of Queensland are entitled to know whether all this camouflage and smoke screen that was put up by hon. members opposite about Socialism during the last election campaign was really meant by them or whether

as in the past, they were merely endeavouring to confuse the people as to the real issue and the Government's real intentions. I propose therefore to examine the Government's attitude during the election campaign in an endeavour to clarify the position.

During that campaign the Treasurer posed as an ultra-Tory. He advocated private enterprise; he was put forward by hon. members opposite as the advocate of capitalism and private enterprise in an endeavour to cloud the issue and to persuade the people that Socialism was far from the minds of Labour candidates. Indeed, after hearing the Treasurer's public speeches and the broadcast he made during that campaign one would have thought that Socialism was something with which he would never have anything to do. He endeavoured to create the impression that his attitude was "Perish the thought that the Treasurer should do anything to further the socialistic objective of the Labour Party!" We have to examine those statements by the Treasurer and the attitude of hon. members opposite on this most important question. The matter must be cleared up at the outset here in view of the election results. Let us cast our minds back to the time just prior to the last election. It is true that at the Toowoomba convention, where the Labour Party framed its policy, Labour's objective of the socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange was reaffirmed.

Mr. Roberts: Publicly.

Mr. NICKLIN: Publicly, if the hon. member would have it that way, but it must not be forgotten that the convention added three qualifying paragraphs to that objective in an endeavour to cloud the real issue and to deceive the people as to the intention. No doubt that was done as a result of the resounding vote that had been cast by the people of Queensland against Socialism just a few weeks before that convention.

Let us therefore examine those added paragraphs, and in their verbiage I see the personality of the Premier. He is no doubt a past-master at the art of camouflage. The first paragraph described the objective as only an attitude of mind. It and the third paragraph were just verbal camouflage intended to convey the impression that the socialistic objective was nothing more than an ideology or philosophy that would have no application to existing conditions. Very cleverly put indeed! But do not let us confuse ideologies and philosophies with the stark realism of Socialism and its attendant evil, Communism—an evil we have in our midst today. It would require more than the clever words of the Premier to hide the real intent behind Labour's No. 1 plank in its objective of the socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange.

The third paragraph stated that the objective rejects private profit as being the prime motive of human activity. Any political party could say that.

Mr. Hanlon: They could say it without meaning it.

Mr. NICKLIN: Profit is definitely a motive in some important forms of human activity. For example, the man who runs a business runs it with the hope of profit, the farmer farms with the hope of profit and the wage-earner works with the hope of profit in return for his labours, but there are many other forms of human activity in which there is no profit motive and there are many other motives. It is quite safe therefore to say that the objective of the Labour Party or for that matter any political party, rejects private profit as being the prime motive of human activity. After all, a human being does not build a house or make a garden or set himself up with a home with the idea of getting any profit out of the activity. In many forms of human activity profit is not the prime motive, it is not a motive at all, and therefore I say that the wording in that camouflaged paragraph means exactly nothing.

Apart from that, the second paragraph goes on to say that the objective does not aim at the destruction of private property and it does not aim at destroying profitable activity. Those are easily the most definite statements in the three paragraphs tagged on to the objective and they were obviously intended to allay any fears the electors might have that the Labour Party, if returned to power, had any intention of carrying out a socialistic programme or of making any radical changes in the existing free-enterprise structure of industry and trade.

Of course, the Premier did say at that convention that the Labour Party should not duck round corners and pretend it did not want the socialisation of industry. He said that the socialisation of industry was a long-term objective in the Labour movement, in exactly the same way as there was a long-term objective in the Christian movement. That statement was an unfortunate one. It brought forth a storm of protest from the leaders of the Christian churches. They rightly objected to a comparison between a purely materialistic and largely immoral concept such as socialism and religions, which are concerned only with the moral and spiritual aspect of humanity. That was the pre-election picture. Now let us look at the picture of election time to see where hon. members opposite were.

Mr. Moore: Where they are today—enjoying the confidence of the people.

Mr. NICKLIN: The confidence of the people—on a minority of the votes. If hon. members opposite are satisfied with confidence of that sort, they are easily satisfied.

The next stage was the Premier's policy speech and here again every effort was made to impress upon the electors that the Labour Party had no real socialistic intentions. The policy speech contained only verbiage regarding Socialism, which could not in any way be regarded as endorsing a socialistic objective, because he said—

“We of the Labour Party accept Socialism as an objective because we

believe that society can be so organised that there will be no exploitation of class by class.”

He went on to say—

“Our hospital and medical services are another example of Socialism.”

And so on. These statements are just ridiculous nonsense and the Premier knows that only too well. Every political party in Australia is pledged to prevent exploitation. (Government laughter.) Of course it is—every political party is pledged to prevent exploitation. The public of Australia has been subject to more exploitation by hon. members opposite than by anybody else. Were the people of Australia ever more exploited than they were under the bureaucratic set-up of the Chifley Government? No. It is only now that the people of Australia are getting some relief in this respect. (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to allow the Leader of the Opposition to make his speech without continued interruption.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is all nonsense for hon. members opposite to claim all the credit for the establishment of social services in Australia when they have not been responsible for the establishment of even one. Who gave the people of Australia age and invalid pensions? Who gave them child endowment and free education? Non-Labour Governments. Yesterday we had a speaker, during the Address in Reply debate, who said that the Labour Government had given everything that the sugar industry had today. Did you ever hear of such arrant nonsense? Everything that the sugar industry has come from non-Labour Governments and hon. members opposite know that full well.

However, let me move on to the arch-Tory of the Labour party; I refer to the Treasurer. He was the first into the fray, the spearhead of the attack in the election campaign. He made one of his first public utterances on the party's attitude towards Socialism at Redcliffe and we had this remarkable statement from him on that occasion on the socialistic objective of the Labour Party—

“The opponents of the Labour Government are frantically trying, by vague and inaccurate references to the policy of the Labour Party as laid down in our platform, to create the impression that this State is in the midst of a headlong rush towards total Socialism and the destruction of private property. That is a lie, a baseless and deliberate lie, and those who utter it know it for the lie it is.”

Further on the hon. gentleman said—

“Actions speak louder than words and the record of successive Labour Governments in assisting private business to establish itself and to flourish in Queensland speaks louder and more truthfully, than the thoughts and mischievous statements of Labour's bitter opponents.”

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. NICKLIN: Fancy such a statement coming from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Gair: It is a good statement.

Mr. NICKLIN: After supplying a list of enterprises that the Government had assisted, the Treasurer went on to say—

“Our society, like all highly-developed societies enjoying the benefits of western civilisation and western ideas, is based in its essential economic framework on three factors:—

(1.) Private individual enterprise, supplying goods and services for the citizen.

(2.) Utilities which, by their essential nature, should be and are publicly administered either by Government or municipal authorities.

(3.) Public administration.”

A statement such as that could have come from an hon. member on this side. What we want to know is, does the hon. gentleman mean what he said on that occasion? Is that the policy of his party, and is that the policy he is going to carry out in expending this money he is asking Parliament to vote for him to-day? That is what the people of Queensland want to know, particularly when it is realised that at the recent elections they voted definitely against any further Socialism in this State. Do not forget also, Sir, that the Government do not represent the majority opinion of the people of Queensland.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. NICKLIN: So if they have any regard to the responsibilities of government, they should take some notice of the opinion expressed so forcibly at two elections in such a short time by the people of Queensland in opposition to the Socialistic objective of the Labour Party.

After reading what the Treasurer said at Redcliffe, and hearing his broadcast I would say that the most confirmed Tory in Queensland could not have presented to the electors a better case in favour of capitalism and free enterprise and against Socialism than did the hon. gentleman. I hope that as that is the policy on which he went before the people he will put it into effect in carrying out the duties of his new office.

Mr. Gair: We have been propping up private enterprise on all sides.

Mr. NICKLIN: Admittedly the Government have given some help to private enterprise, but it seems to me that after giving them that help they have taken some action that has knocked down some of those props the hon. gentleman says the Government have put up to keep private enterprise going. The reason why I based my remarks on the Appropriation Bill on this question of Labour's socialistic objective is that we want to know, and the people want to know, in view of the recent State election, exactly what the Government's intentions are. Are they going to carry out their socialistic objective or are they going to carry on along the lines suggested by the Treasurer in his pre-election broadcast and speeches? That is

most important, particularly as the Government received no mandate from the people to put into effect their socialistic objective, because they do not represent the majority of the people. Therefore they should have some regard to the opinion of the majority of the people so forcibly expressed in this State in the Federal election at the beginning of December and the State election recently held. It will be interesting to hear the Treasurer's reaction to the questions I have put to him in respect of his intentions in the expenditure of the £18,000,000 he is asking us to vote.

Mr. WOOD (North Toowoomba) (12.6 p.m.): In spite of all the chagrin displayed by the Leader of the Opposition the fact cannot be blinked that the Labour Government have been returned to this State with the Hon. E. M. Hanlon again its outstanding Premier.

Government Members: Hear, hear!
(Opposition interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: The Speaker laid down a rule that hon. members should have an opportunity to state their case. An hon. member should have an opportunity to state his case without interruption and I ask hon. members to remember that.

Mr. WOOD: The supporters of the Labour Party realise that Labour has a case to state and it will be stated in spite of the attempts to shout us down.

Labour has committed the unforgivable crime of again winning an election. No matter what we do, if we win an election we cannot be forgiven. The Opposition have not been gracious enough to accept the decision of the people. In spite of the childish attitude that has been displayed the majority of the people of Queensland are glad to see the control of this State vested once more in a Labour Government—a Government who have displayed for so many years their capacity to govern—a characteristic that has never been evidenced by the Opposition in the Queensland Parliament for very many years past. I dread the day when this State will be entrusted to the guidance of the Opposition parties who have not shown the capacity that should be possessed by those in charge of the Government of the State.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition had much to say about the last election. Right through that election we heard a constant repetition of their cries and twisted words, but the people were not fooled. We heard the same old catch-cries, such as “Bureaucratic Socialism,” churned out again and again like sausages from a machine. They have been rehashed again today as though the election were not won.

A review of some of the utterances of hon. members themselves may be refreshing. I remember much prominence being given to a statement by responsible leaders of the Opposition parties that if a Labour Government were returned the election would be the last free election in Queensland. No sooner was the election over than the people who

told us that it would be the last free election if Labour were returned, began telling the public about their plans to win the next election. (Government laughter.) Obviously they were talking with their tongues in their cheeks.

Mr. Gair: It is an insult to the intelligence of the people.

Mr. WOOD: Yes. They under-estimated the capacity of the people to decide things for themselves. They realise as well as the majority of the people that democracy is safest when entrusted to the Labour Party, and that the Labour Party is the last one to do anything to jeopardise the freedom of elections. Notwithstanding that, immediately the elections are over and although they said it was to be the last free election, they lay down plans for the next election.

The Leader of the Opposition had something to say about the last election figures. He said that Labour obtained 46.8 per cent. of the primary votes cast, which is correct; but he did not tell the Committee that the Country Party obtained 29.9 per cent., nor did he tell the Committee that their Liberal friends—are they at the moment?—we do not know—obtained 19.9 per cent. They cannot come before this House and say, "We are a united party and combined received a greater number of votes than the Australian Labour Party." The Liberal Party, the Country Party and the Labour Party went to the election and the Labour Party easily outdistanced all the other individual parties but we see the others now sitting in this Chamber cheek by jowl. We see them close together but that does not necessarily mean that they are in close harmony. It may mean, Mr. Mann, as has been suggested in even some of their own quarters that they sit close together so that the Country Party can keep a closer eye on the doings of their erstwhile friends. On the question of election figures, after all, percentages do not mean so much.

Mr. Morris interjected.

Mr. WOOD: The hon. member for Mount Coot-tha has something to say but I would remind him that in a moment I shall have something to say, too. Did we hear any outcry on the occasion of the last Federal election when in this State three Labour members were returned from 18 Federal electorates—one-sixth or 16.66 per cent. Although they received approximately 46 per cent. of the votes and were returned with 16.66 per cent. we did not complain then, as the Leader of the Opposition is complaining today. We have not made one complaint. All the protestations in the world that come from members of the Opposition will in no way convince the people of Queensland that they are governed by a Tory Government.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha's interjection of a moment ago brought to my mind a story I heard. Hon. members will recall that about 1 April—a very significant day—the "Courier-Mail" published a suggested Cabinet for the time when the Opposition

would be returned to power. We remember that Cabinet and we see that some of its members are today sitting on the front Opposition benches. The Leader of the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Coorparoo, made the statement that if the Opposition parties were returned as the Government he would expect all the members of his Cabinet to dispose of their businesses and become full-time Cabinetees. I have been given to understand that in anticipation of events to come the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha disposed of his business, but events did not run according to his calculations.

These two parties, who publicly stated they were going to make it hot for the Labour Party, come to us in a bond of friendship, united as one party with one Leader of the Opposition, one Deputy Leader, and one Whip. They had much to say about the triennial Labour-in-Politics Convention held in Toowoomba, at which I was privileged to be a delegate. They told us some of the things that were said there but they have not one word to say of the Country Party Convention held last week. At that convention there was a gentleman named Gilly Hudson. I do not know him but I know of him and I know that he has embarrassed both the Opposition parties. I think it was he who made the statement, which will go down in history, that "the Country Party dig potatoes and the Liberal eat them." The Country Party man is under no illusion as to the threat with which his party is faced—and it is not peaceful penetration either. Mr. Hudson made the statement, firstly, as a private individual. It shows the state of hostility that lies between these parties, yet for some time both Opposition parties have been trying to convince the people that all is well between them. The fact is that every day we see indications of the increasing hostility of the Country Party towards their colleagues. They know very well that once given the chance the Liberals will absorb them.

While this was Mr. Hudson's statement of his individual opinion, its significance was extended later on. I think it was Mr. Cameron who moved a motion, as reported in the Press, that the conference declare that it as a body did not hold the opinion expressed by Mr. Hudson, but that was defeated. That being so, the convention must have decided that Mr. Hudson's remarks constituted a statement of the opinion held by that convention of the Country Party in Queensland. And these people come here today and tell us they present a united front to us!

The Leader of the Opposition had a good deal to say about socialisation and spoke of ducking 'round corners. The Labour Party does not duck 'round corners. It has been founded on ideals that our opponents do not understand. It has not been built up without a struggle but it has thrived on opposition. The Labour party I repeat, is founded on high ideals, and has been built up by struggle, suffering persecution and surmounting difficulties, until today it is the great Australian Labour Party that we all know. I cannot come into this Parliament

representing Labour as a fly-by-night member. I cannot come here unless I have served my apprenticeship in the party, unless I have been an active member for at least three years and unless I have the confidence of those whom I seek to represent. On the other hand, a man without any political thought in his head until election time arrives can be chosen and elected as a candidate for the Opposition. We have seen many instances of that. I have seen the Liberal Party in Toowoomba approach friends of mine asking them to stand for Parliament and giving various reasons why they should. They have said, "You are a returned soldier, you will capture the returned soldiers' vote." That is only one example of their methods of approach. One man of high repute in Toowoomba who was approached told me that he said to the deputation that waited on him that they did not know what his politics were. The answer given to him was, "We do not worry about that. You will win the seat and then you will be absorbed into our politics." Things like that cannot happen in the Australian Labour Party. No man will be selected until he has shown that he has the ideals and interests of the Labour Party at heart and no member makes any apologies at all for the ideals on which the party has been built.

We have heard much about the achievements of our opponents, but very little has been said about their failure to honour their promises in the Federal sphere.

Dr. Noble: What about child endowment?

Mr. WOOD: Endowment for the first child has been introduced but let me tell the hon. member that the Federal Government refused to give the Labour Opposition a guarantee that the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration would not take that extra endowment into consideration when assessing the basic wage. At present we have no guarantee that when assessing the basic wage the Federal court will not make a reduction to correspond with the increased child endowment.

But we know very well that the Opposition parties are past masters of the art of stirring up mass hysteria. Whenever possible they try to excite the minds of the people, to take them away from the main issues. In spite of the inquiries directed at them in the Federal sphere they have given no indication, as yet, as to any step they will take to put value back into the £. We know very well that they went before the people in November and December last with the definite pledge that they would restore value to the £. We heard about the Chifley £ being worth 12s. but do we hear about the Menzies or the Fadden £ being worth 10s.? Rather than put value back into the £ they have put the £ further back. The Federal Government, representatives of the same class as our present Opposition, have done absolutely nothing about restoring value to the £. In fact, they have not the slightest idea of any way in which they can go about

the job. The Opposition are vociferous at present in their statements, probably being refreshed after a spell from this House—

Mr. Evans: You should be too.

Mr. WOOD: In reply to the hon. member for Mirani let me say that I have read "Hansard" reports consistently and that one of the things that disgusted me was the continual way in which the hon. member for Mirani gloated over his victory. There are two things I do not like—a bad loser and a bad winner. I won an election but did not crow about it. I was then defeated by the present hon. member for Lockyer. I congratulated him and accepted my defeat without squealing. I was fortunate enough on this occasion to win the confidence of the electors of North Toowoomba but in no way have I attempted to become a bad winner. But in every speech made by the hon. member for Mirani in the last three years as recorded in "Hansard"—

Mr. EVANS: I rise to a point of order. The statement made by the hon. member for North Toowoomba is untrue and I ask that he withdraw the statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for North Toowoomba has expressed an opinion.

Mr. EVANS: I rise to a further point of order. It is not an opinion but a statement of fact and I ask that the hon. member for North Toowoomba withdraw the statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I should say that the hon. member for North Toowoomba is expressing an opinion on what he has read in "Hansard." It is an interpretation of what he has read.

Mr. WOOD: If it gives offence to the hon. member for Mirani I will withdraw it but I advise him to read "Hansard."

Mr. Evans: I said it was untrue.

Mr. WOOD: I am limited as to the time at my disposal in this debate but I wish to say that I feel the public of Queensland have been wise in again returning—

Mr. Sparkes: Portion of the public.

Mr. WOOD: Despite the vociferous interjections continually hurled at me by the hon. member I cannot do anything else but express my pleasure at being returned again to this Assembly as a member of the Australian Labour Party.

As a humble member of the Australian Labour Party I should like to express my appreciation of the magnificent leadership given to the party by the Premier during the election campaign. No matter what our opponents may hurl at us they cannot produce leaders of the calibre of leaders produced by the Australian Labour Party. While we have leaders like Mr. Hanlon the Labour Party cannot fail to win.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. WOOD: That confidence in the Australian Labour Party will be justified. Labour has always fought its elections cleanly and on political issues. In the past couple of elections we have seen various attempts to wean the people from the Labour Party. For instance, just before the last Federal elections we saw a picture in the "Courier-Mail" of a training school for Liberal speakers—they were being trained in the way to hold their hands and the way to hold their coats. They were even being told the answers they were to give to various interjections. The apostles of free enterprise would not even allow their candidates the right to choose the reply they were to give to interjections! I have a very interesting cutting here from the "Courier-Mail" of 14 July last, which says—

"Secret Weapon: Executive Liberal Party Member, T. C. Wadley, had an idea at yesterday's Party Conference:—

Handsome young people at polling booths to help win wavering votes.

Presentable young men could persuade a woman to vote Liberal more readily than an 'old fogey' he thought.

His proposal: More handsome party men at every booth."

Heaven help us if we had to descend to those methods in order to win elections—invitations to young people to come to toff parties. Fancy our saying to the people, "You need not be a member but you may come along and have a good time but bring your own sausages and chops with you."! Fancy a political party deciding to produce handsome young men to woo the fickle women voters! If we had to do that it would be a poor lookout for democratic ideals and it is indeed a poor lookout for the democratic ideals for which the party opposite profess to stand.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Mann, on again being elected to the position of Chairman of Committees. I should like to congratulate the Treasurer too on his appointment to his important portfolio.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (12.28 p.m.): At the outset I offer my sincere congratulations to you, Mr. Mann, on your re-election to the position of Chairman of Committees of this Parliament. It is a high and honourable position and I am sure that you will discharge your duties with fairness and impartiality.

I also take the opportunity of congratulating the hon. gentleman who has submitted the motion on his appointment to the important position of Treasurer. I am sure that the Labour Government will require all the energy and capacity that the hon. gentleman can give them during the next three years. I was rather amused to hear the hon. gentleman say earlier in the debate that the Labour Government were continually propping up private enterprise. but the thought occurred to me that the hon. gentleman made the statement the wrong way round. What he really intended to say, or should have said, was that private enterprise was continually propping up the Labour Government.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLER: If the hon. gentleman had to rely on the results of socialistic enterprises, then he and his Government would not last twelve months. It is only as a result of the efficiency of private enterprise as practised throughout Queensland that he and the members of his Cabinet have been enabled to carry on. Nevertheless, we do wish the Treasurer every success in his office. We have a very high regard for the way in which he carried on the duties of Premier in the absence of the Premier abroad, and I am sure that he will use the same skill in carrying out the duties of his present office as he did on that occasion and as he has done in the past.

I was rather interested to hear the Treasurer tell us that he is propping up private enterprise and that he has forgotten the idea of boosting socialistic activities. On hearing the Governor's Speech, I found that there were rumblings as to an extension of the activities of the British Food Corporation. We heard very little about the activities of that organisation during the election, but since the election there have been rumours of the extension of its activities. I have no complaint as to the quality of the land on which the corporation is carrying out its activities, or as to the work carried on so far but I do oppose any extension of socialistic enterprises, whether in our primary or secondary industries.

The hon. member for North Toowoomba rejoiced in the thought that the majority of the people of Queensland were elated because Labour has again been returned to office. We have to face up to the stark realities of the recent election. I will examine what happened. We are all convinced that Labour is in office by the grace of the electoral boundaries. If we have to congratulate anyone, we have to congratulate those conjurers on the very fine job they made of the ballot. They were very much more successful than any one of us imagined. I take my hat off to anyone who lays down plans and carries them out so successfully as was done on this occasion.

Mr. Aikens: I will move later that a memorial be erected to them.

Mr. MULLER: That will happen in about three years' time.

This is one of the few opportunities hon. members have of examining the economy of this State. As time goes on, all the weaknesses of Labour's policy are revealed. After all, it is by results that we must judge our activities. As time passes, we find that more and more of the people are awakening to the weakness of Labour socialistic policy. The details of the polling, as tabled in this Parliament yesterday, are indicative of what happened. They remind us of the old saying, "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time." A number of people are waking up to the distasteful policy that Labour has had in operation for a few years.

Mr. Aikens: You cannot grumble, as you fellows are charging 8s. a lb. for ham.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Aikens interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want to remind the hon. member early in the session that I am not going to allow him to interrupt continually or disregard my call to order.

Mr. MULLER: I will not be carried away from my point by interjections of that kind, but I desire to take the lid off the Labour machine in order to let the people see what is inside of it. We heard lots of wild statements and figures but, after all, we must judge by results. We must judge Labour's policy over a period of years by what it has practised and the results.

We have been deluding a number of people into thinking that they are getting more, but that policy cannot work efficiently in the long run. The economy of our State is influenced at present by the high values of our export products and if it were not for the amount of money flowing in from this source we certainly could not carry on as we are carrying on today. Despite the amount of money made available no provision has been made for a rainy day. The hon. member for Mundingburra interjected that ham had reached the price of 8s. a pound. I do not believe that is correct, but the increase that has taken in the price of that commodity is an indication of the way prices generally are rising. The hon. member said that the price of ham had reached the high level of 8s. a pound, which is ridiculous. It is not only the matter of ham.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I did not quite catch the hon. member. Did he say that my statement that ham had reached 8s. a pound was ridiculous, or did he say the fact that ham was 8s. a pound was ridiculous? I was merely repeating the report in this morning's "Courier-Mail."

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Muller!

Mr. MULLER: I say that the price is ridiculous. I know the hon. member was referring to what he read in the paper, but the paper is not always correct. I cannot imagine anyone paying 8s. a pound for ham, but the fact remains that people have paid prices for other commodities that are almost as ridiculous. Labour's policy has had the effect of creating this inflationary trend that has brought prices to the high level we see them today. I maintain that figures do not prove anything. You may say that you can improve the conditions of working men by giving them higher wages and reducing their working hours, but that policy has the effect of increasing living costs and is a very short-sighted one. Yesterday afternoon I understood one speaker to say that he rejoiced in the fact that we were importing houses. I agree with him up to a point—I think it is necessary to house our people—but I am ashamed of the fact that we are obliged to import housing material or houses. Compare this country with Great Britain. Here we have a population of slightly less than 8,000,000 and we have to go to a country like Great Britain to import housing material.

Mr. Sparkes: And to Germany for wire.

Mr. MULLER: And Japan. There is something seriously wrong with our economy when we have to go to a country like Great Britain, which was shattered and torn during the war, for housing material. Why are we not able to produce our own?

Mr. Jesson: You know why. Private enterprise has fallen down on its job.

Mr. MULLER: Don't be silly! I am not prepared to say that private enterprise has fallen down on its job, but I do say that it has been seriously hampered in its activities as a result of these socialistic enterprises. One reason why material is so short is that the industries that produce this material were so restricted that their output fell off. When quantities are low prices are high; that is the law of supply and demand.

Now let me give some practical examples, without referring to what happened last year or 10 years ago, or saying that Menzies or Chifley was responsible. I will give the Committee an example of a happening in my own town. It is not an isolated case. A house was erected 12 years ago for £850 but last week it was sold for £2,250. That is some indication of where we are getting to. There is no greater friend of the working-man than myself; although we are branded as being supporters of the wealthy class we are on the side of the people who work.

Mr. Sparkes: You work yourself.

Mr. MULLER: Yes. What chance has a working-man got to provide a home for himself, even with the present wages and conditions, if the cost of houses is where it is and still soaring?

Mr. Power: You were advocating the lifting of controls.

Mr. MULLER: The Minister seems to imagine that controls are the solution of this problem.

Mr. Power: They help.

Mr. MULLER: As a matter of plain fact, if controls are to be exercised they must be exercised with reason and justice and with some discretion. The controls in operation over the last few years have very largely contributed to the state in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. Power: Pure rubbish.

Mr. MULLER: The Minister who interjects had control of works and housing and was in office all the time these prices were rising. If these controls were effective, why have they not kept the prices within reason? It is a strong condemnation of his own work over the past few years that controls have the effect of increasing prices to the height they are today. It does not apply only to materials but applies to building costs and transport. Considering the cost of transport one wonders whether the whole economy of this State is not ready to collapse at any

time—two or three people decide when ships are to sail, when trains are to run and so on.

Mr. Aikens: Your only complaint is that you want the black-marketeer and racketeer to control the Government.

Mr. MULLER: Do not worry yourself: I take it you would look after him.

Mr. Aikens: I do look after them very effectively.

Mr. MULLER: If we are to exercise control I would ask the Minister and his cohorts to see that we keep control—and here I refer to our arbitration system—control of peace within industry. I am delighted to see the new Secretary for Public Instruction is in his place today as I think it was he who said during last session that he still believed in the right to strike. That is a serious statement to make.

Mr. Devries: Do you disagree with that?

Mr. MULLER: Yes, I disagree with that. In fact, that is an invitation to break the law and I regard our industrial laws in the same light as I regard our civil laws.

Mr. Aikens: Only when they apply to the worker?

Mr. MULLER: No, arbitration is not one-sided.

Mr. Power: You are not very consistent; a butter factory of which you were a director was fined for a breach of an award.

Mr. MULLER: I was never fined for breaking it.

Mr. Power: Not you, but the company of which you were a director.

Mr. MULLER: The hon. gentleman does not even know the company of which I was a director. I was never fined for breaking the law.

We cannot have it both ways. We must uphold either arbitration or the law of the jungle. There has to be a showdown somewhere at some time. If industry is to survive arbitration must be upheld. If hon. members on the Government side support the view that people are to have the right to defy our industrial courts they are only driving another nail into the coffin of industry.

The hon. member for North Toowoomba was very concerned about the Country Party's association with the Liberal Party as a joint Opposition. Let me tell him that we went to the people as a joint party, with a joint policy. What do we see if we take the lid off the association of the Labour Party with other organisations in the State? We have one Cabinet Minister here admitting that people should have the right to strike. Why, that is the policy of the Communists! The Communists' objective is destruction of our system of arbitration and it seems to be the objective of the members of this Socialist Government to destroy arbitration.

Mr. Power: A member of your Opposition once said he would ringbark the Arbitration Court.

Mr. MULLER: The Minister who interjects may use the whole of the time allotted to him in putting forward his case, and in the little time left to me I should like to deal with the finances of the State. The question does not end with the finances of the Government. The finances of our semi-governmental bodies, our local authorities, are equally involved and local government in Queensland is in serious danger of collapse at almost any time. The new Secretary for Local Government, when opening the recent Local Authorities Convention, endeavoured to console himself by saying that the finances of local Government in Queensland were very much better than they are in the other States. Even if that is so, they are not good in the other States and two wrongs do not make a right. Despite the serious position in which local-government bodies find themselves, the previous Secretary for Local Government, who has now been demoted to the portfolio of Mines, made no effort at all to help local authorities to carry on. They appealed to the Government time and time again.

Mr. Power: Their main policy is, "Gimme, gimme, gimme."

Mr. MULLER: Not at all. The position of local-governing bodies under existing conditions is impossible.

It is only a matter of a very short space of time when it must break down unless they are permitted to collect additional revenue. It is not a matter of "Gimme, gimme" but a matter of "Take and Take" on the part of the Government, who are encroaching upon the fields of revenue available to local-governing bodies.

Mr. Collins: When is the pound going to buy more goods?

Mr. MULLER: When the Minister is finished I will perhaps continue with my speech.

Honourable Members interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to say that the hon. member for Aubigny is a responsible member of this Chamber and should be responsible for maintaining order and dignity within it. He should not interrupt when one of his own party is speaking.

Mr. MULLER: I say that unless the Government are prepared to lend a sympathetic ear to local-governing bodies, no responsible person will be bothered with helping in the job of local government. A few years ago the State Transport Facilities Act was passed through this Parliament, which was responsible for the return to the Treasury of no less than £500,000 a year. The only facility the local-governing bodies got was the provision of roads, but the Government taxed the people who used those roads and put the money received into Consolidated Revenue. The whole of that sum should have been diverted to the use of

local authorities. As a matter of fact, if the Government were honest and decent in this particular instance they would keep out of the field of land taxation entirely and leave it to local-governing bodies. Furthermore, I say that they should be prepared to return the whole of the proceeds obtained by the imposition of the road tax to local-governing bodies. It is no use any such body's attempting to carry on under existing conditions.

I wish to reply to one or two remarks made in this Chamber yesterday in case they should prove to be misleading. Reference was made to Labour's policy of helping primary industries. I have been engaged in primary industry—

Mr. Collins: You do not deny that Labour has helped the primary producers?

Mr. MULLER: My word, I do.

Mr. Collins: Where would you be without a guaranteed price for butter?

Mr. MULLER: I shall deal with that in a moment. I say that for every pound's worth of assistance Labour has given the primary producers it has taken away two pounds' worth—one for you and two for me, as it were. The Secretary for Agriculture and Stock mentioned the guaranteed price for butter but I ask: what has the guarantee meant over the years?

Mr. Collins: What will it mean in the future? Mr. McEwen is taking away the tribunal.

Mr. MULLER: It will mean something less than we should have got without a guarantee. What the future has in store for us remains to be seen, but I am not prepared to admit that the guaranteed price has given the producer anything. It has had the effect of keeping down the cost of living and the subsidies we hear so much about—

Mr. Collins: What about the cost of production?

Mr. MULLER: Dealing with that—
(Time expired)

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (12.55 p.m.): At the outset I congratulate the Treasurer on the able manner in which he has initiated this Bill. I have no doubt that he will acquit himself creditably in his position and that he will enjoy the confidence, not only of hon. members, not excluding the Opposition, but of all intelligent, fair-minded people in Queensland.

The hon. member for Fassifern started off in a strain that I thought hon. members opposite might refrain from using this session and throughout the Parliament. I had thought that they would have realised the cant, humbug, hypocrisy, and futility that characterised the policy of their party in the past and that they would have turned over a new leaf, settled down to co-operate with the Government in the future advancement, progress, and prosperity of this State. However, after listening to hon. members opposite—and if we can take the speech of

the Leader of the Opposition and, especially, that of the hon. member for Fassifern as a guide, it would appear that they intend to adopt an attitude of facing backwards and of steadfastly refusing to take part in the endeavours to develop the State. First of all, the hon. member for Fassifern referred to the electoral officers as conjurers. Then he went on to say that responsible and decent people would not accept positions on local authorities. In view of something that has happened, particularly in his shire—

Mr. MULLER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member said that I said "decent people." I did not use the words "decent people."

Mr. BURROWS: I accept the hon. member's assurance that he did not use the words "decent people," and I can well understand his not using them. He went on to say that certain respectable people—

Mr. MULLER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member should withdraw the statement without reservation. I did not use the word "decent" or "respectable." I said "responsible people."

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to accept the denial of the hon. member for Fassifern.

Mr. BURROWS: I am only too pleased to accept his assurance, which strengthens the impression that he gave me. I appeal to hon. members opposite not to abuse the privilege given to them in this Chamber, not to regard it as a licence to abuse and libel honest public servants, but to remember that when these people accept their positions they are at least entitled to respect. If the Principal Electoral Officer were to walk into this Chamber now I should have to ask someone who he was—if I were interested. I honestly believe that when a man rises to the position of head of a sub-department he is there because he is honourable, decent, and respectable. At this stage of the session and the Parliament I appeal to the decency of hon. members opposite—and there is a dictionary on the table if they do not understand the meaning of the word—and ask them, if they have nothing to substantiate the dirty, cheap, insulting innuendoes they have made in their attacks upon men in high public positions, to refrain from making them. I do not want to labour the point. I sincerely hope that in this Parliament we can look forward to a higher standard in criticism of public departments and Government policy. I suggest in all sincerity to the Opposition that merely because they were defeated at the election for the reason that their policy did not measure up to the standard required by the majority of the people of Queensland they should not if they want to blame anybody for their failure, blame some public servant who cannot come down here to defend himself but should—for the lack of anyone else to blame—blame me. I have the right to come back at them. I enjoy the same privilege as they do here. I might in all humility consider my ability

limited, but judging from the ability exhibited by Opposition candidates during the election campaign I should have no fear in coming back at them.

The hon. member for Fassifern displayed some concern about the economy of the State. That would be a subject I would be very happy to hear them discuss if I were convinced that they were concerned to place it before self-interest, which has been their prime concern hitherto. According to the hon. member for Fassifern, the economy of Australia today is hanging by a slender thread. If it is, I think it is wearing very well. Only four or five weeks ago in Gladstone Senator McLeay told us that approximately £10,000,000 of Australia's taxpayers' money was going to bolster up the economy of South Africa.

A Government Member: And India as well.

Mr. BURROWS: That is so. Yet only about four weeks ago one of the Cabinet Ministers in South Africa publicly stated that there was no necessity for Africans to take the oath of allegiance to His Majesty. We took that oath the other day. But the country whose leader expressed such sentiments as that, has had its economy assured at the expense of the Australian taxpayers to the extent of approximately £10,000,000 a year, and to the detriment of Australian industry into the bargain. Today we have coal-hauliers at Gladstone who cannot meet their promissory notes on their trucks because of the policy of the party that hon. members opposite support. I shall have more to say on that matter on a later occasion.

The hon. member for Fassifern deplored the fact that the Government were importing a number of houses. If he deplores the fact that this Government are importing houses and housing material when they are not obtainable here, I should like to know the extent of his mourning for the fact that although we have hundreds of millions of tons of coal here the party he supported on the election stumps and helped to return is buying coal that is produced under conditions that I trust will never operate in Australia.

Mr. Sparkes: How much coal did Chifley take from you?

Mr. BURROWS: You would not know if I told you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Collins: He took all the coal we were able to sell.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BURROWS: I inform hon. members opposite that Mr. Chifley did more to help Callide in one week than Mr. Menzies and his party have done since they have been in power. I repeat that I should like to know from the hon. member for Fassifern whether he deplores the action of his Government in importing coal just as he deplores the necessity to import houses. Strangely enough, the hon. member for Fassifern said, "Figures

do not prove anything." Somebody must be wrong over there because the Leader of the Opposition tried, by the manipulation of figures, to prove that they were the Government and we were the Opposition. The two things do not seem to add up.

Mr. Muller: You do not understand.

Mr. BURROWS: If ever I understand the hon. member's policy I will say that I am up in Einstein's class.

Members opposite have blamed the Government for the high rise in prices and they have said that prices have been rising because of controls. Only the other day I was outside a store and a woman came along and said, "I paid 2s. for that breakfast-meal, and I am certain that six months ago it was only 1s. 4d." I went into the store and inquired and the storekeeper said, "That is quite right, and on top of that, Jim, we have been told there will be a further rise in the price." The inconsistency of the policy preached by the Federal Government is strikingly illustrated by that incident. The Federal Government and members opposite said they were going to put value back into the £; that was their story during the Federal elections.

Mr. Muller: Who took it out?

Mr. BURROWS: The chap who took the rat out of your vat. (Laughter). What intrigues me is that members opposite have contended that the removal of all these controls would put value back into the £.

In the fact of what is happening, if the £ note had a hole in it previously, they have now taken an axe and put a decent sort of gash in it. But to have done with hilarity: the tendency of our economy, particularly over the last six months, is such that every serious-minded person should give consideration to it. It must have repercussions. Though there was a definite drift towards inflation before the present Federal Government assumed office there is not the slightest doubt that since they came into power the tempo of the drift has been increased tremendously, and if it is not soon arrested I shudder to think of the consequences. I recommend hon. members opposite to give this matter serious consideration and if they have any influence with the members of the party they were so eagerly and zealously supporting at the last Federal election they would be doing a duty to this State by drawing their attention to the seriousness of the position and its ultimate effect on the economy of the whole country. At the rate at which it is going we shall be forced to push a wheel-barrow down the street when we go shopping.

Mr. Muller: Why has Mr. Menzies gone to America?

Mr. BURROWS: I can tell the hon. member why Mr. Menzies has gone to America—to get a dollar loan because he has used all the dollars to provide petrol. It is a very popular move to abolish petrol-rationing on the eve of an election: politically it paid dividends, nevertheless I believe

that Mr. Chifley was honest. Although with petrol rationing fewer cars may have been able to journey from Brisbane to Southport at week-ends and on Sundays than now, I have never known a primary producer who was ever short of petrol. (Opposition laughter). When I say that, I mean genuinely short of petrol. Of course, under petrol-rationing the city man, the city blacketeer and city slicker with a home at Southport could not travel to Cairns in the winter in his high-powered car. Mr. Fadden pandered to that class but ignored the economy of the country and in consequence Mr. Menzies has gone to America cap in hand to pawn Australia for a few more dollars in order to save the reintroduction of petrol-rationing.

Mr. Collins: What about the men sacked at Gladstone because there was no tin-plate?

Mr. BURROWS: That is another matter. We know there was a limited amount of money in the dollar pool and if they bought petrol with it, well then, there was none to buy tin-plate or other necessary goods. That is my understanding of the position and I believe it is correct. Immediately on the eve of an election Mr. Chifley, then Prime Minister, said petrol-rationing had to be retained. I fully realise the political significance of that but we must admire a man who would place the interests of Australia before his political future and courageously continue petrol-rationing. He didn't do this because he was a fool; Mr. Chifley is a man of outstanding ability.

Mr. Evans: He was a pretty good money-lender.

Mr. BURROWS: The hon. member mentions the nasty things that were said about Mr. Chifley. Hon. members opposite had not the courage to fire that bullet themselves. They knew that it was wrong, that it was nasty and, not having the courage to come out in the open and say these things themselves, they handed the bullet to Jack Lang. We all know that not one of those men who tried to hound down Ben Chifley is fit to wipe his boots, either politically, socially, or domestically. Having no other way of endeavouring to crucify him, they attack him because he lent certain moneys as a trustee. Had he lent those moneys at any rate lower than the ruling rate of interest he could have been charged with betrayal of his trust.

I repeat that I hope this Parliament will determine the matters that come before it in a fair and statesmanlike manner, that personalities will be avoided. We should treat our position more seriously than we have done in the past. I hope we have no more personalities or attacks such as those we experienced during the last Parliament, especially the attack in connection with the Golden Casket, a matter on which, greatly to the surprise of the Opposition, a Royal Commission was granted. We all know that it was proved before that Royal Commission that the charges of the Opposition were without foundation. We also know that in the face of his failure to discredit the Government in connection with

the Golden Casket the then hon. member for Windsor, Mr. Bruce Pie, made an appeal through the Press to the public for subscriptions to a fund to defray the expenses he had incurred in an unsuccessful attempt to prove that a very efficient public servant was dishonest. He had put the taxpayers of Queensland to the expense of a Royal Commission just to prove that he himself was a liar, something that I suppose 99 per cent. of us knew already.

Mr. Plunkett: What about your personalities now?

Mr. BURROWS: I am not attacking Mr. Pie's personality, because he has none.

Mr. MUNRO: I rise to a point of order. Statements that are untrue have been made about the hon. member for Kedron in his absence. I ask that they be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In the absence of the hon. member for Kedron, the hon. member for Port Curtis might refrain from continuing in that strain.

Mr. BURROWS: I should like to agree to that. If the hon. member for Kedron was absent performing duties for the good of his electorate, or if he was absent through illness, I appreciate that I should be expected to refrain from mentioning these things, but in my opinion the hon. member is neglecting his electorate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want the hon. member to misunderstand me. The only point that arises is that the hon. member has referred to the hon. member for Kedron as a liar. Any other criticism of the hon. member is quite in order.

Mr. BURROWS: I will say that if the hon. member for Kedron is not a liar, Santa Claus told me he was.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.35 p.m.): First of all, I join with my colleagues in congratulating you, Mr. Mann, upon again being elected to the position of Chairman of Committees of the House. There have been times when you and I have not agreed in this Assembly, but I am fair-minded enough to know that you have always tried to carry out your duties well, and as the hon. member for Coorparoo said some three years ago, your decisions are always given with firmness, clarity and quickness. I believe you to carry out your duties very satisfactorily, and I congratulate you upon your return to office.

As to the speech delivered by the hon. member who resumed his seat a moment ago, I say that I completely and utterly deny the statements he made about the hon. member for Kedron. There is no more honourable man in Queensland, nor is there a greater Queenslander than the hon. member for Kedron. He is away from Queensland today because he is furthering the interests of Queensland; he has done this on many occasions, completely at his own expense, and with advantage to the State. It ill becomes any hon. member of this Assembly,

and particularly the hon. member who just resumed his seat, to attack in an untruthful way a man who is not present—

Mr. BURROWS: I rise to a point of order. I deny that I attacked the hon. member for Kedron in an untruthful way. I ask for a withdrawal of that remark.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Mount Coot-tha will accept the assurance of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. MORRIS: I accept his word but I remind him that at the conclusion of his speech he said that if the hon. member was not a liar he had been told he was.

Mr. Burrows: By Santa Claus.

Mr. MORRIS: He said that Santa Claus told him he was a liar.

Mr. BURROWS: I rise to another point of order. I ask the hon. member for Mount Coot-tha to accept my assurance that I did not say it in an untruthful way. I said that Santa Claus told me.

Mr. MORRIS: If the hon. member for Port Curtis has assured us that he has withdrawn the statement that he believed the hon. member for Kedron is a liar, I will accept his statement wholeheartedly, because I know that the hon. member for Kedron is not a liar and that he is an honourable man.

Might I, before proceeding with other matters, thank the hon. member for North Toowoomba for the kindly interest he has displayed in my personal affairs? It was very nice of him to take such an interest in my personal affairs—and this he has evidently done—and for his own inquisitiveness I propose to tell him that I intend very shortly to become a primary producer in a small way. Seeing that he is so interested in my personal affairs, if he likes to see me after the House rises I will give him all the details he wants to know so that he can use the information inside this Chamber or outside it. In reply to him, might I make to him a kindly suggestion and give him a little bit of personal advice? I remember in his last fleeting visit to this Assembly—and he was only here for a little while—he took exception during the time I was speaking about the subject of education to a suggestion I made about making secondary education freer than it was at the time.

Mr. WOOD: I rise to a point of order. That statement is not correct and I ask for its withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will accept the denial of the hon. member for North Toowoomba.

Mr. MORRIS: I accept his denial but let me tell the Chamber that at that time I was advocating a much more liberal system of entry into secondary education than we had at the time and the hon. member for North Toowoomba, then the hon. member for East Toowoomba, said, "What, do you propose throwing it open to all?"

Mr. WOOD: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the statement be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will accept the denial of the hon. member for East Toowoomba.

Mr. MORRIS: I will do that but I refer the hon. member to "Hansard" for the period concerned wherein he will see that what I have just told the Chamber is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORRIS: I will let that go but I suggest to the hon. member that if he wants to make his visit to Parliament on this occasion less fleeting than the previous one he will make more accurate statements than he has just made.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is now indulging in personalities and I ask him not to continue in that strain.

Mr. MORRIS: When speaking this morning the hon. member for North Toowoomba said that in the Federal elections the Labour Party in Queensland obtained approximately 46 per cent. of the votes. I want to correct that statement and point out to him that the Labour Party got only approximately 41 per cent. of the votes. Here are the actual figures. The Fadden-Menzies Party in Queensland got 363,381 votes while the Labour-Socialist Party in Queensland got 255,036 votes. I have not got the figures but I presume it is only natural that the Labour Party got credit for the votes of their bed-fellows, the Communists. Notwithstanding that fact the percentage is still not the percentage given by the hon. member for North Toowoomba.

I propose to make a few comments about education in one particular aspect and one aspect only. I shall touch on the subject at greater length on some subsequent occasion. Seeing that the Treasurer—whom I congratulate upon his appointment to his important portfolio—will want to see that the money that is being passed today is spent to good advantage, I know that he will have some interest in what I am going to say. I will introduce the subject first of all by quoting a letter that was sent to the Department of Public Instruction on 5 May last by the Enoggera School Welfare Association. It reads as follows:—

"Members of this association are seriously alarmed at the inadequacy and condition of the sanitary arrangements at the Enoggera State School, and I have by direction to request some immediate improvement."

Mr. Jesson: You are always talking about lavatories.

Mr. MORRIS: I would tell the hon. member in reply to his interjection that I have some academic knowledge of them, but I have not yet descended to having a practical knowledge of them. Perhaps the hon. member will think over that.

The letter continues—

“It is appreciated that long-range plans are being contemplated, but we believe that prompt temporary relief can be given without prejudice to more permanent schemes.

“At present the number of children assigned to each lavatory compartment is approximately 40, and it must be obvious that even a daily clearance of pans could not cope with this demand on the facilities provided.

“As the usual requirement in Health Acts and Industrial Awards where groups of men are employed is that one lavatory compartment must be provided for every four persons, we feel that our children should not be subjected to 10 times the inconvenience and health risks implied by the provisions of these Acts. Manpower and materials are found to provide for the needs of workmen, even on temporary jobs like road construction, and we are sure you will acknowledge the necessity for at least equivalent facilities for our children.

“Apart from the question of adequate accommodation the condition and maintenance of the facilities is a matter for very grave concern. They are so bad that some children are reluctant to—and others instructed by their parents not to—use them.

“Inspections by Committees of our members have been made from time to time, and the following faults, all reasonably easy to ameliorate, have been found:—”

“1. Portion of the floors of the lavatories are lower than the ground outside, and therefore subject to flooding, particularly in the boys' urinal. Having no get-away this water becomes stagnant and foul.”

The letter goes on to enumerate many other disadvantages that occur at the Enoggera State School, and it can be examined if any hon. member cares to look at it. It then asks that conditions should be made a little bit better for the children attending that school. As a result, a letter was received from the department promising very much better conditions. The lavatory arrangements in this school even at the present time are shockingly bad but they are not nearly as bad as the conditions that have been revealed by subsequent information I have received as existing at other schools. I asked a question in the House today as to the number of lavatories that should be provided at State schools and I had a reply from the Secretary for Public Instruction informing me that the number was according to an Act passed in 1936. I went to the trouble of looking up that Act. I found that it did not contain any specified number of conveniences to be supplied, and that the number depends on the recommendation of the local authority concerned. I went a little bit further in my inquiries and I found it specified that with respect to factories, shops, warehouses, offices and buildings occupied for part or the whole of any day in the week there should be not less than one convenience for every female

and one convenience for every male. I found that prior to the objection made by the Enoggera School that there was only one convenience for approximately 40 children instead of the number laid down in the Act.

Mr. Devries: You say one pedestal to one female and one pedestal to one male?

Mr. MORRIS: No, one pedestal for every 15 females.

Mr. Devries: You did not say that.

Mr. MORRIS: Well, I am very sorry if I did not; I did not intend to mislead the Committee. I was wrong and I withdraw. It was one pedestal to 15 females and one pedestal for 20 males.

However, I found that approximately 40 children at the Enoggera School were being required to use one pedestal. In reply to the complaint made, this reply was received from the department—

“With reference to your letter of the 5th ultimo, I have to inform you that the Town Clerk, Brisbane City Council has been advised that the Department requires additional sanitary services for the Enoggera State School as follows:—

Boys' closets—8 pans twice weekly.

Girls' closets—8 pans twice weekly.

Teachers' closets—2 pans twice weekly.”

That work was done immediately by the Brisbane City Council as a result of an application by the Department of Public Instruction. It has relieved the conditions there to a very great extent; in fact, so much so that there is now one pedestal for approximately 20 children. It is quite satisfactory in that regard.

The letter goes on to say—

“The Works Department has been requested to give consideration to the following matters—”

This letter was written on 7 June this year.

“The urgent provision of four only additional compartments to the boys' closet and four only additional compartments to the girls' closet.”

Although that letter was written on 7 June no action has apparently been taken as no move has been made to improve existing conditions in the school so far as can be seen.

The letter goes on to say—

“Attention to the area adjacent to the lavatories to prevent flooding.”

No work has been done in that connection because when I made an inspection two weeks ago the floor of the lavatory was so disgraceful that it was impossible for children to walk on certain parts without going up to their ankles in mud.

That is in a school in the metropolitan area. The letter goes on to say that attention will be given to the lids to make them self-closing. In this case the lids of these earth closets are so badly constructed that they are not satisfactory, and the doors of the cabinets cannot be completely closed because of their faulty construction. Not only are the conveniences inadequate, many

of the lids and the doors provided will not properly close. Yet within ten yards of these conveniences the children are required to sit and eat their lunch because that is where the seats are provided for them. Flies are there in abundance and in these circumstances they are a source of irritation to the children during their lunch hour.

Mr. Low: How many children are there at the school?

Mr. MORRIS: About 683. I will point out something infinitely worse. At the Mitchelton school, instead of a figure of 20 to 1, the service is so bad there that there are 28 children to every convenience provided.

A Government Member: They must have a poor member.

Mr. MORRIS: They have a much worse Government. The Government apparently have no interest whatsoever in providing proper hygiene to safeguard the health of the children.

Let us look at another school, at Indooroopilly, where 464 children are in attendance with one convenience for every 35½ children. Yet this Government talk about trying to do something for the welfare of the people in this area! Those conditions are shameful. I believe the new Minister will see that they are improved—I have that much faith in him. But no doubt these conditions exist in schools in many other parts of Queensland. It is a disgrace that any committee should have to write to the department complaining not only about the inadequacy of the service provided, but about the dirt and filth in these conveniences. They do so in that letter, the whole of which I have not read because I do not want to take up too much time. Surely it is the responsibility of the Government and the Department of Public Instruction to see, first that where there are young children especially facilities are provided at least up to the standard and the number required in workshops and factories. It is the responsibility of the Government, too, to see that these conveniences provided at these schools are inspected regularly. If that was done no member would have to come and make a complaint about the unsatisfactory condition of affairs. Not only should the department wake up to its responsibility and see that these services are provided, but it should appoint an inspector or inspectors to see that the work is carried out satisfactorily in the future. I would hate to think that my children were going to a school where the conditions were as bad as they are in the schools I inspected. At one of them conditions were so bad when I made the inspection that it was positively unpleasant to go into the area. I hope these conditions will be improved in the immediate future.

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) (2.55 p.m.): Mr. Mann, first of all I add my congratulations to those already offered to you on being reappointed to the position of

Chairman of Committees. I am sure you will conduct the Committees as you have done in the past.

Now I would briefly reply to the enthusiastic member for Mr. Coot-tha, who always manages to find a lavatory somewhere. He has made a charge against the Government, but I make the charge against him that he held back a letter for several weeks without making further representation to the department all the time, allowing these disgusting conditions to continue.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. Had the hon. member been listening to me he would have heard me state that the letter I read had been sent to the department and I quoted from the letter received from the department. His suggestion that I have withheld this information is incorrect and untrue. I ask that he accept my denial.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to accept the denial.

Mr. JESSON: Yes, Mr. Mann, I will do so, but the letter in reply is dated June when it was said the matter would be expedited and something done. He cannot get away from that. The hon. member might speak the English language more plainly. He so hates the Labour Party that he gets himself all excited. He said a letter was received from the department in June and this is the first week in August.

Mr. Morris: And still nothing has been done.

Mr. JESSON: If it was in my electorate I should have been on the Minister's doorstep the next day, and in fact every day until it was fixed up. The hon. member keeps it for weeks to use it as propaganda against the Government.

A Government Member: What are the city inspectors doing?

Mr. JESSON: Yes, what are the inspectors of the Brisbane City Council doing about the thing? They can inspect the school conveniences the same as those at homes and dwellings.

Mr. Morris: You know it is the Government's duty.

Mr. JESSON: I know it is that of the health inspectors of the Brisbane City Council. We are discussing introducing a Bill to provide for £18,000,000 for Government services, but the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, or One Tree Hill, did not mention anything about the appropriation at all. He had this little nest egg or political bomb hidden which has now turned out to be a squib.

It was with a great deal of interest that I listened to the Leader of the Opposition. This is the 16th Appropriation Bill I have heard discussed in this Chamber but the speeches from the Leaders of the Opposition have been exactly the same—probably a word here and there altered. Over the last five or six years since the war ended they have dug up the old socialistic cry. Apart from the

use of the words "Socialist" and "Socialism" a few times, the speech of the Leader of the Opposition is exactly the same as that made by Arthur Moore as Leader of the Opposition in 1935 when I first entered this Parliament: it is a re-hash of bitter hatred against the Labour Party. The only complaint they have is that the Labour Party won the election. They then bring out the cry of minority Government. In the last election there were about five different political parties. The opposition could not be politically honest in their figures. In some of the metropolitan areas held by Liberal Party representatives, and one in particular, there are as many as three times more electors than there are in some of the western electorates. The Opposition know that. They know very well that the redistribution of electorates carried out by honourable gentlemen is just and fair. The numbers of members returned for the Labour and Country Parties show that. As a matter of fact, for the first time, at any rate for many years, the Country Party have had elected to this Parliament two of their North Queensland candidates. Was that a rigged redistribution?

Mr. Muller: It is the writing on the wall.

Mr. JESSON: Not at all. It is the writing on the wall for the Opposition.

The present hon. member for Coorparoo led the battle in the North. He went from Brisbane to Gympie, to Rockhampton, and to other towns. I had the extreme pleasure of listening to him at Ingham, having come hurriedly away from another meeting to do so. He made me very sad. He reminded me of Christopher Columbus. I called him Christopher Columbus Hiley. I do not know whether I was insulting Mr. Hiley or the original Christopher Columbus, but he could hardly speak at Ingham because he was so brokenhearted that he did not see all the neglect that he expected to see round him. He had been visiting such places as Bundaberg, and other towns with water supplies and beautiful trees in the streets. And he was there at the right time. He was there when the poinsettias and frangipanis and other beautiful shrubs were in bloom. He saw the beautiful city of Bundaberg, the lovely city of Mackay that was represented by Labour for years, then he went to Townsville, and finally came to the glorious city of Ingham and there his heart was broken. I have never seen a man leave Ingham so disillusioned, so sad because of the prosperity he saw everywhere. He saw that Ingham had an electricity supply, a water supply, and beautiful parks, as well as public swimming pools under construction. I suggest that he would do well to take a team of his Liberal colleagues up there to see how the North has been developed. We all know that Townsville's trouble has been the fault of the old Tory crowd who were in power in the city council there. They could not agree over the source of water supply. They fought over it for 25 years, being satisfied with small weirs here and there, and the result is that Townsville has not developed

as it should have done because there has not been an adequate supply of water for industry. Finally, the Government had to tell the council that Mount Spec had to be the source of Townsville's water supply and that if the council did not go on with the work the Government themselves would.

Fifteen years ago I spoke in this Parliament about the potentialities of the Herbert for a water supply and hydro-electricity scheme. The Opposition scoffed at me, just as they scoff at the Burdekin scheme. If we had listened to their crying about the expenditure of public money on development works, we should still have been living in bark huts at such places as Ingham. All hon. members opposite can think about is their own purses, how they can fatten them. They care nothing about posterity. It seems to me that they cannot have many of their speeches circulated through their own electorates because they are seeking to undermine the Government all the time. Their speeches remind me of the man who speaks about lavatories, a man who cannot build one, yet who can blow the Sydney Harbour bridge to pieces without any trouble whatever. They cannot be constructive; they delight in being destructive.

I really thought the hon. member for Logan would have a stroke while he was at Ingham, because he looked so ill. His speeches lacked their usual vim and vigour, and I could not blame him for that. He had been led up the garden path by propaganda published in the Press and uttered by other Labour-haters about the neglect of the North. I think he will agree when I say it was the first extensive tour he had made of these places since entering Parliament. I do not blame him for that. When he went up there he got first-hand information and the farther North he went the more he got. He saw what was being done in the North and he learned that he had had his leg pulled. He resented that. He had the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha up there also but he was shy about going into Ingham. They held a meeting in a little hall at a place about five miles out and they ran round in motor-cars to get people to come and listen to them. They had a nice quiet talk and then they organised little committees—they advertised for committees to help them. I will tell hon. members why. For many years the cane farmers—many in their ignorance—had been paying levies to the Country Party.

Mr. Muller: What has this got to do with the motion?

Mr. JESSON: No more than the cat in the vat had to do with the hon. member.

As I was saying, the primary producers were paying this money into a fund for the Country Party. The Leader of the Opposition did not have the courtesy to drop into Ingham on his way North and say good-day. My friend, Mr. Hudson, very nicely hit the nail on the head when he said that the Country Party will grow the spuds and the Liberals will eat them. What will happen when the pound is revalued? Believe me, the Liberal Party will take its pound of flesh. The banks and the supporters of the

Liberal Party who went out of their way to defeat the Chifley Government and who did their best to defeat this Government, will want their pound of flesh. In their own way they will demand their pound of flesh and they will get it by interfering with interest rates. What will happen to the sugar industry? Those engaged in the industry are working under a sense of false security at present. They will get a 20-per cent. reduction in their incomes and so will the graziers and the dairy farmers and every other primary producer. I can appreciate what is going on behind the scenes at Canberra. The hon. "Call-me-Arty" Fadden is going to get subsidies to make up for the loss; the rest of the people will pay in subsidies to the sugar industry and perhaps increased prices and they will make up for the loss when the pound is revalued. That is the only hope the farming community have got—subsidies from the Commonwealth Government to stop what you might call the bash when it hits them in the big losses to their incomes; and these losses will come about, as I said before, by the revaluing of the pound.

Mr. Evans interjected.

Mr. JESSON: I guarantee that the hon. member for Mirani will be one of the first to gobble the Liberals up. He will go red in the face and will be gripping the hon. member for Coorparoo by the neck and choking him and he will be sitting down on the poor hon. member for Lockyer and flattening him out. Yes, that is what will happen. There will be a bust-up over there and when we want to open another sugar mill and make it a co-operative one the Liberal Party will oppose a co-operative association where the profits go back to the man on the land. I would not be in Mr. Nicklin's job for £10,000 a year. (Laughter). I read in a newspaper not so long ago where he had sold his farm, but I bet he will regret that. In less than three or four years he will be wishing that he was back on his farm and he will have no farm to go to then.

Mr. Sparkes: The Socialists would take all the farms.

Mr. JESSON: Let us examine this Socialist cry. The Liberal Party are the real Socialists in this country and don't know it. What did the Lord Mayor of Brisbane do with regard to the buses in the Brisbane area, and what about the measly compensation he paid for them? For years and years they ran over rotten, bad roads serving a very small population, barely making ends meet, but as soon as the Government started to put up homes and carry out other work the council took the buses over. It did not have to do so. For instance, the Townsville City Council has not taken over the buses there nor have they been taken over in quite a number of other places. It was not compulsory to take them over. But here was an opportunity for these Socialists to get to work and the Socialists on the Brisbane City Council got to work in the Brisbane area and not only took the buses over but paid very little compensation for them. Then we

have hon. members opposite speaking of confiscation or of acquiring property without paying proper compensation to the people. What happens in New South Wales and Victoria? In South Australia electricity undertakings are publicly owned. There is no such thing as a City Electric Light Co. there such as we have here. No private companies such as we had in Bundaberg before regional boards came about—none of these things in South Australia! And that country has been run by the Liberals ever since I can remember. In Victoria they have a minority Government in control of the most highly industrialised State of the Commonwealth. It is controlled by 13 members of the Country Party, assisted by the Labour Party. Yet hon. members opposite have the audacity to come here and say that this story is not right or if it is right over there it is wrong over here. The Country Party and the Labour Party can get together because it is possible for them to be reasonable. There are some members of the Country Party who know they would be all right in the Labour Party. Quite a number of members of the Country Party think that they ought to be in the Labour Government. However there are the few publicity-seekers, the racketeers, and those with the usual human frailties who like honour to go with their names, who like chauffeurs to drive them about, but the majority of the Country Party are happy where they are—away from the Liberal Party. Now they have the Libs tacked onto them and God knows what will happen. It makes me shudder.

I do not want to delay the debate. We have a job to do in this country but unfortunately once again we are faced with a conflagration overseas. I went to the first World War, had a son who went to the second and now I have another growing up who may be required for the third World War. I am just one of thousands of units in this country who are similarly situated. I hope that something fortunate will happen and that the United Nations will be able to clear up this threat overseas. It is a serious matter but I trust that the American armies or the United Nations' Army—put it that way—will be able to bring the matter to a successful issue. If they are driven out of Korea by the Communists then virtually the last seafront in the South Pacific will have gone. It will bring enemy places in close contact with British and American outposts in the Pacific in these days of fast and efficient means of transport; aeroplanes travelling at 600 miles an hour, thereby making them a serious menace in these days of the atomic bomb. The future does not look a very bright one but I sincerely trust it will improve, that better counsels will prevail and that we shall be able to clear up this threat in the East as quickly as possible.

Mr. HILEY (Coorparoo) (3.15 p.m.): I should not like to let the occasion pass without making reference to the fact that this is the first time on which the newly-appointed Treasurer has led in this Committee on a Bill presented by the Treasury and to

express the view that the long experience he has had in the Ministry, and particularly the number of occasions he has served as Deputy Premier, which gives him a very wide background of experience, will stand him in excellent stead in discharging the duties of the portfolio now entrusted to him. It is because this is the first occasion that he has appeared in this Committee as Treasurer that I propose to have something to say with the view to preventing a practice, particularly illustrated within the functions of his department, that calls for consideration not merely by this Government, but by Governments everywhere, that is, the practice of Governments in employing what is known as a departmental or Government spokesman either to issue pronouncements announcing Government policy and even, as was done on this occasion, to embark on criticism which can only be criticism reported as levelled by one Government on another Government. I propose to examine it at some length. Yesterday's "Courier-Mail" contained a statement attributed to a Main Roads Commission spokesman, and then mentions the name of the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. D. A. Crawford. In this statement there is a general observation concerning a 50-year lag on roads and it then goes on to say certain things that impressed me, as it will every hon. member in this Chamber, as being in the character of criticism by a Government of a Government.

Listen to this, in the first place, which is attributed to a Main Roads Commission spokesman—

"Shortage of machinery from dollar areas and an inadequate share of money collected in Federal taxes on petrol were slowing road-building."

That is a general statement. Later on this is attributed to Mr. Crawford—

"The machinery we need is manufactured only in the United States, and the Federal Government has refused us an import licence for it.

In addition, we have been trying for a long time to get a bigger share of the Federal import duty paid on petrol. Last year the Commonwealth collected nearly £20 million in petrol tax, but less than half of that came back to the States for roadmaking."

It does seem to me that this practice of allowing statements to be made by a departmental spokesman is a dangerous practice that we should take stock of and eradicate from Government procedure and behaviour. In the first place, in many instances no name is mentioned, and as a result you have one of those loose statements that can be adopted at the sweet will of the Government or easily disowned if proven to be inconvenient. In this case both statements started in that character and then went on and received the acknowledgment of the departmental head. It seems to me that since expressions become a matter of policy all expressions of policy should come, and only come from the lips of a ministerial head.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HILEY: When you find a departmental officer embarking on statements touching on Government policy and even amounting to criticism on the behaviour of another Government, it seems to me that it is a practice that we should take stock of and cure by common sense, as this is not a matter of party or one single Government. I think by far the worst offender in Australia is this nebulous person "a Commonwealth Government spokesman." He is legion. Again and again you can take up a paper and find this mythical person talking about matters of the greatest import. It is time something was done to draw attention to this objectionable practice to see that less use is made of it in the future.

I propose to create almost a precedent on an Appropriation Bill by venturing to have something to say that includes a few figures. I know that in a Budget debate, apart from the Treasurer and one or two other persons, no-one talks figures.

On the Appropriation Bill, if we can judge by the speeches of hon. members till 3.15 p.m., I doubt if the figures mentioned are more than those that relate to the *avoir-du-pois*. It seems to me that the Committee might very well tolerate a few figures for once. The statement made by the Main Roads Commission's spokesman said that lack of money and equipment was the biggest hold-up and hindrance to putting the roads in order. We shall have to remind ourselves repeatedly that it is doubtful whether with 50 years of this century behind us ever again will the roads be subjected to the continual strain by weather conditions such as this year has provided. Whilst it is true that many of the things affecting our road programmes, such as building methods, ought to be considered, in any case the basic trouble this year has been the influence due to the extraordinary strain of the wet season. I wanted to make that observation because I think some of these observations, such as the 50-year lag on the roads, are no doubt influenced by the shock that the recent months have given to the road surfaces. But whilst I cannot accept 50 years as the period necessary to put the roads in decent order, equally I cannot accept the observation of the Secretary for Local Government that there is little wrong with the roads and that they will be put right soon. I would say that the real truth is half-way between the two. We have a serious problem. This statement says that shortage of money and lack of equipment are the reasons behind it. The method of the presentation of that statement is such that it reads as an attack on the present Federal administration. The Treasurer supplied to the Committee figures concerning the amounts of grants by recent Commonwealth Governments. In 1948 the Chifley administration's grant amounted to £1,088,000; in the succeeding year it increased by about 230,000 to £1,316,000 and in 1950, when the pattern of the finance was laid by the Chifley Government and was largely followed by the present Government, the figures grew to 1,693,000. The exact figure for 1951 has still to be determined, but there

does seem to be a strong prospect—and this is entertained in Commonwealth, State Government and Local-authority spheres—that the amount this year is going to be still further increased from the petrol tax. So there is no evidence so far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned of a dwindling realisation of the needs of the State. Those increases are material, and proportionately they are higher than the increases we are getting under the main grant.

The next point, on the evidence supplied by the Minister, is that it is not inadequacy of grant from the Commonwealth Government that is holding back the progress but that we are putting money into our trust funds faster than we are spending. The balance held at 30 June in each of the three past years virtually equals the increased amount of the grant.

I would here remind the Committee that in 1948 there was a balance of £75,000. In 1949 it had grown to £290,000; in other words, it had grown by virtually the identical sum by which the Commonwealth Government had increased their grant. They increased their grant in round figures by £230,000 and Queensland increased its carry-over by £220,000. By 1950 that balance had increased to £548,000. That was money we held in our hands for road-making and that we could not spend in the period.

Mr. Gair: Allocated and not spent.

Mr. HILEY: That is the standard pattern. There is nothing new in that argument in 1950 that was not equally present in 1948.

Mr. Gair: There are quite a few local authorities that had money advanced to them three years ago that have not spent it.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly, and that bears out my argument, that it is not mere lack of funds that is the biggest factor in holding back road construction in this State, and that was the primary reason advanced by the Main Roads Commission. I suggest to the Committee that the real reason against road construction and other big capital projects exercising our minds, the reason for the holding up of the bridge over the Fitzroy River at Rockhampton and the slowing down of the bridge over the Burdekin between Ayr and Home Hill, is the same reason that has prevented any move from being made in big capital works for the past five or six years. We want to see the Tully Falls scheme proceeded with and these other schemes gone on with, but the same cardinal reason prevailed to prevent the main-roads mileage of the State from being increased—the sheer inability of Australia with its handful of people to meet the manpower and material requirements at a time when some world markets are not available to us and others are badly supplied with the sort of things we need.

That, I think, disposes of the first argument. If there is to be any substance in this suggestion that it is niggardliness of

the Commonwealth, let us look at our own record and search our own consciences on the aspect of money requirements. In the same three years I quoted to the Committee Queensland has imposed a State transport tax. This is a tax based on the use of the road. For many years past there has been quite a lot of money from motor vehicle registration that has gone straight into trust funds for the Main Roads Commission, but the transport tax, which is a revenue tax, goes straight into Consolidated Revenue. In 1948 it took £313,400 from the road-users of this State and not a penny of that went back for the roads of this State. In 1949 the figure grew to £504,000. In 1950 there was a tiny increase to £509,000. It is true that in those three years the Government did make grants to the Main Roads Fund, but those amounts were at a diminishing tempo and at a time when the Government were collecting for the use of the roads at an ever-increasing rate. These grants were—

1948	£403,500
1949	£400,000

And for 1950 I am guessing but am assuming that the amount provided for in the Estimates does accord with what in fact was transposed. The amount was down to £300,000. Every penny of this grant came not from the Consolidated Revenue that took the transport tax but from the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund, which was a nest-egg stored away in the war period and was intended to overtake some of the bad arrears that had developed during the war, notably in the Railway Department. I observe that every grant that has gone to the Main Roads Fund for the past three years has been taken from the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund.

So that on this argument, if there is to be any fair examination of the matter, at least the suggestion that Commonwealth niggardliness is the reason for the bad road position in this State is not an argument that will stand the light of fair examination, and if we do contrast the improving grants from the Commonwealth on the one hand with our increasing collections for the use of roads in the State—which we get and take for our own requirements without putting any of them into the roads—we find the criminal nearer home.

The next matter is lack of material. That is the second great reason advanced by Mr. Crawford for the lag in road construction. I agree that lack of heavy equipment, the great bulk of which has to come from dollar sources, is unquestionably a tremendous factor in hampering not only main roads but other important construction work that we should like to see going on. One great complaint that I had against the Government who were beaten last December was their attitude on the dollar question. That Government's attitude was definitely defeatist. It was one of the great reasons put forward as to why there should be a changed approach to this question. In all fairness, the Menzies

mission did announce that amongst its purposes it was going to the United States of America. It took a bevy of departmental officers from the Commonwealth Department of Supply and Development with it in order, amongst other things, to endeavour to arrange the necessary funds for the purpose, and secondly to secure for Australia a greater quantity of heavy equipment, for the purpose of repairing those very deficiencies that have been complained about.

In all fairness again, if we accept, as we must, the argument that shortage of heavy dollar equipment is one of the big factors that have inhibited decent road construction in this State for some time past, then the first decent ray of sunshine we have had for years has been this attempt by the new Federal Government to see if at last we cannot break this dollar barrier. In spite of the suggestion by the hon. member for Port Curtis that the purpose of this visit is to put Australia in pawn, I venture to suggest that every Australian who has any serious regard for the need to develop this country with speed will recognise that it is a matter of sound finance—

Mr. Burrows: Then why is all the heavy equipment lying idle at Callide today because of the action of Menzies and his Government?

Mr. HILEY: I shall have something to say about that later. If the purpose of the interjection is to suggest that the quantity of heavy equipment that is potentially idle at Callide today would be more than a drop in the bucket in meeting Australia's road requirements, he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Burrows: But it indicates their attitude towards our economy.

Mr. HILEY: I shall examine that later.

The point I desire to stress is that here we are as a nation over-burdened with external money in London. Here we are as a nation unable to spend that money in London at a rate comparable with the rate at which we built it or on the goods we need. Here we are also as a nation desperately starved for dollars in New York, and by a very simple process of transferring the loan indebtedness, paying off some of our London loans and borrowing fresh money in New York, we should succeed in doing two things. In the first place we should reduce some of the inflationary pressure that these London funds represent in this country and which is one of the biggest factors in pushing up our price levels. I heard a very eloquent plea for putting the value back in the pound. There is no easier method of putting the value back in the Australian pound than by bringing in more dollar goods to balance the excessive purchasing power of this community. Yet, when Mr. Menzies takes a step to do this he is accused of putting Australia into pawn.

Mr. Burrows: Do you suggest that you can put the value back by borrowing?

Mr. HILEY: If the hon. member will only listen he will find that my contention is this: that if we repay our debts in London and borrow a smaller sum in dollar quarters—

Mr. Burrows: You know that it is a sense of loyalty to England and that there is sentiment behind it.

Mr. HILEY: I have yet to learn that there is sentiment in owing money when you have money to pay off what you are owing.

Let me now deal with the hon. member's argument relative to Callide coal and I first of all remind the Chamber that the Callide coal problem has only become something to talk about on the lines adopted by the hon. member for Port Curtis since a date in December when the present Federal Government defeated the Chifley Government. The Chifley Government never subsidised one ton of Callide coal and they did not subsidise it for a very good constitutional reason. That constitutional reason is that there is no way in which a bounty can be given on a discriminatory basis. That is something that has troubled each successive Commonwealth Ministry.

Mr. Burrows: Why did they give money to South Australia to buy coal?

Mr. HILEY: I do not feel compelled to listen to the hon. member's ravings interminably and I should like the opportunity to speak to you, Mr. Farrell, if I may.

My second point is: I hope some constitutional device will be found that will enable Callide coal to be used economically in the other States. Again, let me make this observation, because we hear the hon. member for Port Curtis speaking about putting value back into the £. There has been no greater factor to take value out of the £ than the failure of the Commonwealth Government to obtain a sufficiency of coal to keep the productive efforts of Australia going. That is demonstrated by the fact that 40 per cent. of our blast-furnaces have been idle. But no word has ever been mentioned by hon. members in protest!

Mr. Burrows: Read my speech on the Address in Reply two years ago.

Mr. HILEY: There is food for serious concern in the fact that Queensland's coal-producing potentiality is not being fully used at the moment and I will cheerfully join in any attempt to discover a way round it. The new Commonwealth Government were determined to see that Australia's producing capacity was not hampered by lack of coal. It will be remembered that the bulk of the coal coming in is gas-making and coking coal and the hon. member for Port Curtis will admit that Callide coal would be useless for that purpose.

Mr. Burrows: I have made inquiries and you are definitely wrong.

Mr. HILEY: It will be my pleasure to table a list of the orders given recently and then I hope the hon. member will swallow,

if not his coal, his words. We have heard about putting value back into the £ but this discovery was only made since 10 December last. I say that there is no greater need in Australia than to put value back into the £ but some of the criticism of raising a dollar loan and the supplying of a greater quantity of coal to Australian industries does not march with the determination of the Government to put value back into the £.

Let me come somewhat nearer home. The new Federal Government have proposed one measure that I and many other people think would have more effect than any other in the matter. It was a Bill to deal with the Communist menace in Australia. We have had the spectacle of Federal members, to which category the hon. member for Port Curtis belongs, tying Australia's hands for many endless months in the face of the Korean situation on a measure designed to put value back into the £ and for defence purposes. When the history of Australia is written the Australian Labour Party will blush for the part it has played in recent months.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Treasurer) (3.40 p.m.): I should like first of all to deal with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Opening his speech he asked for an assurance that none of the £18,000,000 to be voted today would be expended on socialistic works in this State. Why the Leader of the Opposition should have any doubt about how the money is to be spent is difficult to understand, because he has been associated with politics in Queensland long enough to know that the Queensland Labour Government have a record unequalled by any other Government in Australia for liberality to industry and private enterprise. He must know also that all this carping criticism against the Labour Government on the bogey of Socialism is entirely worn out and, as an hon. member on this side has said during the debate, the socialistic tiger is invariably brought out by the opponents of Labour when they have no better argument to advance.

The Leader of the Opposition said that he was surprised at the statement made by me at Redcliffe and in a subsequent broadcast on this important question. Why he should have been surprised I am at a loss to understand because there was ample evidence to prove that what I had said in those speeches had been implemented by successive Labour Governments in this State. Let the Leader of the Opposition or any other member opposite indicate what extreme policy of Socialism has been implemented by successive Labour Governments in Queensland. On the contrary we know that Labour legislation has encouraged and assisted people to own property. Land laws have been passed to encourage people to take up land and primary producers have been encouraged through the Agricultural Bank. Over the years people have been helped to acquire their own homes and under successive Labour Governments in Queensland we have built up a higher percentage of people owning their own homes

than any other State in the Commonwealth—all evidence that the policy of the Labour Party over the years has been one of liberality in this connection. But the Labour Government reserve the right to nationalise or socialise any industry in the public interest. Immediately we believe that private enterprise has fallen down on a job and has ceased to serve the public interest, then I say very definitely, and make no apology for the statement, that any Government would be recreant to their trust if they failed to nationalise or socialise that industry.

Our policy has had some support from the Tory Premier of South Australia, Mr. Tom Playford. He did not hesitate to introduce legislation that enabled him to take over the electrical power-houses of South Australia when he believed that they ceased to function in the interests of the public.

An Opposition Member: It was their wish to be taken over.

Mr. GAIR: That is why some of the Tories in South Australia, particularly in the Upper House, resisted the legislation. That is why they bucked against it. Mr. Playford, the Tory Premier of South Australia, told me himself that it was only with the support of the Labour members of that House that he got the legislation through.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAIR: It was the same reason, of course, that prompted our ultra-Tory Lord Mayor of Brisbane to nationalise or socialise the transport services of this city. He did not hesitate to take the buses over because he believed it to be in the public interest. I am not condemning him for it, but I do condemn those people who criticise Labour members of Parliament and Labour Governments on the score of Socialism, and when it suits them they do the things for which they condemn Labour Governments. I think it was Mr. Playford who had this to say, and I subscribe to his statement—

“When public welfare or civic development require that any such businesses in private hands have ceased to serve the public interest, or that to serve the public interest better they should be controlled as public authorities—then they should, and will be taken over.”

What responsible member of Parliament or what responsible Government would fail to subscribe to such a policy if they believed it to be in the public interest? This is what Mr. Chandler had to say to me when I chided him in the Press for the inconsistency between Tory actions and Tory words—

“The people who originally gave control of transport to the public in Australia were the people Mr. Gair has referred to as Tories.”

Well, coming from Mr. Chandler that is very refreshing. He says that the people whom I referred to as Tories were the people who were responsible for the socialisation of transport in Australia, yet he will condemn Labour Governments when they engage in any form of socialisation or nationalisation. The Federal Tory Government have been in power

long enough to give effect to their policy in opposition to socialisation or nationalisation. Have they done anything to abolish the T.A.A. service, something that they condemned strenuously when Labour established it? Of course not! Does anyone believe that it is the intention of either Mr. Menzies or Mr. Fadden to abolish or hand over the T.A.A. service to private enterprise? Of course not. You know very well they appreciate the service and the competition it is creating. For that reason that service is serving a public interest and for that reason it can be justified. If the Leader of the Opposition intended to insult me this morning, he succeeded when he said I was the greatest Tory in the House. I have suffered many insults in this Parliament. I have been charged with printing tickets and a lot of other things. I have been accustomed to them and I have ceased to be thin-skinned. Therefore I can accept what the Leader of the Opposition said this morning, which I know he did not mean because he wore a big smile when he said it; hence I did not take him very seriously. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition, however, that what I said at Redcliffe and in my broadcasts I do mean and I subscribe to wholeheartedly, and that is the policy of this Government. We believe—and we have shown it by our actions in providing financial assistance—that we encourage the establishment and extension of private enterprise in this State, and as long as private enterprise will discharge the responsibilities and obligations attaching to the charter we give it, that is, of functioning in public interests, we will continue to encourage it. But immediately we know that it has ceased to discharge its obligations we will not be found wanting and we will give effect, just as any self-respecting Government would, to our policy of seeing that any utility is carried on in the public interest.

Now we come to the criticism by the hon. member for Fassifern of Government treatment of local authorities. The hon. member complained very bitterly about the scant treatment that the local authorities have received from the Government. Let me give the Committee some facts. Since 1932, under the subsidy scheme for aid to local authorities, the sum of £11,547,947 has been approved for subsidies to local authorities. These subsidies are free grants; not one penny is repayable. Approval for loans on easy terms since 1932 was given to the extent of £8,384,025. The Government in the same period gave guarantees aggregating £39,439,202 in financial assistance to local authorities. There is also the matter of the abolition of hospital precepts as from 1 July, 1945. The benefit to local authorities to 30 June last from not having to meet this charge amounted to £2,591,800. This is what the hon. member for Fassifern regards as scant financial assistance. On the contrary it is very generous assistance and it leaves little room for complaint.

Mr. Muller: How do you account for the present financial position of local-governing bodies?

Mr. GAIR: Because incapable men like the hon. member are in control of some of them.

Mr. Muller: You say they are not capable of doing the job?

Mr. GAIR: In some cases, no.

The hon. member argued too that the whole of the revenue from the transport fees should be spent on main roads. The amount spent on main roads by the Commission and allocated to local authorities for the year 1948-49 was made up as follows:—

	£
Amount expended on permanent works	1,622,081
Maintenance	1,050,564
Allocated to Local Authorities	60,187
Maintenance	238,964
Portion borne by Commission on permanent works	1,561,894
Maintenance	811,600

It will be noticed that the total amount borne by the commission was £2,373,494 and the total amount borne by the local authorities was £299,151. It will be seen, too, that the local authorities in 1948-49 received excellent treatment; £2,373,494 was spent on roads without any cost to them, whereas the revenue from motor registration fees was £1,056,813. I do not see that there is any room for complaint by any of the representatives of the local authorities of the treatment of those bodies by the Government.

Mr. Muller: Those subsidy-loans were an open invitation for local-governing bodies to go into debt.

Mr. GAIR: That is an attitude that is quite in opposition to the arguments advanced by representatives of local authorities. The progressive local authorities are only too happy to take advantage of the subsidies and they are prepared to do something for their people and districts.

Naturally, if they are to be progressive, they must go into debt but posterity must be expected to pay some of this debt. The debts cannot be liquidated in the year in which the money is borrowed or lent. Any person with any business sense must recognise that if a local authority is to give the people it represents proper amenities, health schemes, water supply, and those things that are indispensable to a progressive district it must spend money and if it spends money it must go into debt.

Mr. Muller: There must be some limit.

Mr. GAIR: I suppose that is sound, too, but who has reached the limit? The Government are not going to allow local authorities to borrow and borrow without limit. The Government will watch the financial affairs of every local authority. The Government will not merely hand out any amount asked for. We pay regard to the financial position of the council.

Mr. Muller: Do you not allow too many of them financial aid?

Mr. GAIR: If we err on the side of generosity it is not in accordance with the hon. member's criticism. He cannot say that we have been niggardly towards local authorities and then criticise us for being over-generous. He cannot be as inconsistent as all that and get away with it.

Mr. Kerr: How do you arrive at the limit of borrowing?

Mr. GAIR: We have regard to all the factors associated with the local authority.

Mr. Kerr: Ratable values?

Mr. GAIR: They would come into consideration, also areas. Everything has to be taken into account including the capacity of the local authority and the people in the district to bear the cost of the project proposed.

The only other matter that I think merits reference is that raised by the hon. member for Coorparoo, who stated that the only money made available for the main roads of the State was taken from the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund, not from Consolidated Revenue into which fund the money received under the State Transport Facilities Act had been paid. I am sure the hon. member will agree that the Post-War Reconstruction and Development Trust Fund has been made up by moneys originally paid into revenue, so after all that money made available to the Main Roads Commissioner for main roads purposes initially and primarily came from Consolidated Revenue. I think the hon. member's criticism in that connection has been adequately answered.

I agree with the complaint of the hon. member with regard to public servants making statements on matters of Government policy and can assure him that as long as I have been a member of the Government—even before I became a member—I always believed and Ministers have made it very clear to their officers that they were not to make statements on Government policy, particularly statements which the hon. member said were criticism of other Governments. I can assure him again of the policy and attitude of this Government in that connection. I read the Press article to which he referred. One cannot blame them but unfortunately some of our pressmen go round Government offices. After all, it is their job to get as much news as they possibly can. I am not critical of them in that connection. They go round and collect bits of news from one officer, then another, piece them together, and write an article under the heading of "Special Correspondent" and make a quotation as from a spokesman of one particular department or another. It is often very embarrassing and unfair to high officers who have not been responsible for giving out the information and who might be suspected of supplying it to the Press. I can assure the hon. member for Coorparoo that I agree with him entirely. It would be a very unsatisfactory state of affairs if our under-secretaries and senior public servants were to make statements on Government policy to the Press. Every effort

has been made from time to time by pressmen to get these people to make statements. Often when they are unable to obtain something from the Minister they try to get it from the under-secretary without telling him they have failed to get it from the Minister.

Mr. Larcombe: They go round on the blind side.

Mr. GAIR: That is so. I shall certainly mention it to Mr. Crawford who has not been very long in the position of Commissioner of Main Roads. I am sure that what he did was done with a conscientious desire to supply the public with some information and without any desire at all to cause any offence.

Motion (Mr. Gair) agreed to.

Resolution reported, received, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

COMMITTEE.

VOTE ON ACCOUNT, £18,000,000.

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

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Treasurer): I move—

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1950-1951, a further sum not exceeding £8,500,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland exclusive of the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account.

"(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1950-1951, a further sum not exceeding £6,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

"(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1950-1951, a further sum not exceeding £3,500,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account."

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

ALL STAGES.

A Bill founded on the resolutions was introduced and passed through all its stages without amendment or debate.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

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

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 15 August, 1950."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.12 p.m.